



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

34 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-10/34.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-fourth Session**

**Brasilia, Brazil
25 July – 3 August 2010**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

The text contained in the present document is a transcription of the debates of the session. It is therefore to be considered as a verbatim.

Le texte contenu dans le present document est une transcription des débats de la session. Il doit donc être considéré comme un verbatim.

Monday, 26 July 2010

FIRST MEETING

Morning session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira
and M. El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

2A. Amendment of Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedures

Document *WHC-10/34.COM/2A*

Decision : **34 COM 2A**

The Chairperson :

« Bonjour à tous les participants de cette 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Je vous souhaite le plus grand succès pour ces journées de travail qui nous attendent. Cette rencontre est très importante pour l'avenir du patrimoine, nos débats sont fondamentaux pour l'avenir de la convention, pour effectuer une réflexion sur celle-ci et pour l'évaluation des sites.

Tout d'abord, je souhaite vous présenter mes excuses pour ce retard et nous commençons nos travaux par le point 2A. Ce point 2A de notre ordre du jour concerne l'amendement du Règlement intérieur du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Je donne tout de suite la parole au Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial qui va nous présenter ce point ».

Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you, Chairperson. This item includes two documents that you have been given as hard copies: com/2A and com/2B. Com/2A is a proposal to amend the existing rules of procedure, in particular rule 8.3. As you know at this time we do not have a deadline for the presentation of request for observer status. Technically, a request can come, even now, and we are supposed to include it in the list. This has created some unease in previous sessions of the Committee. Therefore the Committee has been asked to look into a way to study this process.

The Decision that we have put forward is a slight amendment to Rule 8.3, in which, essentially, we established a deadline set up in our proposal of at least one month prior to the date of the Committee session. This is a very simple and technical adjustment to our rules and it should not be very problematic to accept it. It will also facilitate the work of the Secretariat.

We have discussed it with members of the Committee and the observers. I think everybody agreed with it, apart from some people who asked for a deadline of 15 days. For us this would be acceptable, within two weeks we have time to prepare the document but I leave this for the Committee to discuss.

The second document, 2B, is a standard document with a list of participants with observer status. I think Mr. Chairperson perhaps we could open the floor for comments on this draft issue.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, Mr. Bandarin. Now, I would like to know if any of the Committee members would like to address this issue. Have you any comments to make on this? Please let me know. Mr. Bandarin, please take the floor again.”

Francesco Bandarin:

“Obviously there is a consensus on this and I would like just to indicate that from a Secretariat point of view a period of 15 days would be sufficient. If you allow me Mr. Chairperson, we can then use this time frame rather than the one month period that is included in the proposed draft resolution. I think that the rapporteur can take note that this is a proposal of the Secretariat to change it to 15 days. Thank you.”

ITEM 2B. REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Document : WHC-10/34.COM/2B, WHC-10/34.COM/INF.2.

Decision: 34 COM 2B

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now point 2B, which deals with the requisition of the observer status. The floor is again to Mr. Bandarin.”

Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you, Chairperson. This is a list of participants with observer status. For those who have requested you have it. This is decision Com/2B and it relates to the decision to attend the Committee for these observers. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“We therefore take that as adopted, and let us move on to Item 3, Mr. Bandarin.”

ITEM 3: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE OF THE 34TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (BRASILIA, 2010)

3A. Provisional Agenda of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010)

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/3A and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.3A.Rev

Decision: 34 COM 3A

3B. Provisional Timetable of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010)

Document WHC-10/34.COM/3B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.3B

Decision: 34 COM 3B

Francesco Bandarin:

“Item 3 is the adoption of the agenda timetable of the Committee. You have two documents with you: 3A is the agenda and 3B is the timetable. Compared to the agenda provisionally approved at the 33rd Session of the Committee, there are some small changes. I would like to indicate to you which items were not included in the agenda approved last year and therefore added by the Secretariat on the basis of recommendations and consultations.

New items that you will find are, first, Item 5G, regarding the audit of the World Heritage Centre, carried out by the external auditors of UNESCO. This item was requested to be included during a members’ meeting that was held in Paris earlier in the year.

Second item, 9A, the terms of reference for the new audit of the World Heritage Centre concerning the partnership programme and the global strategy. As you may recall, this audit by the external auditors of UNESCO has been requested by the General Assembly that met last year in October in Paris. Point 9a is the terms of reference of this audit that you have to consider for approval.

Item 9C regards the Global Training Strategy which was included in the previous agenda. Then, Item 10b is proposed by the Secretariat and it merges several items that were separated earlier on, regarding reporting from several regions of the world. As you know, we are going to present to you one report for the Arab region this year. The other regional reports and situations will follow and we have put them all together in one document.

Item 10D is a report on Africa 2009. There was a request to have it singled out from the periodic reporting document. We have prepared an independent, separate document.

Finally we have merged Items 7.1 and 7.2, the development of the Recommendation on the historical landscapes, and the request that was put forward by the Committee last year to discuss the impact of contemporary architecture on World Heritage sites. We thought that these two items, although they slightly differ, could be put together in the same document.

To summarise: six new items have been either edited or adjusted according to recommendations or considerations of the Secretariat during the year. The agenda has been renewed; you now have both agenda and timetable. The latter has been discussed in the previous two days with the Bureau which met in the morning yesterday and today. As you know, the task of the Bureau is to look at the agenda and timetable of the Committee. This task was carried out and the Bureau has given its preliminary approval of this agenda now submitted to your final approval. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much; the floor is open for Committee members on the items that have just been exposed: the draft timetable and the agenda. The floor is open for comment thereupon. There do not seem to be any comments; therefore the agenda and timetable as read to you are adopted.

Before proceeding, let me tell you that it is absolutely forbidden to film our working session. Please do not take film and I will ask you all to comply with this decision. I will now leave, as I have an appointment with the Director-General of UNESCO, and I would like to ask the vice chair, the Egyptian representative, to be kind enough to act as Chairman during my absence in keeping with the rules of procedure.”

ITEM 4. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEURS

4A. Report of the Rapporteur of the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009)

The Vice Chairperson:

“Ladies and Gentlemen, let us continue our proceedings. *Bonjour tout le monde*. I will now proceed to Item 4 regarding the report of the rapporteurs. It starts with the report of the rapporteur of the 33rd Session of the World Heritage Committee for 2009. In this regard I have the pleasure to invite Mr. Antonio Ricarte, rapporteur of this session. Mr. Ricarte will highlight the main issues discussed and decisions adopted during the Committee session.”

The rapporteur, Mr. Ricarte:

“Allow me, first of all, to thank you colleagues and members of the Committee to have entrusted me with the challenging role of rapporteur for the Seville meeting of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to pay tribute to The Chairperson of the 33rd Session, Ambassador María Jesús San Segundo, permanent representative of Spain for UNESCO, for her relentless effort in intelligently conducting the discussions in Seville. I am certain that without her able leadership the Committee would not have been able to accomplish the examination of an extensive agenda in only seven working days. As the rapporteur, I assisted her in compiling the different proposals made during the debate and at the time of decision making. But I have to acknowledge that it was her who brought forward the best possible draft proposals to reflect the sense of deliberation and to achieve consensus.

As you know, the 33rd Session was preceded by the first Ibero-American World Heritage Youth Forum, held in Seville on 15–21 June 2009, which brought together 39 participants from countries in Latin America, Spain and Portugal. The involvement of youth in the activities of the World Heritage Convention has become a tradition, as we witnessed yesterday at the opening ceremony. This practice ensures that the Convention is better known and the values of conservation and humanism it enshrines are effectively transmitted to future generations.

The opening ceremony in Seville was attended by many personalities, such as Ms. Angela Gonzalez-Sinde, Spain’s Minister of Culture, who welcomed the participants and stressed the importance of united efforts to preserve humanity’s shared heritage. Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, the ex-director general of UNESCO, Mr. José Antonio Griñán, president of the autonomous region of Andalusia, Mr. Monteseirin, mayor of Seville, Mr. George Anastasopoulos, ex-president of the UNESCO General Conference and

Mr. Olabiyi Babalola Joseph Yai, ex-chairman of the Organisation Executive Board, were some of the many special guests that attended the inauguration.

Representatives of the 21 State Parties members of the World Heritage Committee were present (Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United States of America). Some of the members that I have mentioned have left the Committee and some new colleagues have joined us, since the Committee last year. We also had the presence of 97 State Parties to the World Heritage Convention that are not members of the Committee but came as observers. This means that more than half of the 185 State Parties to the 1972 Convention were represented at the Seville meeting.

The Convention is quickly approaching universal ratification, with only seven other members of UNESCO which are still not parties to the Convention. The Committee has always been at the centre stage of the Convention and its workload has been increasing significantly, as is amplified by the 177 State of Conservation reports submitted to the Seville Session and around 40 reactive monitoring missions conducted before the session.

The 34th Session did not divert from the recent trend of long hours of meetings, evening sessions and parallel discussions which will probably be reproduced here. The Committee established some Subsidiary Bodies to examine specific issues like budgetary matters and the use of the emblem. However, one particular initiative is worth mentioning, given the transcendence for the evolving nature of the Convention. An open-ended working Group was established under the leadership of Mr. Greg Terrill from Australia to reflect on the future of the World Heritage Convention, building upon the results of a seminar which had been held in Paris earlier last year.

The working group met every morning before the start of the Committee sessions and presented its recommendations on a calendar and draft vision for the future of the Convention, with a view to a celebration of its 40th anniversary in 2012. That working group, which will be re-established at this session, attracted the interest of many delegates and particularly those who had previous experience as Committee members. Its output was brought at the attention of the General Assembly last October dedicated especially to the celebration of the 40th anniversary.

During the debate in Seville, issues were raised about the respective role of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre itself. Many Delegations felt that further studies on this relationship were necessary in order to clarify their mandate and voice overlap. Delegates also expressed that impact of the Global Strategy raised in the workshop on the future of the World Heritage Convention would continue to be a preoccupation; although positive results were obtained, such as 145 State Parties now have World Heritage sites and new categories such as Modern Architecture were introduced. Imbalances in the World Heritage List continue to affect its credibility. In this regard the network of Training Centres for Capacity Building in World Heritage has given new hope that some of these imbalances will start to be addressed at the country level. The Committee praised the efforts undertaken by the African World Heritage fund in support of the countries in the region, as well as the progress made with relation to the feasibility study on the Pacific World Heritage Fund as important tools for the implementation of Article 5 of the Convention and to help redress the imbalances.

The discussions on the report of the World Heritage Centre took longer than originally foreseen, given the interest of Committee members in examining several aspects relating to the role of the Observers and of the Advisory Body, as well as some dramatic issues such as the impact of tourism on the conservation of heritage sites, and new emerging topics like prehistoric sites. The richness of the debate made evident the need to allocate more time for the examination of the complexity of activities carried out inter-sessionally by the members of

the Committee, State Parties, the Advisory Body, the World Heritage Centre and many more actors involved with the functioning of the World Heritage system.

One issue that the World Heritage Committee discussed is the need to update the existing framework for the protection of historic cities initiated during the Vienna conference in 2005, by drafting a new recommendation for submission at the General Conference of UNESCO in 2011. In this context, the concept of historic urban landscapes needs to be included in the operational guidelines of the Convention. Therefore, a process was launched by the Committee with a view to including this concept in the operational guidelines at this session, if the Committee visited the sites. An expert seminar was held in Brazil last December in order to prepare a draft for examination by the Committee.

The debate on Items 7 and 8, State of Conservation of the properties described in the List of World Heritage in danger, reviewed the situation in several World Heritage sites under particularly serious threat, such as: the Galapagos Islands, the National Parks in the Democratic Republic of Congo, sites in Ethiopia, Egypt, Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Philippines, Azerbaijan, Chile, Peru, Venezuela, Serbia and Tanzania. The Committee also decided to remove the Walled City of Baku with Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower in Azerbaijan from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee took a difficult decision with regard to the Dresden Elbe Valley, deleting it from the World Heritage List. The Committee also inscribed three new sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

As to the additions, the World Heritage Committee inscribed two new natural sites and 11 cultural sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List. Since it also withdrew one site from the list, as I mentioned, the Dresden Elbe Valley, the list now totals 890 properties. Three countries had their first World Heritage sites inscribed on UNESCO's list of properties recognized as having universal outstanding values. They are: Burkina Faso, Cape Verde and Kyrgyzstan, whom I congratulate.

Mr. Vice Chair, I conclude my brief remarks by a simple statement. The atmosphere of the session in Seville was unforgettable.

4B. Report of the Rapporteur of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the States Parties to the *Convention* (UNESCO, 2009)

The Vice Chairperson:

"Any comments or questions regarding the report of the last session? I see none, so let's move to the next point regarding the report of the last 17th Session of the General Assembly on 23-28 October 2009 held in Paris at the UNESCO headquarters. We have a five-minute video presentation by Ms. Dangnija Baltina which was moderated by Mr. Dawson Munjeri, to whom I send my best regards. Can we proceed with the video?"

The rapporteur, Ms. Dangnija Baltina:

"*Bonjour*, good morning I hope everybody is fine, safely arrived in Brasilia and fit and ready to start working on an extensive agenda in a peaceful environment, yet, taking time to enjoy the hospitality of the Brazilian people. I am sorry for not being able to participate in the session in Brasilia, but I am pleased to virtually be with you using modern technologies and to deliver my report on the outcomes of the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the World Heritage Convention. I had the honour last October of being elected as the rapporteur, and treasure the trust you put in me to fulfil this task with my utmost consciousness. I thank you for all the messages I received from my colleagues and representatives of both State Parties and Secretariat.

The 17th Session of the General Assembly was indeed an active, challenging and intensive session. It gives us feedback that we can learn from and a source for future directions and successful common work. It summarised the previous work and inputs as well as marked areas for future concern. Mr. Dawson Munjeri from Zimbabwe was elected as The Chairperson while Malaysia and Argentina were elected to serve on the Bureau. At the close of five days of very intensive works, at the end of the session, 12 Resolutions were adopted, including resolutions related to the financial, administrative and conceptual aspects of implementing the World Heritage Convention, as well as elections to the World Heritage Committee. New members elected to the World Heritage Committee were: Cambodia, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Iraq, Mali, Mexico, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand and the United Arab Emirates.

The main issues and highlights of the session were amendments to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly of State Parties regarding possible alternatives to the existing system of elections to the World Heritage Committee and the matter of the future of the Convention. Amendments to the rules of procedure prepared by an open-ended working group chaired by Ambassador Kondo, though widely questioned and discussed at the session, were at the end adopted, remaining with the basic principles of: a four-year gap between two mandates; reserved seats for electoral groups risking a lack of representation in the following Committee and a State Party with no property on the World Heritage List; streamlining of the voting methods of the principle of absolute majority of the first round of the ballot and a simple majority at the second round; and drawing of lots in case of tie-breaks in the second round.

Capacity building for World Heritage Committee members and the need to elaborate upon the role of Observers in World Heritage Committee Session were underlined, introducing the second main issue: the matter of the future of the World Heritage Convention, global strategies and setting of its priorities. It was acknowledged that there is a need to organise more expert meetings to guide the developments and reflections on agreed priorities, thus, mobilising more and more expertise as a crucial aspect for the implementation, credibility, visibility, strategic management of the Convention, efficiency of the statutory organs and capacity building for the State Parties and stakeholders.

Offers from Australia, Bahrain, Brazil and Japan of such expert meetings were welcomed. Furthermore, debates around this issue of the General Assembly itself were for the first time concentrated more around contents and procedures, thus focusing further debates. Issues in the financial and managerial aspect accordingly were adopted with little debate focusing on demand from member States and the need for increasing additional voluntary contributions.

An issue which raised more concerns was about the management audit of the World Heritage Centre. Repeatedly questioned were the human resources and staffing policies of the World Heritage Centre, as well as its relations with advisory bodies. Many points raised during the 17th Session of the General Assembly are ongoing and remain open, underlying the evolving relevance of the Convention along with the evolving challenges of maintaining its spirit.

I thank you for your attention and wish you fruitful work. *Obrigado e Adeus.*"

The Chairperson:

"Again, are there any comments, questions regarding that part of the last General Assembly? Barbados, you have the floor."

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. I appreciate the report that was delivered by our colleague as rapporteur of the 17th General Assembly. I would just like to note that at the time of the General Assembly, Barbados put forward an intervention specific to the issue of the date and timing of the General Assemblies in association with the General Conference. I was assured that my remarks would be taken in the overall reporting of the General Assembly. I would just like to make sure that it would, in fact, take place. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to the representative of Barbados, the Secretariat will comment.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to assure the delegate of Barbados that your comment has indeed been taken into account and will be reflected in the summary records of the session.”

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee’s decisions

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5A

Decision: 34 COM 5A

5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5B

Decision: 34 COM 5B

The Chairperson:

“Are there any further comments or questions regarding the report of the last General Assembly? I see none. We will move now to the next item, which is the report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities regarding these issues. I would like to invite Mr. Rao to please report on that Centre which is contained in document WHC10-34.com/5A. You have five minutes.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I do not think I need five minutes. I will just present a very brief summary of document 5A that, I am sure, all of you have in front of their eyes. This document basically lists all activities that were undertaken after the 33rd Session of Seville by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. I’ll briefly highlight some of the activities which are I might say non-exhaustive as some of them are continuing activities which have been reflected in tabular forms in the document.

One of the highlights, of course, is the fact that we have 187 State Parties to the Convention now since the ratification of Equatorial New Guinea. We have, as the rapporteur

of the last session just mentioned, inscriptions from State Parties which did not previously have any sites on the World Heritage List: Burkina Faso, Cape Verde and Kyrgyzstan. We have also taken into account requests that were made by the Committee for providing all the decisions that the World Heritage Committee has taken to date. I am very pleased to announce on behalf of the Secretariat that we have all the decisions since the inception, 1978. All the decisions are now available online on the Centre's website and are provided with a link to this matter.

For the last session of the Committee we have also provided a tracking table which gives you the progress of implementation of the decisions. The document contains also a list of the expert meetings that we have been organising since the Seville Session of the Committee. These are illustrated on page three. I will not go into each of the meetings and their results, as they are available in separate documents that the Committee will consider during this particular session.

I might point out that the report on the audit of the Centre, which is mentioned in part C of the document, is now a separate document, number 5G, as requested by the informative session of the Committee on June 14; and consequently in the Draft Decision on the last page, I would suggest that paragraph four is to be deleted because there is a separate Draft Decision associated with document 5G which deals with the audit of the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.”

France:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président et je voulais remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour ce rapport qui nous a été présenté et qui est tout à fait synthétique comme cela est utile. J'aimerais toutefois avoir des précisions sur quelques points qui sont contenus dans le rapport, notamment celui mentionné dans le paragraphe 14 où on évoque les accords de partenariat avec le secteur privé qui ont été conclus par le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que neuf accords de partenariat avec le secteur privé plus cinq en cours de négociation.

Nous estimons également qu'il mériterait que les réponses à la décision 33.com/5A soient moins elliptiques et donc qu'elles soient plus précises. Enfin, nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec le projet d'amendement qui vient de nous être présenté dans le projet de décision puisque nous l'avions également préconisé à l'instant. Il nous semble que cela est tout à fait en cohérence avec la modification de l'ordre du jour et l'inscription, dont nous nous félicitons, d'un point 5G, donc d'un point à part, sur le rapport d'audit avec un projet de décision annexé. C'est un souci de cohérence qui est le bienvenu et je remercie le centre du patrimoine mondial ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, est-ce qu'il y a des questions de la part des membres et observateurs?
Australia, you have the floor. »

Australia:

“Thank you very much, Chair, and good morning. As with France, We would like to congratulate the Centre on a very good and interesting report. I just have one question in relation to it: It is mentioned that the decision database is only available to Committee members. Is there a reason for that, as it would be a very useful tool if it were available to all parties and observers? Question to the Secretariat: Is there any impediment to doing that? If not, we would like to amend the Draft Decision to achieve that.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, Australia. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you very much, Chairman. First of all, as it is the first time that we have taken the floor this morning, we would like to thank Spain for making it possible for us to speak in Cervantes’ language for this meeting. We would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its very concise report. We agree with what France said regarding the amendment to point 5G. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. Mali is asking for the floor, granted.”

Mali:

« Merci. J'avais seulement une petite question concernant ce Rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial. L'intitulé dit Rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des Organisations consultatives. J'aurais souhaité quand même que l'on parle des dossiers présentés par les Organisations consultatives pendant cette période. Je ne vois pas le partenariat, c'est-à-dire l'énorme dossier présenté par les Organisations consultatives pendant cette séance. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, le point concernant les Organisations consultatives sera abordé tout à l'heure lors du point 5B. Je donne la parole à Monsieur Rao pour répondre aux demandes et questions des membres du Comité ».

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will address the question of France and Mexico. We agreed to the comments that have been made and I would like to point out, as demanded during the General Assembly of State Parties, that there will be an audit of the Partnership Unit of the World Heritage Centre by the UNESCO external auditor. The partnerships that the Centre has ended in Dubai with the private sector will be looked at as part of that audit as well.

Regarding the comment made by the delegate of Australia, you are right; all the decisions will be acceptable to the State Parties so we can amend that part as suggested by Australia. The question by Mali has already been responded to by The Chairperson. The reports of the Advisory Bodies will be dealt with under Item 5B.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, any further comments, questions?”

Mali:

« Je ne suis pas satisfait de parler du Rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de laisser les Organisations consultatives sur un autre document tout à fait séparé. Comme le travail des Organisations se trouve sur un autre document, il serait souhaitable de modifier ce titre : “*le Rapport du Centre du patrimoine mondial*”. Et enlever le terme les *Organisations consultatives* et de le réserver à un autre document. Sinon, si les Organisations consultatives sont annoncées sur le document, on s’attend à y découvrir leurs travaux ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Je redonne la parole au Secrétariat qui répond rapidement ».

The Secretariat:

“I would like to point out to the distinguished delegate of Mali that there is a subtle difference between an item and a document. Item number 5 is common. It deals with the reports of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre and the documents are called 5A and 5B. So the item is common but the documents which present these reports are separate. It is just the difference between an item and the document.”

The Chairperson:

“Switzerland is asking for the floor, please.”

Switzerland:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président. Simplement pour annoncer que nous avons des difficultés avec les transmissions électroniques et donc que nous avons des modifications du projet de décision pour le 34 COM.5A que nous allons écrire et transmettre au Secrétariat par voie manuelle puisque nous n’arrivons pas à les passer par voie électronique. Ces propositions vont dans le sens d’explicitier un petit peu mieux ce que l’on attend du Centre du patrimoine mondial en matière de renforcement de la présentation de son rapport. Et également pour inviter le président du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Le texte est parti et je ne peux pas continuer. Nous allons essayer de le rédiger et de le donner par écrit. Excusez-moi, Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci la Suisse. L’Estonie a demandé la parole, vous l’avez ».

Estonia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We have a question concerning point 4 of the report, namely the written summary records of the last meeting in Seville. Our question is, when was this report distributed? Because we had trouble locating it from the webpage and we did not receive a response from the Secretariat. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Estonia; the floor is now to Thailand.”

Thailand:

“Thank you, Chair. Regarding point 5A and the report of the Centre, first of all I would like to thank the Secretariat for producing this interesting report which outlines the resource-based report of the activities. But I would like to refer and draw attention to Item 17B. We invite the Centre to describe the criteria by which the World Heritage Centre makes decisions, as to which activities under the Convention it undertakes. I found a response from the World Heritage that the World Heritage Centre’s activities are only motivated by the Committee’s decision. This means that this World Heritage Centre has not yet outlined the criteria required by the Committee. I would like to suggest that the World Heritage Committee should improve its documentation on criteria. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Madame. I see Barbados. I would like to ask the members of the Committee if they have further comments or questions regarding the report of the World Heritage Centre to close the list for the moment in case more members of the Committee would like to take the floor. Barbados has now the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. Just to make sure that having reviewed the report of the World Heritage Centre we are struck by the lack of information regarding the workshops and funding strategies and other capacity-building measures to address heritage development in the Caribbean. We know that there are other separate reports, but what we look for in 5A is a coherent distillation of all the activities so that you can branch out to more detailed information.

One point that we do feel should have been addressed in this report is the issue of the World Heritage Centre’s response to the recent calamities in Haiti, which is tied in with the broader UNESCO agenda in relation to the CIC. I would propose that it should be recognised as part of the document and its activities in the future, mainly regarding that kind of major activity.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados, I will give the floor to the Secretariat, first to Mr. Rao and then to Mme Lemaistre.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Responding to the comment by the delegate of Thailand: the criteria for selecting activities, as is explained on page 3 of the English version of the document, are essentially based on the decision that the Committee takes. The Secretariat of the Committee is here to implement the decisions that you adopt here at various sessions. But it is also possible that, from time to time, based on unforeseen events or emergencies, we are required to undertake activities that were not reflected in previous decisions. One example now given by the delegate of Barbados is the earthquake which was not foreseen and not part of the Decision, but we had to respond to that event and undertake certain activities. Essentially, it is based on the Committee’s Decision, but if the delegate of Thailand has some suggestions to make, in the form of the criteria that we should adopt in terms of activities that we undertake, they would be most welcome.

Moving to the comment made by Barbados, we can certainly not reflect in the Secretariat report all activities undertaken. As I said at the beginning, this is a non-exhaustive List and, if you recall, at the 23rd Session we had a separate document dealing with Small Island Developing States, and there, we had provided an exhaustive list of activities that we had undertaken. But we will definitely strive to make it more comprehensive in future reports.

In relation to the Haiti disaster and the response of the Centre and how it fits with the response of UNESCO as a whole, a separate presentation will be made including a separate lunchtime event that will be organised on that particular topic. Thank you.”

Secrétariat, Mme Lemaistre:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. En ce qui concerne le rapport de la 33e session, il vient juste d’être signé par le rapporteur, donc il sera mis en ligne ensuite pour commentaire par les membres du comité sur leurs propres interventions et le délai pour pouvoir faire des commentaires sur ses propres interventions ira jusqu’au 30 septembre 2010 ; merci ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci au Secrétariat.* Now I give the floor to Observer One to comment the report of the World Heritage Centre. Please could you introduce yourself at the beginning of your intervention? You have the floor Sir.”

Japan:

“Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; this is Japan. First of all I would like to congratulate the efforts of the World Heritage Centre in promoting private sector partnership by concluding agreements and involving them by promoting the goals and activities of the Heritage Convention. I thereby would like to make particular reference to the media partnership agreement.

For instance, UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre has made agreements with two Japanese private television broadcasters: NHK and TBS. They respectively have video archives of more than 500 sites. This kind of partnership certainly will help promote the purpose of the Convention and this video material can be used for public goals like education. I would like to urge Member States to help the efforts of the World Heritage Centre in promoting this kind of media partnership by, for instance, facilitating the granting of permission of filming videos of those sites.

Some samples of their work would be put in the form of leaflets and distributed to all members during this Committee. Thank you very much to the World Heritage Centre for your work and thank you all.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Japan. I would like to remind you that the time of interventions is 3 minutes for members of the Committee and 2 minutes for observers. We activate the timer from now.

Are there any further comments? I see none; I would like to remind you that we are also invited to adopt the *ad hoc* decisions included in document WHC-1034.COM/5A, although we have a technical problem regarding the screening of this decision. We have two amendments from Switzerland and France. What I would suggest is that we examine this decision just after lunchtime. Thank you for your cooperation. The floor is given to the rapporteur for further explanation.”

The Rapporteur:

“I think the main issue has been already stated. We have received amendments from Switzerland, France and Australia. The amendment France suggests is to paragraph 4. It has been supported by Mexico and the Secretariat. The amendment of Australia is a slight modification of paragraph 3 which is also supported by the submission of Switzerland and the new paragraph 4 replacing the old paragraph 4. The amendment of Switzerland adds four new paragraphs at the end of the Decision, some of which are further paragraphs. We note that this is a level of complexity that you may want to see in writing and the suggestion is therefore that we put the Draft Decision together, distribute it during lunch as a paper version, and examine it after. Thank you.”

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

Documents WHC-10/34.COM/12A, WHC-10/34.COM/12B and WHC-10/34.COM/14

Decision: 34 COM 12 And 12B

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for that proposal and I would like to suggest that we move to the next item on the agenda, Item 12: Reflection on the future of the World Heritage Convention. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Rao, deputy president of the World Heritage Centre, to briefly present the content of the document.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you, Mr. Chair. This document, 12A, outlines the process of the future of the World Heritage Centre which was launched in 2008 at Quebec, followed by an international workshop held in Paris in 2009, further reflected on at the 33rd Session of the Committee in Seville and at the 17th General Assembly of State Parties. What you find in this document is a progress report on activities implemented within the framework of the future of the Convention’s discussion, as well as plans on future activities to be undertaken. The important items to bear in mind, while looking at this document, are the Seville Decision 33.COM14/A2 and the resolution that was adopted at the 17th General Assembly of State Parties last year.

The working document basically outlines many of the priorities that were reflected in the resolution of the General Assembly last year, as well as some of the priorities that the State Parties wanted to be reflected on the future of the Convention. If you recall, the Decision was that the draft Action Plan which was adopted at Seville should be circulated to all State Parties; this was done and we received feedback on suggestions for priorities to be reflected in the Action Plan. We have reflected those suggestions that have been made by the State Parties also for your consideration.

I would like to draw attention to two meetings that have been held since the 33rd Session of the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the future discussion. One was a consultation meeting held in Bahrain supported by the Kingdom of Bahrain and Australia for the organisation of this meeting in December last year. This was to look at the decision-making processes. This will be further considered during this Committee session, perhaps in the framework of the working group that will be set up, to look at the various issues related to the future of the Convention.

The second meeting was on the upstream processes to provide more support to State Parties for ensuring that nominations do not fail in the manner that they fail currently, to provide for more robust mechanisms for successful nominations to be submitted. This meeting was held in Phuket in Thailand; thanks to the Royal Kingdom of Thailand, Australia and Japan who hosted this meeting jointly in April this year. The document contains a summary of the recommendations that were made by that Expert Committee.

I will not go into details of the recommendations of these meetings that were held because one of the proposals in the Draft Decision and, as was mentioned by Mr. Bandarin in the Bureau meeting this morning, is to constitute an open-ended working group as a consultative body under rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. The working group would meet during this session to look at the various recommendations of the expert meetings and to look at the draft Action Plan.

I would also like to draw attention to two other documents which need to be reflected on further. One is Document 12B, which is in your list of documents. It outlines the preparation for the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2012. We are proposing a very preliminary outline of the suggestions that the Secretariat is planning. We propose that the activities will be launched in January 2012 and culminate with a major event that the government of Japan has very kindly agreed to host on 16 November, to coincide with the date of the signing of the Convention. We are proposing that the themes of the celebration will be Heritage and Sustainable Development. There are a number of communication-related activities that we are proposing, as well as establishing a World Heritage Prize. These are very preliminary suggestions and things that will be reflected upon within the working group that is proposed to be set up.

Another document is for consultation for the working group, which deals with the working methods and which will be introduced later on. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to invite the members to agree to the constitution of the working group, as indicated in the document mentioned above. I see no objections, it is so decided. The Advisory Bodies regarding these issues have requested the floor for a joint statement. However, it seems that they have changed their minds.

Let’s now go further into detail regarding the organisation or constitution of the working group. France would like the floor, please.”

France:

« Monsieur le Président, je voulais juste faire une remarque et une précision pour être sûr d'avoir bien compris. Je note au passage que dans le programme qui nous a été distribué – à la différence de celui qui nous a été donné auparavant – le point sur l'avenir de la Convention n'y est plus inclus. Cela a été peut-être oublié, ce qui explique le flottement que vous avez senti dans la salle au début et dans certaines Délégations.

Bien entendu, il n'y pas d'objections pour la création du groupe de travail. Si je comprends bien, le groupe de travail portera à la fois sur l'avenir de la *Convention*, mais également sur les célébrations du 40^e anniversaire, donc nous ne discutons pas du projet de décision contenu au point 12B de l'ordre du jour. C'est le groupe de travail qui traitera l'ensemble. Est-ce que c'est bien le cas ? »

The Chairperson:

« Tout à fait. Je ne vois pas d'autres commentaires, si, l'Égypte ».

Egypt:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président, juste une question d'ordre pratique qui rejoint un petit peu le délégué de France. Elle porte sur les pays qui contribuent au *working group* pour le futur de la *Convention*, car en même temps M. Bandarin nous a signalé qu'il y a un autre groupe pour le budget qui se tient au même moment et les deux groupes se réunissent dans deux salles en parallèle.

Comment cela se fait-il pratiquement ? Les pays qui contribuent à l'un des groupes, ont-ils le droit de contribuer à l'autre par le biais d'un autre délégué ? ».

The Chairperson:

« Tout à fait, mais on reviendra sur ce point tout à l'heure. Pour le moment, on va aborder le point 12, et le point 16 sur les groupes de travail sera examiné plus tard et une décision sera soumise au Comité. *Mexico you have the floor, and after Mali* ».

Mexico:

“Thank you very much. In the same vein as what has been said by France, we would like a precision. It is not clear to us how the discussions on the outcomes of the working group are going to be presented, so that we know how to discuss things if we decide to join the working group. Because we have many matters that we would like to discuss regarding the future of the Convention and we would like to be able to make a contribution. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique, la parole est maintenant au Mali ».

Mali:

« Je souhaiterais faire une correction, car dans le document il est écrit 186 alors qu'il y a 187 États parties qui ont signé la *Convention*, c'est dans la page 2 du document, le paragraphe sur le contexte du processus. Mon second point est relatif à l'avenir de la

Convention. Lorsque l'on parle de l'avenir de celle-ci, le premier élément qui me vient en tête c'est sa crédibilité, autrement dit, la stratégie globale pour une liste crédible, équilibrée et représentative. Mais on se rend compte qu'il y a un grand fossé entre les États parties. Dans certains cas, un seul État partie peut avoir un nombre de biens supérieur à l'ensemble des États de tout un continent ou bien la moitié de ses biens.

Quand on parle de la mise en œuvre et de l'avenir de la *Convention*, on doit mettre l'accent et voir dans quelle mesure on peut réduire l'écart de la notion de représentation des biens sur l'ensemble de la planète. Réduire le fossé entre les États parties. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, la parole est à M. Rao pour apporter sa réponse ».

M. Rao:

“Very quickly, to respond to the question raised by the delegate of Egypt, it is true that various working groups will be constituted and will conduct their business during the session. But what we are proposing is that one working group meets in the morning between 8:30 and 9:30am, another working group at lunch time between 2:00 and 3:00pm and the third working group meets in the evening. We are trying to provide the opportunity for interested State Parties to participate in each of these working groups.

The delegate of Mexico raised the practical issue of how the report of the working groups will be reported back to the Plenary. If you look at the timetable, the discussion for the future of the Convention is listed on the agenda for Monday 2 August. What we have done is that we brought forward that item, today right at the beginning of the Committee session, to be able to constitute the working group. The substantive discussions on various issues will take place within the working groups and they will come back with a report which will be presented next Monday in the Plenary, when all Committee members are attending.

The point made by the delegate of Mali is very valid. Undoubtedly the credibility of the World Heritage List and equal representation of various different State Parties is a different issue. Like I said, all these issues will be looked at and discussed within the framework of the working groups. I would urge the delegate to please make this comment to the working group on the future of the *Convention* when it meets. Thank you, Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China, you asked for the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. As this is the first time that I take the floor, may I complement you on your chairmanship for this important session. What I proposed is that at yesterday and today's Bureau meetings, the members of the Bureau all agreed that three working groups are to be established. Now Item 12 is not yet delivered so why do not we constitute all these working groups this morning, so that Item 12 will be delivered and then we could ask Mr. Kishore Rao to introduce Item 14 so that one working group is established. Then we could come back to Item 13 to establish the second working group and repeat that for the third. By then we will be finished this morning. This would save time. Thank you.”

**ITEM 14: FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE
– POSSIBILITY OF HOLDING TWO ANNUAL SESSIONS OF THE WORLD
HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Document WHC-10/34.COM/14

Decision: **34 COM 14**

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, China. I completely agree with you and I am going to give the floor to Anne Lemaistre for presenting the next part.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président, je vais vous présenter maintenant le document 14 qui est relatif à l'étude de faisabilité sur les méthodes de travail du Comité et la possibilité de tenir deux sessions annuelles du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Je voudrais vous rappeler que lors de la 33^e session du Comité, ce dernier avait demandé au Centre du patrimoine mondial de mettre en œuvre une étude de faisabilité pour étudier plus à fond le concept et les implications de la tenue de deux sessions annuelles du patrimoine mondial, mais également de tirer les enseignements des autres conventions multilatérales. Vous trouverez à la fin du document, en annexe, un tableau récapitulatif des *modus operandi* des diverses conventions multilatérales et environnementales de l'UNESCO.

Il convient de rappeler à ce stade que les méthodes de travail du Comité, en raison de la surcharge du travail, ont été déjà discutées à plusieurs reprises par ce même Comité dans différents contextes et cadres, mais vous vous souviendrez que cela avait déjà été discuté à la 23^e session à Marrakech en 1999 et qu'un groupe de travail avait été établi sous la présidence de Mme Cameron et que ses conclusions avaient été présentées à ce moment-là.

Cela a aussi été discuté à la 7^e session extraordinaire du Comité en 2004, à sa 29^e session en 2005, à sa 30^e session à Vilnius. Lors de cette dernière, le Comité qui s'était penché exactement sur ces mêmes questions avait conclu que le Comité du patrimoine mondial devrait tenir une session par an. *“Les sessions extraordinaires du Comité ne doivent avoir lieu que si des circonstances très exceptionnelles l'exigent”*.

Pour rentrer un peu plus dans le vif du sujet et donc sur cette étude de faisabilité, j'attire votre attention sur les paragraphes 8, 9, 10, 11 et 12 de ce document dans lesquels sont présentés les avantages et les inconvénients d'une session supplémentaire par an. L'un des avantages de la tenue d'une session supplémentaire par an serait de d'alléger l'ordre du jour surchargé du Comité, ce qui pourrait garantir une plus grande sérénité des débats. Cette scission de l'ordre du jour pourrait consister à tenir une session consacrée à l'examen des propositions d'inscription et des rapports sur l'état de conservation. Puis, avoir une autre session qui aurait trait à tous les aspects administratifs et financiers liés à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*.

Il y avait une autre proposition qui avait été suggérée lors de l'atelier sur l'avenir de la *Convention*. Elle consistait à dissocier l'état de conservation et les propositions d'inscription. Le Secrétariat juge cette proposition un peu dangereuse, car cela dissocie des processus qui sont quand même intimement liés. C'est bien entendu au Comité de décider.

Maintenant que je vous ai parlé des avantages, passons aux désavantages. Ceux-ci bien évidemment seraient les coûts supplémentaires directs et indirects doublés par la préparation et la tenue de deux sessions. Ils ont été évalués dans le cadre de cette étude à 263 000 \$ US par session supplémentaire. L'autre désavantage serait le manque de temps.

Car, outre les coûts, la ressource la plus précieuse et la plus nécessaire à l'organisation de ces sessions par an s'avère être le temps. Que ce soit pour les Organisations consultatives, le patrimoine mondial, mais également pour les membres du Comité. En ce qui concerne les deux premières, je crois pouvoir dire que nous travaillons dans des délais déjà extrêmement courts et avec des dates butoirs extrêmement serrées. Il faudrait pouvoir introduire cette session supplémentaire dans le cadre de ce calendrier déjà un peu serré.

Il a été suggéré, à la 9^e session extraordinaire qui s'est tenue le 14 juin dernier, que ce sujet, le point 14, serait débattu dans le cadre du groupe de travail sur l'avenir de la *Convention*. Il s'agit donc, comme l'a dit Madame l'ambassadrice de Chine, de créer ce groupe de travail. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, Madame Lemaistre. Je souhaiterais que l'on suspende les débats sur ce point car il sera abordé par le groupe de travail. Je vois le Mexique qui demande la parole ».

Mexico :

« Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Nous pensons qu'il est important à la lumière de l'information que vient de nous fournir le Secrétariat d'exprimer deux idées, commentaires d'importance, sur lesquels nous reviendrons lors des groupes de travail. Nous souhaitons dire que l'organisation de deux réunions du Comité par an augmenterait de façon substantielle le coût des réunions statutaires du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Étant donné les restrictions budgétaires de l'UNESCO et la demande croissante d'appui technique par les États membres, il me semble que cette question n'est pas faisable. Peut-être que l'on pourrait considérer que cette question devrait être examinée à la réunion de Bahreïn et cela nous permettrait de trouver une solution pour alléger les débats de notre session annuelle du Comité. Nous pensons pour cela qu'il faut promouvoir la participation du Mexique à ladite réunion ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique. Comme je viens de le mentionner, je voudrais arrêter le débat à partir de ce point avec deux options : qu'il soit abordé en groupe de travail et ensuite on y reviendra en plénière suite aux recommandations proposées par le groupe de travail. Je vous remercie de votre compréhension et j'aimerais maintenant poursuivre sur la question de la constitution des groupes de travail qui a été évoquée ce matin. Conformément à l'Article 20 du Règlement intérieur, ces groupes de travail seront ouverts à tous les États parties.

Le premier groupe de travail examinera les points 12 et 14. En ce qui concerne le point 12, il devra examiner les rapports des réunions d'experts et les décisions de la 19^e Assemblée Générale. Il devra aussi définir la vision de l'avenir et le plan d'action pour le 40^e anniversaire de la *Convention* et sa célébration.

En ce qui concerne la durée et les horaires de réunion de ce groupe de travail. Je propose que ce groupe se réunisse pour les trois prochains jours en commençant dès demain de 14 h à 15 h. Au cours de la première réunion du groupe de travail, vous choisirez un président et un rapporteur à moins que vous mainteniez M. Greg Terrill qui a fait un excellent travail l'année dernière. Êtes-vous d'accord avec moi ? M. Terrill est-il d'accord ? Avez-vous des commentaires ou des objections en ce qui concerne la création de ce groupe de travail ? La Thaïlande ».

Thailand:

“I second the nomination of Mr. Terrill, the member of the Committee of Australia, to be The Chairperson of the working group, as he has great experience as chair of this working group in the past. At the same time I would like to clear some minor points from the Secretariat regarding the document on page 3 of Item 14: Feasibility Study and Working Methods of the Committee. In this document we refer to the transportation and *per diem* of the World Heritage Committee members financed under the World Heritage Fund. I would like to ask for clarification whether this is a practice of the Secretariat to provide such transportation and *per diem* to all the members of the World Heritage Committee. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Thailand. The floor is now to Anne Lemaistre.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président. Effectivement, le Fonds du Patrimoine mondial a une dotation annuelle de 60 000 \$ US pour pouvoir financer la participation des membres du Comité. Cela a été institué cette année. Nous avons informé les membres par une communication avec un délai statutaire qui est d'un mois avant le début de la session, de manière à pouvoir nous organiser. Plusieurs membres du Comité sont ainsi venus, financés par le Fonds du Patrimoine mondial qui n'est pas extensible et se limite à 60 000 \$ US par session. Merci. »

ITEM 13: REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents: WHC-10/34.COM/13 and WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev,
Decision: 34 COM 13

ITEM 16: PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2008-2009, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2010-11 BUDGET COVERING 01 JANUARY TO 31 MAY 2010.

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/16 et 16 Add
Decision: 34 COM 16

The Chairperson:

« Merci, Anne. Avec votre permission, je suggère que l'on continue avec les discussions puisque l'on parle de constitution d'autres groupes de travail sur les points 13 et 16 et peut-être que l'on conclura notre séance du matin après la constitution des groupes de travail.

Regarding Item 13 I will ask Ms. Anne Lemaistre to present this item which refers to the document WHC-10/34.com/13.”

The Secretariat:

« Le Secrétariat ne va pas rentrer dans le détail des amendements proposés dans le document 13 puisqu'il est proposé qu'un groupe de travail le fasse, mais plutôt expliquer l'organisation du document. Je souhaite attirer votre attention sur le fait que le document est en deux parties. La première partie du document contient le texte présenté l'année dernière à Séville avec les amendements proposés par l'Australie et le Canada. Mais également tous les autres amendements proposés par les États parties qui ont répondu à la lettre circulaire envoyée le 1^{er} décembre 2009. Elle demandait des commentaires et des amendements au texte proposé.

La deuxième partie du document 13 comprend des amendements proposés lors de réunions d'experts qui se sont tenues pour la plupart cette année, à l'exception de l'atelier d'experts sur la science et la technologie qui s'était tenu à Londres en janvier 2008. Il y avait une demande d'amendement, qui a été intégré. L'atelier sur l'avancée du tourisme durable sur les sites naturels et culturels du patrimoine mondial : cette réunion s'était tenue en Chine en septembre 2009. La réunion d'experts sur l'inclusion du paysage urbain historique qui s'est tenue à Rio en décembre dernier. La réunion d'experts sur la proposition d'inscription des biens en série qui s'est tenue à Ettingen en Suisse au mois de février dernier. Enfin la réunion sur les processus d'inscriptions qui s'est tenue en avril en Thaïlande. Donc, vous avez la compilation, dans cette partie 2, de tous les amendements qui ont été proposés lors de réunions d'experts.

Ce document a été distribué aux membres du Comité en couleur pour en faciliter la lecture, car ce texte est assez complexe en raison du nombre important d'amendements, et bien entendu le détail de ce document vous sera proposé pendant le groupe de travail qu'il est proposé de créer maintenant. Je vous remercie de votre attention ».

The Chairperson:

“Before asking the members of the Committee if they have any comments or questions, I suggest that we go further as discussed this morning during the Bureau meeting. To propose according to rule 20 of our Rules of procedure, to constitute a Consultative Body open to all State Parties with a specific mandate to review all amendments proposed. I suggest that this group will meet again for three days, starting tomorrow, between 8:30 and 9:30am, in the room which is downstairs from this room. The working group, before starting procedures, will choose a Chair and a rapporteur. Do you have any comments or objections to this suggestion? Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Mr. Chair, we have no objections to the working group, just some questions. Considering Sweden's interests and engagement in the relations regarding sustainable tourism and sustainable development/transnational nominations on urban heritage, we would like to actively contribute to the working group, of course. However, we would like the Centre to make some clarifications regarding document COM13 on some of the relations or the results of the Committee's decisions and proposals of expert meetings as Ms. Lemaistre told us. But we also have contributions from other State Parties and the status of these contributions is unclear to us against the Committee's decision last year.

We might be wrong, but our understanding is that what was decided was to include proposals made during the discussion and circulate all the proposals to State Parties for comment. These comments regarded the Committee proposals only. Could the Centre

please clarify this? The Committee can, of course, decide to consider all the proposals. Most of them are very good and constructive but we also note that there are proposals with far-reaching consequences which need careful consideration. I hope the working group will be able to do that in the course of the session. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is back to the Secretariat."

The Secretariat:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ce que vous venez de souligner est tout à fait juste. Vous avez les amendements qui étaient proposés l'an dernier par le Secrétariat et qui étaient donc une compilation de tous les amendements proposés lors des différentes sessions du Comité précédemment. À ces amendements présentés l'année dernière ont été ajoutés, pendant la session, des amendements de l'Australie et du Canada parce que nous avons des contraintes de temps. Pendant la session de Séville, il a été demandé que ces amendements de l'Australie et du Canada soient soumis pour commentaire à l'ensemble des États parties. Le texte a donc été envoyé le 1^{er} décembre 2009 à l'ensemble des États parties et, de ce fait, ces commentaires qui sont des amendements aux amendements figurent en vert et doivent être considérés par le Comité cette année pour adoption ou non. J'espère avoir été assez claire. Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

"*Merci*. Rapporteur, would you have any further comments?"

Rapporteur:

"Concerning decision 34. COM.13 I have not received any amendments, however I would like to draw the attention of the Committee members to the fact that in the English version of paragraph 3, extra rule 20 should have an insertion of the Rule of Procedures of the World Heritage Committee, as is already the case in the French version. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"If there are no other comments or objections, then I would like to move to Item 16, devoted to the report on the execution of the 2008-2009 budget and the report on the execution of the 2009-2010 budget. I would like to draw your attention to document WHC-1034.COM/16, which presents the final accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the mentioned years, covering the period of 2008-2009 and the state of implementation of the budget for 2009 -2010, starting from 1 January up to 31 May 2010. During the discussions of the Bureau meeting this morning, it was agreed there would be another, third working group on this issue. According to rule number 20 of our Rules of procedures, this group will be open to all State Parties. Actually, I have a correction; it will only be open to Committee members with a specific mandate to review all the amendments proposed. It was established and agreed during the Bureau meeting that this working group will meet during lunch time from 2:00 to 3:00pm in parallel with the working group regarding Item 13. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Kishore Rao on this item."

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I make a very brief presentation on this document I would seek your indulgence in introducing to the Committee the new Administrative and Finance Officer of the World Heritage Centre, Ms. Tania Besimensky. As you know, her predecessor Mr. Carlos Romero retired at the end of March and she has taken his place. She will then be working with the Committee members during the working group as well.

I would like to basically draw attention to document 34.COM.16 and highlight a few elements that we have introduced into this document. We have taken into account the various recommendations that were made in Seville. As you recall, we had a working group established in Seville in the last session which was very ably chaired by the delegate from Barbados. Based on the recommendations, we have tried to make document 16 clearer and provided more explanations of the various figures that are reflected in this document.

We have also taken into account recommendations at the last General Assembly of State Parties and in particular Recommendation 10 of the external auditor’s report, which you can see in document 5G. So we have taken all the suggestions into account in preparing this document. I would like to highlight just a few changes that we have introduced.

As you can see, Tables 1 and 2 of Annex 3 of this document have been left blank for the present. The reason for this is given in paragraph 29 and 30 of this document. For the first time we have established the figures in this document in consultation with UNESCO’s Bureau of Budget and Bureau of Controllers so that the figures are checked by all our central services. Previously we used to gather these figures based on the various financial and expenditure statements available at the World Heritage Centre, but now we have these credible figures from the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Controllers, and on their recommendations we have left Tables 1 and 2 blank.

The greatest innovation we have introduced is in Table 3 of Annex 3. If you recall, the Committee has asked for the various major activities to be reflected in Table 3, so that the Committee is able to appreciate what activities the World Heritage Fund monies are being spent. Now we have provided in Table 3 the activities under major groupings for the Committee to basically understand where the money of the World Heritage Fund is utilised.

We have also asked the Committee to allow us to adjust attachment 1 of Annex 3 so that it is aligned to Table 3 in order to have common figures and headings in both these documents. We have provided for that in the Draft Decision in paragraph 7 and if the Committee and the working group think it is a good idea, we could make the change in the presentation of the budget last year.

Lastly, I want to say that in the Draft Decision we have asked the Committee to make some budgetary adjustments to allow for the cost of the external audit of the Partnership Unit to be undertaken and the audit of the Global Strategy which the General Assembly has asked for, and we need funding to carry out this audit. We have asked an amount of the World Heritage Fund to be utilised for that purpose and we will take the money from the International Assistance Budget.

Finally, we also want some funds to finance the work of the Advisory Body. As you know, as part of the second cycle of periodic exercise, they are required to undertake a review of the retrospective statements of outstanding universal value, which is an enormous task and requires a lot of effort and resources on the part of the Advisory Body. We have asked this money to be allocated and adjusted from the International Assistance Budget. It might appear to the Committee that we are reducing the International Assistance Budget, but be assured that we will be recouping that money from the very generous contribution made by the government of Italy at the 2008 session. As you would recall, they have contributed €250,000, which was to be used exclusively for international assistance. This budget

adjustment, that we are seeking to make, will be offset by the contribution of Italy, so there will be no shortfall in the funding available for international assistance. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am asking for comments or observations regarding this issue which will be considered later on by the working group. I see the United Kingdom; you have the floor.”

United Kingdom:

“Just a quick question for clarification. Did I understand you correctly? When you described the working group you said it was for ‘members only’. Therefore, I would like to know the rationale behind that, because it seems to me that the spirit is generally more open than that.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to the representative of United Kingdom. I was conferring with Mr. Rao. He confirmed to me that this is according to rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure. I do not see any legal advisor but this is the rule. Further comments from Mr. Rao.”

Mr. Rao:

“If I may clarify for the representative of the United Kingdom: According to the Rules of Procedure, there are two types of bodies that can be set up. One is a Consultative Body that helps the Committee in its function. It is open to all State Parties. This is pursuant to rule 20. Under rule 21, we have a Subsidiary Body, which is restricted to the members of the Committee and helps the Committee in implementing its work. Since the allocation and the use of the World Heritage fund has been determined by the Committee and not by the Advisory Body, the work of the Subsidiary Body is restricted to the Committee members only. This is the rationale, and it has always been like that.”

The Chairperson:

“Any further comments on this issue? If none, then we can go further, knowing we have 35 minutes until lunch time, and we can start working on Item 5B because it should take just 20 minutes before lunch. France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président. Avant de passer au point suivant et pour faire écho à l'intervention du délégué du Mexique, je voudrais que vous précisiez les lieux et horaires des groupes de travail. Merci, Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. Je donne la parole au Secrétariat pour vous répondre sur ce point ».

Le Secrétariat:

« Merci, c'est effectivement une précision fort utile, je crois, pour tous les participants à ce groupe de travail. Le Secrétariat a cru comprendre qu'il y avait un consensus puisque cela avait été agréé également pendant le Bureau ce matin et la séance de cette matinée. Le groupe de travail sur la révision des orientations prendrait place pendant les trois prochains jours de 8 h 30 à 9 h 30 dans le Bureau, avec l'interprétation en anglais et en français qui sera disponible.

Il a été également agréé que le groupe de travail sur l'avenir de la *Convention*, donc concernant les documents 12A, 12B et 14, se tiendrait pendant les trois prochains jours de 14 h à 15 h dans la salle du Bureau. Nous devons faire des arrangements, car il avait été prévu des arrangements en parallèle, je ne vous le cache pas, donc il va falloir s'organiser.

Je crois pouvoir comprendre que le groupe de travail sur le budget aurait lieu en même temps, mais que pour ce groupe de travail il n'y aurait pas d'interprétation qui serait fournie puisque ce serait également de 14 h à 15 h dans une salle de travail que nous avons en face du Bureau, ce serait une possibilité.

Tout ceci pourrait commencer dès demain et nous aurons la première réunion de travail demain matin à 8 h 30 pour la révision des orientations, si le Comité est toujours d'accord ».

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5B

Decision: 34 COM 5B

The Chairperson:

"*Merci au Secrétariat.* If there are no objections, I would like to suggest that we go further with Item 5B regarding the report of the Advisory Body with the document WHC-10/34.COM/5B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5B. I would also like to add that the Nordic World Heritage foundation provided an input on its activity which is the subject of document WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5B, which is not subject to any adoption by our Committee. I would like to invite the Director General of IUCN, Ms. Julia Marton Lefèvre, to take the floor for a joint statement from the three Advisory Bodies of the World Heritage Committee, and then to present the report by IUCN, followed by Mr. Gustavo Araoz, president of ICOMOS and Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, Director General of ICCROM."

Ms. Marton Lefèvre, IUCN:

"Thank you, Mr. Chair. On behalf of the Advisory Body, I would like to thank Brazil for its very warm welcome for this important meeting. As Director of IUCN, I am privileged to provide an introduction on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Convention: ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN. I wish to highlight three points from the written reports provided.

Firstly, to reaffirm the Advisory Bodies' strong commitment to the World Heritage Convention, which we view as one of the most important instruments for protecting cultural and natural heritage. This Convention differs from many others because of the direct relationship it has with exceptional places we know and care about. World Heritage sites are

flagships with growing relevance to the debate surrounding conservation, sustainable youth and development.

As transpires from the report you have in front of you, the commitment of the three Advisory Bodies is evident in the work of our small but hugely motivated teams. In addition to the much-appreciated support of the World Heritage Fund, we each contribute significant time and resources of our own, including from our large volunteer technical network. Through our wider programme, we all also have considerable involvement in World Heritage sites beyond our formal role under the *Convention*.

Secondly, I wish to emphasize that sound science is central to the *Convention*. The operational guidelines oblige us to be objective, rigorous, scientific and consistent. We would not be doing our job if we were not willing occasionally to deliver difficult and even unpopular advice to this Committee. We consider this exemplary principle of separating technical from political conventions, vital, for this convention to remain credible. We are proud that the World Heritage *Convention* entrusts this responsibility to our networks and us. We also realise the need to provide better and earlier advice to governments who are looking for the support of the *Convention* to lead to more successful nominations and to more effective conservation and management.

Finally, extending our work on World Heritage requires partners. We value our partnership with the World Heritage Centre, we are delighted at Francesco Bandarin's recognition as UNESCO ADG for Culture, and we look forward to working with his successors. The three Advisory Bodies are strengthening our long-standing partnership to make the most of this unique platform that the *Convention* provides to link culture and nature. I am pleased that this year we have further enhanced our collaboration with ICOMOS in the evaluation process and that ICCROM and IUCN will sign an MoU later this week to reinforce our joint work on capacity development.

Mr. Chair, new partners are joining these efforts, including the Swiss Confederation with its support for the new programme of collaborative work. The MAVA Foundation has also provided funds for IUCN work on World Heritage, including an important focus for Africa. We will be presenting more information on this partnership later this week, and we encourage others to enable our networks and us to contribute even more fully to realising the potential of the World Heritage *Convention*. I thank you for your attention."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, Ms. Lefèvre. Now I would like to give the floor to the members of the Committee for any further comments or questions regarding this report. There is one request from South Africa, so you have the floor."

South Africa:

"As it is the first time I take the floor, I would like to thank and congratulate you for chairing this meeting. South Africa welcomes the collaboration between the Advisory Bodies and the African World Heritage institutions, including the African Heritage Fund, especially now that the 2009 Africa Programme has come to an end. We would like to appeal to ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN especially in this regard to ensure that the tangible benefits of Africa 2009 are not lost. That they should be transferred to the African world institutions and we appreciate and acknowledge all the good work that has been done. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

“Are there any further comments or requests? No? Then I would then like to ask Mr. Gustavo Araoz, representative of ICOMOS, to take the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“There is little for me to add to what Ms. Lefèvre said on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies and on behalf of ICOMOS, other than to thank the Brazilian authorities for this warm welcome that you are offering us. Julia Marton Lefèvre spoke of partnerships and ICOMOS too would like to recognise the contribution of our partner institutions throughout World Heritage work, and most particularly that of DOCOMOMO on the Modern Movement Heritage, that of TICCIH on our work on industrial heritage and of course ICOM (International Council of Museum) which is our long-standing partner.

We are also looking forward to enhanced cooperation with the Organisation of World Heritage Cities. ICOMOS’ commitment to the goal of the Convention as defined by you, the World Heritage Committee, is unwavering and it is very often coincidental with the priorities of ICOMOS. That is one of the reasons why we have adopted Heritage and Development as the themes of our next General Assembly, to be celebrated in Paris next November in partnership with UNESCO.

I would also like to highlight for you some important documents that will be made available to you during the course of the meeting. One is an independent audit or an assessment of the ICOMOS evaluation procedure that was conducted by Jacques Tabet, who many of you might know as a past member of this Committee. You will also receive a thematic study on astronomical sites which has been compiled by ICCOMOS in partnership with the International Union of Astronomy. There is a pre-nomination guideline for Rock Art sites that you requested and also a guideline for World Heritage impact assessment studies.

Just to close, I would like to emphasize and to remind you that our Delegation and myself, as president of ICOMOS, are available to the Committee members and to any State Party Delegation that would like to seek clarification on any aspect of our work. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Again, are there any comments on the ICOMOS report? Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you; actually I wanted to comment on the IUCN report but it seems that you did not see me in this corner.”

The Chairperson:

“Please do.”

Nigeria:

“My Delegation wants to thank at the onset the Brazilian authorities for the warm hospitality and the wonderful introduction to Brazilian culture last night. I would like to endorse the comment made by South Africa concerning the IUCN Africa Heritage Fund. We greatly welcome this collaboration, especially when offering continuous staff support for co-financing for nominations in Africa and for this event, because we believe that this collaboration will ensure better conservation for Africa’s heritage sites. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any further comments for both IUCN and ICOMOS presentations? I see none. I would like to invite Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of ICCROM, to present the report of his institution.”

ICCROM, Mr. Bouchenaki:

“Thank you Mr. Chair and for the sake of diversity, I will shift to French.

Excellences, Mesdames Messieurs, je suis très honoré d’être avec mes collègues et amis, Mme Julia Marton Lefèvre et M. Gustavo Araoz, parce que nous avons considéré qu’à l’heure actuelle on ne pouvait plus travailler seul. On doit travailler en partenariat très étroit pour la mise en œuvre de cette importante *Convention* du patrimoine culturel. Je ne vais pas répéter ce qui a été dit par mes collègues, mais je vais insister sur un certain nombre de points concernant la stratégie de formation qui a été déjà présentée et acceptée par ce Comité. La formation étant considérée comme élément essentiel à la fois pour la préparation des dossiers de nomination, mais surtout pour la suite : la gestion et le suivi régulier, la protection, la sauvegarde et la mise en valeur des sites. La nomination d’un site n’est jamais une fin en soi ; c’est le début d’un processus.

ICCROM s’est engagée, grâce à ses cours de formation, à élever à chaque fois le niveau de responsabilité, de connaissance des gestionnaires (conservateurs, architectes) qui sont responsables des sites du patrimoine mondial. C’est dans ce sens que nous remercions la Confédération Suisse de nous apporter un appui dans le cadre du renforcement des capacités et des institutions chargées du patrimoine. Je suis très heureux de pouvoir signer avec la présidente de l’IUCN un accord de coopération dans le domaine de la formation où nous avons justement montré cette jonction nature-culture qui est très importante.

Le second point sur lequel je voudrais insister, c’est qu’à l’ICCROM nous avons lancé certaines opérations importantes. Un grand programme – et mon ami et collègue Themba Wakashe s’est exprimé il y a un moment. Il a parlé du programme *Africa 2009* qui effectivement s’est terminé l’année dernière en 2009. Il fut important et a eu un très grand succès grâce à l’appui de donateurs (pays nordiques, l’Italie et le Fonds du patrimoine mondial) et j’ai personnellement participé à une réunion à Mombasa, en septembre 2009, au cours de laquelle nous avons parlé avec l’ensemble des directeurs du patrimoine africain. Comment maintenant développer une deuxième phase de ce que l’on a appelé *Africa 2009* sur un projet *Africa 2020* ?

Deuxièmement, j’ai lancé avec l’appui de l’Italie et des Émirats arabes unis, en particulier l’Émirat de Charjah, un programme à destination du monde arabe que nous avons dénommé Patrimoine (en arabe). Ce programme a aujourd’hui une reconnaissance. Il est mené à l’université de Charjah et va se développer grâce à l’appui des Émirats arabes unis, d’autres pays arabes ainsi que de l’ALECSO.

Enfin, je voudrais dire qu'avec l'appui des experts de l'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes, nous avons lancé aussi un programme en direction de l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes que nous avons nommé LATAM en abrégé, qui veut dire Amérique latine et Caraïbes. Ce programme, nous allons vous le présenter avec quelques éléments d'information plus précis le 2 août de 14 h à 15 h avec l'assistance de ma collègue Nuria Sanz qui est la chef de la Section Amérique latine au Centre du patrimoine mondial et la présence d'un certain nombre de membres de l'ICCROM venant de l'Amérique latine, je pense en particulier à Mme Blanca Nino du Guatemala, à M. Luis Souza du Brésil et bien sûr le Président du collège de l'ICCROM qui est parmi nous.

En troisième lieu, nous avons participé, et nous y sommes associés, à la création des Centres catégorie 2 que l'UNESCO et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ont encouragés dans le cadre de la gestion et de la mise en valeur des sites, notamment par la recherche et la formation. Nous avons travaillé, en particulier avec nos collègues de Chine, pour le *World Institute for Training and Research for Asia Pacific* qui a une base à Pékin, Shanghai et Suzhou. Nous avons travaillé avec Madame la ministre de la Culture du Bahreïn pour l'établissement d'un Centre de catégorie 2 à Bahreïn. Nous travaillons actuellement avec notre collègue Fernando de Almeida de l'IPHAN pour le Centre de catégorie 2 qui sera établi ici au Brésil et avec nos collègues mexicains pour le Centre catégorie 2 qui sera établi à Mexico. Nous prévoyons aussi d'apporter tout notre appui aux Centres catégorie 2 qui seront établis en Afrique. Nous pensons à deux centres dû à l'importance de l'Afrique. L'un serait au Bénin à Porto Novo, là où se trouve l'École du patrimoine africain qui existe déjà depuis dix ans et l'autre à Mombasa au Kenya.

Voilà donc quelques-unes des activités qui nous paraissent extrêmement importantes et qui sont liées à la thématique qui nous intéresse tous ici à savoir la protection et la mise en valeur du patrimoine culturel et naturel de l'humanité. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, Monsieur Bouchenaki pour cette présentation très intéressante. Maintenant je vous demande si vous avez des commentaires sur ces trois rapports. L'Égypte, vous avez la parole, suivie par la France. Le Secrétariat va établir une liste ; je vois le Mali, la Suisse, l'Uruguay, etc. ».

Egypt:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président, mon commentaire concerne le rapport de l'ICCROM. Au nom de l'Égypte et du ministère de la Culture égyptien, je tiens à remercier vivement l'ICCROM et à sa tête M. Mounir Bouchenaki, pour le travail énorme et les efforts déployés dans le monde arabe. Surtout avec le programme ATHAR dont nous avons largement bénéficié, notamment à Beyrouth avec des ateliers. En ma qualité de présidente du groupe arabe, je tiens à vous remercier pour l'avenir de ce programme ATHAR et celui mentionné par vous-même précédemment, et nous sommes tous prêts à collaborer avec vous et avec les membres distingués de l'IUCN et de l'ICOMOS. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte ; la parole est à la France ».

France:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président, et en propos liminaires, je voudrais chaleureusement remercier M. Bouchenaki de s'être exprimé en français. Je voudrais remercier les trois Organisations consultatives, en particulier l'ICCROM, l'ICOMOS et l'IUCN, pour le travail considérable qui a été accompli, tant du point de vue quantitatif que qualitatif. Les Organisations consultatives sont de véritables piliers pour la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* et leur travail est particulièrement important.

Je voudrais en particulier souligner les efforts en termes de partenariat, d'association, le développement de synergies entre ces trois Organisations consultatives et encourager les efforts qui ont déjà été entrepris et qu'il faut poursuivre en faveur d'une plus grande transparence dans les processus d'évaluation.

Je voudrais revenir sur deux points plus précis. Tout d'abord le paragraphe 64 du rapport de l'IUCN et de la proposition qui est faite par l'IUCN : que les Organisations consultatives participent au processus de vérification du caractère complet de nouvelles propositions d'inscription. Cela nous semble particulièrement pertinent et la Délégation française soutient cette proposition de l'IUCN.

Je voudrais enfin revenir sur tout ce qui est contenu de renforcements des capacités et en particulier en Afrique qui ont été évoqués par M. Bouchenaki et par les autres représentants des Organisations. Cela se trouve paragraphe 87 et suivants. Je trouve qu'après la fin du programme 2009 il faut poursuivre tout ce qui a trait au renforcement des capacités. Cela se fait dans le cadre d'un fonds multilatéral, mais nous invitons aussi les partenaires à poursuivre les efforts bilatéraux. Vous le savez, la France le fait dans le cadre de la Convention France UNESCO qui a été mise en place en 1999. Nous avons aussi essayé de participer au renforcement des capacités dans le cadre du séminaire de Mombasa et nous le faisons aussi en essayant de développer l'assistance préparatoire qui est un des sujets clés dans le cadre de l'École du patrimoine africain de Porto Novo au Bénin. Ce sont des entreprises qu'il faut absolument encourager, soutenir et essayer de développer encore leurs activités pour que l'Afrique puisse arriver à une Liste du patrimoine qui soit représentative et équilibrée. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. La parole est à la Suisse et ensuite la parole ira aux représentants des Organisations consultatives pour qu'ils puissent répondre ».

Switzerland:

« Merci. Nous rejoignons les distingués délégués qui ont mérité du travail mené par les Organisations consultatives. La Suisse aussi en bénéficie et nous avons établi une étroite collaboration en ce qui concerne la formation. Nous sommes de l'avis qu'il ne suffit pas de prendre note du manque de ressources des Organismes consultatifs pour leur travail, mais d'entreprendre aussi des mesures. Pour cette fin la Suisse propose un nouveau paragraphe 3 qui prend note : *“avec préoccupation des ressources actuelles trop restreintes accordées aux Organisations consultatives du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour accomplir leur tâche et demande à ce dernier ainsi qu'aux Organisations consultatives, d'optimiser leur processus de travail et de collaboration afin de mieux balancer les ressources requises avec les prestations à fournir et de rapporter les mesures entreprises à la prochaine session du Comité”*. Merci, Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse ; nous prenons note. La parole est maintenant au représentant du Mali ».

Mali :

« Merci. Je voudrais joindre ma voix à celle de mes prédécesseurs pour soutenir fortement le programme *Africa 2009*. Si l'on sait que ce programme est une manière de mettre en œuvre la *Convention* dans la mesure où ce programme nous a permis de rétablir la position de l'Afrique sur le registre de l'UNESCO ; il nous a aussi permis de renforcer des capacités, mais aussi et surtout, de nous intéresser au troisième ANDC de la *Convention* : les communautés. Le programme *Africa 2009* s'intéresse aux communautés locales. La Délégation malienne supporte fortement ce programme et sa continuation.

En ce qui concerne la création de centres, oui, nous soutenons la création de Centres de catégorie 2, mais nous sommes d'abord pour le renforcement de l'existant : renforcer l'École du patrimoine qui est au Bénin, mais aussi le CHDA. En plus du renforcement de ces deux institutions de formation, créer d'autres Centres de catégorie 2 pour une question d'équilibre ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali ; le Mexique a la parole ».

Mexique:

"We would like to speak along the same lines as Committee members who have spoken before us in expressing our congratulations for the impressive works the three Advisory Bodies are doing. We are very, very interested in working with all three Advisory Bodies on the establishment of category 2 Centres, especially the one to be set up in Mexico.

We would also like to make comment concerning the activity carried out by ICOMOS. In the document presenting their report, in paragraph 55, there is reference to the World Heritage working group of ICOMOS. Given the concerns among various member States regarding transparency in decision making for evaluation of nominations, we would like to have more information on the specific mandate of this working group of ICOMOS, in particular with regard to evaluation of nominations and the final decision taken."

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique ; l'Australie a la parole ».

Australia:

"Thank you very much indeed. I would like to echo the voices of those who have congratulated the Advisory Bodies for their excellent work of the last 12 months, as well as the report presented here. We would like to join France, who supported the role of the Advisory Bodies being involved in the technical check and to quickly provide additional and

more detailed assistance to State Parties in their early stages in the preparation for nominations. This seems to be a very good idea.

Secondly, a question: We understand that there has been a manual prepared to assist in the preparation of nominations but we have been unable to locate any copies. So I wonder if we could get any information to where those manuals may be found. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l’Australie ; les Barbades ont la parole ».

Barbados:

"Thank you. Barbados would indeed like to echo other members in congratulating the Advisory Bodies on their progress today. We are particularly delighted with the progress in the area of partnership. The strategic nature of the partnership also points to the sustainability of these activities and we really strongly endorse that. We also support the notion of the involvement of the Advisory Body whenever is possible on the issue of the technical check. This would already signal where some difficulty may arise for State Parties and it may be an item to better succeed in the processing of nominations through the various processes, especially when State Parties are not as well engaged, as some State Parties have not gone through the process very often.

I also would be very anxious to see when and where we are going to have access to the manual on nominations. I thank also our colleague from Switzerland for making some proposals with regard to not simply taking note of the area of concern with regard to the subvention of the Advisory Body, but making an active point of engagement by this Committee and the Centre and making sure something concrete happens along these lines. I take note of this and I support the nature of them and assume this will be taken up as part of the working group discussion that will occur. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

«Merci. L’Égypte a la parole ».

Egypt:

« Très rapidement, je voudrais exprimer mon soutien au distingué représentant du Mali qui parlait du programme *Africa 2009* entre l’ICCRROM et le *World Heritage Fund* et je suis tout à fait d’accord pour ce genre d’interventions non seulement pour la liste des sites mais également pour la *tentative list* africaine qui est également importante et qui à tous, non seulement l’ICCRROM mais aussi l’IUCN et l’ICOMOS, permet de travailler en collaboration pour essayer d’avoir une carte des pays africains plus claire et précise ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l’Égypte. Je n’ai pas d’autres demandes de la part des membres du Comité. J’ai deux observateurs qui ont demandé la parole : l’Uruguay suivie par le Guatemala ».

Uruguay:

“Thank you. Just very quickly, first of all I would like to express our congratulations and thank Brazil for their very warm welcome through the organization of this meeting. Uruguay would like its thanks to be recorded to the three Advisory Bodies for the work they have been doing to preserve world heritage, especially in our country. ICOMOS recently made it possible for us to do significant work to draw our Indicative List and they have given us favourable recommendations for the provision of technical assistance. Not only regarding work in Uruguay, but also the region as a whole, we would like to congratulate and thank them for their work helping us to organise the preparatory meeting for the cycle of preparing reports from the Latin American/Caribbean region.

Finally, we would like to express our recognition in the context of the global framework on thematic issues for the help with regard to the nomination of Cave Art in Uruguay. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l’Uruguay ; le Guatemala a la parole ».

Guatemala:

"Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN for their work in the region, and also internationally. I would also like to particularly focus on the Latin American region. I would like to stress the support provided by ICCROM with its APHAN project and the World Heritage Centre which has provided its support with the Centre in Zacatecas in the Latin America region and in particular in Central America. This has made it possible for us to improve representations for us on the World Heritage List. We only account for 14 percent of the sites listed at the moment.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Guatemala, maintenant je donne la parole aux Organes. IUCN, ICCROM, ICOMOS vous avez la parole ».

IUCN:

« Merci, Monsieur le Président. Premièrement je voudrais remercier l’appui reçu par les intervenants membres du Comité pour notre travail individuel et surtout en partenariat que l’on renforce de plus en plus. Deuxièmement, en ce qui concerne le manuel des préparations aux nominations, il y a un projet qui a déjà été préparé en anglais et je crois que la version française est en cours. On va vous les trouver pour qu’au moins vous receviez le projet en anglais. En ce qui concerne l’Afrique, évidemment nous sommes tous engagés à renforcer notre travail en Afrique, je parle pour l’UICN mais je sais que mes collègues sont d’accord. En ce qui concerne l’IUCN, avec cet engagement nous avons trouvé des fonds pour ouvrir un nouveau poste dans un bureau régional à Nairobi, justement pour s’occuper du patrimoine mondial en Afrique. Le point final concerne le *technical check* ; je suis désolé je ne connais pas la traduction exacte en français, ceci sera discuté dans l’ordre du jour numéro 12 dans les jours à venir. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

«Merci, Madame Lefèvre. ICOMOS vous avez la parole ».

ICOMOS:

“I would start by thanking the Committee and respond to the fact that there is a lack of transparency because we did not get any information on this. ICOMOS is following an ongoing process in order to improve our evaluation of standard procedures. We really have a policy to ensure transparency; there is a set of documents that are available to you all during the Committee session, but also outside the session. For example, the 8B1INF record where we outline the procedure for the evaluation of all nominations and the role played by each of the groups, including the Working Group on World Heritage.

To answer the question on transparency, let me say that we value transparency because we believe that transparency will make sure we have no conflicts of interest with some of our members who wear different hats. So transparency must go hand in hand with confidentiality to prevent any real or apparent conflicts of interest. We have a policy and you can consult it on our website. This is to answer your specific question, but I don't want to go into the nifty gritty of this because we can discuss it any time.

The Working Group on World Heritage is appointed by the Executive Board of ICOMOS. It is made up of members of the Executive Board and their work is to support the work of our permanent staff within the Paris Secretariat. As was mentioned previously, we rely on a lot of voluntary work in order to fulfil the tasks involved in implementing the World Heritage Convention.

I hope I answered all the questions. Finally a last point of clarification, when you read the Decision when we carry out evaluation, the World heritage panel Decision is the final Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'ICOMOS ; ICCROM vous avez la parole ».

ICCROM:

« Je crois que mes collègues ont déjà répondu à la plupart des questions. Je voudrais remercier les honorables membres du Comité ainsi que les observateurs sur les remarques faites sur la formation, sur les efforts que l'on doit mener dans le cadre d'un partenariat stratégique entre nous et avec d'autres institutions. Je rappelle en particulier qu'en dehors de l'aspect monument avec Madame la Présidente de l'ICOM Mme Cummins, nous avons aussi un partenariat extrêmement fort en ce qui concerne la partie conservation des objets et il y a un accord entre l'ICOM et l'ICCROM pour tout ce qui concerne la conservation des objets.

De la même façon, je suis heureux de dire qu'hier, après la présentation magnifique, les Brésiliens nous ont montré cette liaison entre le patrimoine matériel et immatériel et je crois que là aussi un travail devra être fait pour ne pas engendrer des coupures entre les différents aspects du patrimoine.

En ce qui concerne l'Afrique, je voudrais rappeler qu'il y a un point sur *Africa 2009* et que nous allons revenir sur ce projet, l'importance de tout ce qui a été fait et qui a donné,

comme l'a dit le représentant, d'excellents résultats. Mais il ne faut pas s'arrêter là, il faut continuer ; c'est pour cela qu'à Rome j'ai pris contact avec le doyen des ambassadeurs africains et que nous allons organiser au mois de septembre une réunion avec tous les ambassadeurs africains présents à Rome pour leur présenter le résultat du travail fait dans le cadre d'*Africa 2009* et aller plus avant vers ce que j'avais proposé à la réunion de Mombasa : *Africa 2020*.

Deuxièmement, j'ai parlé avec la Directrice générale et nous avons pensé qu'une réunion au niveau africain des responsables de la culture des bureaux UNESCO de l'Afrique serait importante, pour là aussi essayer de coordonner nos actions en matière de formation. Je reviens à ce qu'a dit l'honorable représentant de la Suisse, c'est qu'il y a un problème de ressources. Nous devons trouver plus de moyens certainement en ce qui concerne la recherche de financements pour assurer un programme à long terme. Vous savez que ce n'est pas en faisant un cours ou deux que l'on peut arriver à une véritable formation ; il faut préparer des programmes à long terme. Voilà ce que je voulais répondre en remerciant encore une fois tous les délégués qui ont insisté sur l'importance de la formation et du partenariat. Merci de votre attention ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'ICCROM. Avant de suspendre les travaux de notre Comité, je souhaite donner la parole au Secrétariat pour quelques annonces d'ordre logistique ».

The Secretariat:

« Merci. Trois annonces : la première est relative au programme qui va prendre place maintenant. L'information sur le programme MAB, l'Homme et la Biosphère, se tiendra aujourd'hui de 13 h 15 à 15 h dans la salle du Bureau et une petite collation sera servie à cette occasion. Deuxième annonce, les experts dont la participation à la 34^e édition a été financée par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial et/ou la Fondation Nordique du patrimoine mondial sont invités à se rendre avec leur passeport dans le Bureau B situé en sous-sol pour prendre contact avec Mme Ribeiro qui est à côté de moi maintenant.

La troisième annonce est relative aux amendements. Beaucoup d'entre vous nous ont approchés pour savoir quelle était l'adresse courriel du rapporteur. Je vous invite à regarder ce formulaire vert, qui normalement est pour la soumission par écrit des amendements, mais vous pouvez également les envoyer électroniquement à l'adresse qui est indiquée en bas : wh-rapporteur@unesco.org. Je vous invite à regarder ce formulaire et à voir l'adresse courriel qui figure au-dessous. Bon appétit et merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Secrétariat. C'est ainsi que s'achève notre première session. Je voudrais vous remercier pour votre efficacité et esprit de coopération. La Suisse demande la parole.

Switzerland:

« Excusez-moi, Monsieur le Président, juste une remarque. Est-ce qu'il est possible de demander officiellement aux organisateurs que l'adresse courriel qui vient d'être mentionnée fonctionne, car cela ne marche pas, on n'arrive pas à se connecter et cela simplifierait les travaux et le travail de Madame le rapporteur je pense. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse pour cette remarque. Nous clôturons ainsi la session et reprenons à 15 h précises avec le débat sur le projet de décision sur le point 5B. Bon appétit, mais avant je n'avais pas vu la Barbade qui souhaite prendre la parole ».

Barbados:

“Very briefly and quickly, can the green form be available to us by email also, because it would make it a lot simpler to put our typewritten proposal onto the form? And secondly, I wonder if any provisions could be made to have better access to electricity. We all have laptop computers and printers and we do not have any access to electricity from our desk; it would be better if we had. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci, la Barbade ; bon appétit à tous ».

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 26 July, 2010

Monday, 26 July 2010

SECOND MEETING

Afternoon session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson:

"We are going to continue with Draft Decision 5A. The item was discussed in this morning's session and we have some amendments. I am now going to give the floor to the rapporteur to give further explanations on the Draft Decision."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Chair. Reading the Draft Decision also provides you with information regarding the source of the individual paragraphs. I am reading it out paragraph by paragraph because we cannot ensure at this moment that all the observers have received a copy of the Draft Decision in front of you.

It is Draft Decision 34 COM 5A.Rev. The World Heritage Committee, having examined document WHC-10/34.COM/5A, in this paragraph, the end of the paragraph was deleted at the suggestion of Switzerland because Document INF5A does no longer exists as it has become 5G.

Paragraph 2: *Recalling Decision 33 COM 5A adopted at its 33^d session (Seville, 2009), this paragraph remains unchanged.*

Paragraph 3 incorporates suggestions by Australia and Switzerland. Both State Parties suggested changing its five strategic objectives and the end of the paragraph has been added by Switzerland. I read the paragraph:

Takes note with appreciation of the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre over the past year in pursuit of the five Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee and of the Global Strategy for a balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List.

Paragraph 4 is a new suggestion proposed by Australia:

Welcomes the efforts undertaken to list the World Heritage Committee's decisions in a new database, and calls upon the World Heritage Centre to ensure that the database is made openly and transparently available to all State Parties and observers.

I have first to add that this paragraph incorporates the former paragraph 8 as suggested by the Swiss Delegation, as both proposals were redundant in content. Therefore, we have merged paragraph 8 of the Swiss amendment and paragraph 4 of the Australian amendment. Of course there was the amendment made by the Delegation of France to delete former paragraph 4 which was seconded by the Mexican Delegation. This is a replacement of former paragraph 4.

Paragraph 5:

Expresses its gratitude to the States Parties of Australia, Bahrain, Brazil, China, Japan, Switzerland, and Thailand for the financial and technical support to the various international expert meetings held in 2009 and 2010, which have contributed to the reflection on the Future of the Convention. This paragraph remains unchanged despite some editorial issues.

The following paragraphs are entirely the suggestions of the Swiss Delegation. Paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 are Swiss proposals.

Paragraph 6: *Requests the World Heritage Centre to reinforce the presentation of its report by:*

- a) Regrouping the activities presented around the five Strategic Objectives;*
- b) Mentioning the cooperation with the UNESCO Bodies, as well as with the partners of civil society,*
- c) Integrating a general evaluation commentary on the results obtained and the challenges encountered,*

Paragraph 7:

Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre to inform the World Heritage Committee of the envisaged partnerships, indicating the procedures and conditions foreseen before concluding such agreements;

Paragraph 8:

Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre:

- a) To proceed with an exhaustive inventory of pending decisions after the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee;*
- b) To present to the World Heritage Committee a draft plan of priority activities for the following year, including the formulation of objectives, expected results, and indications regarding the resources anticipated.*

Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, I am asking you if you have any comments regarding that Draft Decision. Barbados you have the floor. Yet, just before I give you the floor, the rapporteur will give us additional information.”

Rapporteur:

“I apologise, I have just received some additional amendments. The proposition by Thailand is to be inserted in paragraph 6 as I understood under the chapeau

Requests the World Heritage Centre to reinforce the presentation of its report by: a small paragraph d) Describing the criteria by which the World Heritage Centre makes decisions on its activities in conformity as required by the Committee,

I repeat *Describing the criteria by which the World Heritage Centre makes decisions on its activities in conformity as required by the Committee.*

I hope I have read it out correctly. I apologise. It is: *as requested by the Committee* and not *as required*. So it reads out: *makes decisions on its activities in conformity as requested by the Committee.*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now give the floor to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. We have no objection to the proposed revisions; we are happy with them. Nevertheless, we would suggest some minor revisions in paragraph 8a to put *suggest than* rather than to proceed with *indicate to conduct* and at the end of a) after *Committee* to add *and their anticipated date of execution*. I repeat the whole sentence revised:

a) *To conduct an exhaustive inventory of pending decisions after the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee and their anticipated date of execution.*

I hope Switzerland will have no objections to this and we think this would clarify things, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. Any further comments? Egypt, you have the floor, Madame.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Ma question concerne le point 7, l'amendement Suisse qui dit en français : *Invite le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial à informer le Comité du patrimoine mondial des partenariats envisagés — qui sont déjà connus à l'avance j'imagine — en indiquant à l'avance les modalités et les conditions prévues avant de conclure de tels accords.* Ce que je crains, Monsieur le Président, c'est la durée et la

complexité de l'administration concernant ces procédures. Il y aussi un problème de confiance — je suis désolé de le dire. Si déjà des pactes ont été établis, ce n'est pas la peine d'engager des processus qui nous feront plus perdre de temps qu'autre chose. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte, d'autres commentaires. Si j'ai bien compris la proposition de l'Égypte est de supprimer ce paragraphe ».

Egypt:

« Exactement ».

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse a demandé la parole, à vous ».

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Juste peut-être quelques remarques concernant les trois articles. Ce que nous aimerions entendre par là, et je crois que tout le Comité est d'accord, c'est d'avoir des instructions spécifiques pour le Centre du patrimoine mondial, quelque chose qui soit plus clair en quelque sorte. Dans ce sens-là et j'en viens au point 6, l'ajout demandé par la Thaïlande nous convient tout à fait. Le deuxième point, ce que nous recherchons, est effectivement une ouverture et une transparence. Dans cet objectif la suppression du point 7 nous dérange, parce que ce que nous envisageons ici, c'est que l'on soit mieux informé des partenariats envisagés. Il ne s'agit pas de ceux qui ont déjà été conclus, contrairement à ce que ma collègue d'Égypte sous-entend je crois dans sa demande de suppression de cet article. Simplement, s'il y a des partenariats qui sont envisagés il serait utile que nous ayons les modalités et les conditions prévues avant de conclure de tels accords. Ce qui va aussi dans le sens du rapport concernant l'audit.

Quant au point 8, là encore je n'ai pas de problème avec la Barbade. Ce qui est important pour nous dans ce point c'est qu'une hiérarchisation des objectifs soit claire. Néanmoins, la traduction qui a été faite du paragraphe a: de *mener un inventaire* il me semble qu'en français on procède à un inventaire plutôt qu'on le mène, mais ça, c'est un détail et je suis sûr que le Secrétariat en prendra dûment compte. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. La France a demandé la parole, à vous ».

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je voulais appuyer ce que vient de dire le délégué ambassadeur de la Suisse. En effet, pour nous il est très important que dans le projet de décision le point 7 soit maintenu dans la mesure où il indique en effet que nous souhaiterions simplement être informés. Ce n'est pas un alourdissement des procédures que nous prônons, mais une information comme cela me semble logique de la part du Comité pour les partenariats qui sont envisagés. C'est d'ailleurs l'application pure et simple d'une recommandation, dont nous parlerons plus tard, du rapport de l'auditeur externe, la recommandation 12 très exactement et nous sommes donc très attachés au maintien de ce paragraphe 7 ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. L'Égypte demande la parole, elle est à vous ».

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je fais juste un commentaire pour mes collègues français. Je comprends tout à fait ce qu'ils souhaitent en utilisant le mot *être informé*, mais il y a une différence entre le terme *être informé* et le restant de la phrase qui lit : *en indiquant à l'avance les modalités et les conditions prévues avant de conclure de tels accords*.

Il me semble dans cette dernière phrase que la procédure va être alourdie. Elle devra déjà informer les États membres, attendre un retour, il y aurait certainement du travail administratif, ce qui m'inquiète. L'information je comprends tout à fait et nous sommes d'accord là-dessus, mais ce que je crains, c'est l'alourdissement de la procédure. Je clarifie mon point de vue. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte. Est-ce qu'il y a d'autres commentaires de la part des membres du Comité. Je n'en vois pas. La parole est à Monsieur Francesco Bandarin pour apporter des clarifications sur ce point et les deux positions concernées ».

Francesco Bandarin:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaiterais juste commenter deux points qui sont dans la décision. Le point 8a, effectivement je pense que ce matin on vous a informé que toutes les décisions de la 33^e session sont maintenant en ligne avec un outil qui vous permet de regarder et vérifier leur mise en œuvre. J'imagine que cela se réfère à ce système nouveau que vous n'avez peut-être pas pratiqué, car il a été mis en ligne récemment, mais qui constitue et appuie l'observation et le monitoring de la mise en œuvre des décisions. D'ailleurs, on pourrait peut-être le citer dans le point. Ce n'est pas une chose nouvelle qui est demandée c'est simplement la continuation et la mise en œuvre de choses qui existent déjà.

Sur le point 7, je vais vous faire part du commentaire d'une personne qui pendant dix ans a essayé de développer des partenariats. Avant tout, je voudrais dire au Comité qu'il ne faut pas penser que l'activité du partenariat n'est pas régulée. Elle est lourdement régulée par l'UNESCO. Il est très difficile de développer des partenariats dans le cadre des règlements de l'UNESCO. Parfois, je m'en souviens, on a dû même renoncer au partenariat en raison du système de Règlement intérieur de l'UNESCO. Donc, soyez assurés que rien ne se passe sans qu'un système assez lourd, et je voudrais même parfois dire négatif, envers le partenariat soit mis en œuvre.

Cette demande envers le partenariat est justifiée, ce que je trouve non justifié et qui appartient à un alourdissement de règlements déjà pesant, concerne la demande d'autorisation qui est incluse dans le paragraphe 7. Pratiquement on ne pourrait plus développer de partenariats et les faire signer dans le cadre de règlements lourds de l'UNESCO sans avoir la permission du Comité. Je peux vous dire que cela correspondrait pratiquement à devoir fermer le programme de partenariats, car il faudrait attendre l'année d'après pour avoir un partenaire.

Je pense que si vous avez déjà pratiqué le partenariat, vous savez qu'il n'existe pas de partenaire qui puisse attendre un an et l'avis du Comité pour savoir s'il peut devenir partenaire. Je conseille donc de ne pas alourdir une procédure déjà pesante avec une demande qui pratiquement soumet au Comité tous nouveaux partenariats envisagés. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci Monsieur Bandarin. Je donne la parole au rapporteur qui pourra apporter une solution ».

Rapporteur:

“Well, I am not sure, but I'll try my best, as we have two conflicting positions in the room and it is rather hard to mediate between the two. I am wondering if a formulation like: *indicating the procedures and conditions foreseen preferably before concluding such agreements*, would be agreeable to both parties. This would give the possibility, if there is time pressure, for a potential partner to be an exception to the rule.”

The Chairperson:

“ *Thank you*, la Suisse souhaite prendre la parole, allez-y. »

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est pour répondre à Monsieur Bandarin. Je comprends très bien qu'avec la deuxième partie du paragraphe 7 on alourdisse encore une procédure qui est extrêmement pesante. Effectivement, cela n'est pas notre but. Néanmoins, je pense que d'être informé des modalités et des conditions de tels accords fait partie de l'information.

Alors ce que je pourrais proposer peut-être et qui pourrait être une forme de compromis entre ceux comme nous qui souhaitons avoir cette deuxième partie de phrase et ceux qui souhaitent le supprimer, ce serait d'enlever les termes *prévus avant de conclure de tels accords*. Donc maintenant on lit : *en indiquant les modalités et les conditions de tels accords*. On ne donne plus de barrière de temps ou de cadre temporel. On admet simplement que l'information doit porter sur les modalités et les conditions de tels accords. Je ne sais pas si cela pourrait convenir à la Délégation égyptienne ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse, effectivement je trouve que c'est un texte plus constructif. Avant de donner la parole au Brésil, je donne la parole à l'Égypte pour avoir leur point de vue et peut-être qu'on arrivera à un consensus ».

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, alors mon cher collègue Suisse, je suis tout à fait d'accord. J'étais d'accord au départ pour l'information, mais c'était justement le cadre temporel qui me gênait, car je suis dans l'administration de mon pays et dans la pratique je

sais très bien ce que c'est que l'alourdissement de la procédure et je ne voulais pas que le Centre tombe dans ce piège ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte. Le Brésil a demandé la parole ».

Brazil:

« Merci. Pour abonder dans le sens de ce que vient de dire notre collègue de l'Égypte. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial n'est pas une entité indépendante, il fait partie du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO, il y a donc des règles qui sont suivies, qui sont applicables à tous les accords et ententes que le Secrétariat de l'UNESCO peut conclure. Donc, nous pensons que la précaution qui est envisagée est déjà prévue, dans le type d'accord pour lequel le Centre du patrimoine mondial pourrait s'engager. En tout cas, nous trouvons méritoire que le Comité soit informé des conditions de ces accords négociés et adoptés par le Centre du patrimoine mondial, mais pas au préalable. Donc l'amendement qui a été proposé par la Suisse est le bienvenu ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Brésil. La France a la parole ».

France:

« Je serais très bref. C'est pour soutenir en effet l'amendement de la Suisse proposé à son propre amendement et abonder dans le sens de ce qui vient d'être dit. Il est important que les membres du Comité puissent connaître les modalités et les conditions de tels accords. C'est un point de transparence qui nous paraît essentiel et nous sommes très heureux de le voir mentionné dans ce projet de Décision ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France, je vois que nous approchons d'un consensus, je donnerai la parole à notre rapporteur pour lecture des derniers paragraphes 7 et 8 ».

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. I am going to read out again paragraphs 6d, 7 and 8a, as these are the three where changes occurred during the discussion. The final version of these would be:

Paragraph 6d:

d) Describing the criteria by which the World Heritage Centre makes decisions on its activities as requested by the Committee.

Paragraph 7:

Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre to inform the World Heritage Committee of the envisaged partnerships, indicating the procedures and conditions.

Paragraph 8:

Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre:

- a) *To conduct an exhaustive inventory of pending decisions after the 34th session of the Committee and their anticipated date of execution, after the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee.”*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil asked to the floor, please.”

Brazil:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Encore la même préoccupation sur l'élément temporel. Peut-être le terme *envisagés*, *envisaged* en anglais, pourrait faire croire que l'accord préalable serait nécessaire. Donc peut-être qu'on pourrait biffer ce mot ou bien adopter une autre expression comme les accords entretenus ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Brésil. Le rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“There are two options for dealing with this situation. We can either delete *envisaged* and just leave *partnerships* or we could outline that we want the current and the present if possible and make it *envisaged and present partnership* but then *envisaged* would still be included in the decision and may not address your concern. Perhaps Brazil could give some input?”

Brazil:

“I would be glad to delete the word *envisaged*.”

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse a demandé la parole, vous l'avez ».

Switzerland:

« Je regrette de redemander la parole, Monsieur le Président, et je vous remercie pour votre patience. Je pense qu'effectivement *envisagés* seul n'est pas très bon alors que la proposition de Madame le rapporteur est excellente : *envisagés et conclus* ou *conclus et envisagés*. Comme ça nous avons les deux choses. Dans le texte que Madame le rapporteur a lu, les trois mots *de tels accords*, en tout cas dans l'interprétation française que j'écoutais, étaient tombés. Du coup, la phrase était bancale. Donc : *indiquant les modalités et les conditions de tels accords* parce que l'on ne sait pas très bien quelles sont les modalités et les conditions si l'on supprime les termes *de tels accords*. Il va sans dire que le *prévu avant de conclure* est supprimé, merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Je vais demander au rapporteur de nous faire une relecture de ce paragraphe ».

Rapporteur:

"I will read again paragraph 7 in its final version. Very slowly, so that the interpreters can properly catch everything: *Invites the Director of the World Heritage Centre to inform the World Heritage Committee of the envisaged and present partnerships, indicating the procedures and conditions of such agreements.* Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I think we have now reached a consensus on this text. You do not have any objections? **Draft Decision 34 COM 5A** including its 8 paragraphs has been adopted, thank you very much.

Let's move on now to Decision 5B and the rapporteur will read it out."

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies (*Continuation*)

Rapporteur:

"You have Decision 34.COM5B.Rev in front of you it. It has been distributed in both languages. Paragraphs 1 and 2 remain unchanged from the initial decision. Paragraph 3 was amended by Switzerland and I have received another amendment, which is not yet included, by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies which would like to correct two words in the proposal of the Swiss Delegation. I will highlight these two words in paragraph 3 when I reach it.

The Decision reads as it stands:

The World Heritage Committee,

1) *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/5B,*

2) *Takes note of the reports of the Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN) on their activities;*

This is the Swiss amendment in Paragraph 3:

Takes note with concern of the restricted resources—and here the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre suggest to delete the word contractual that is in your amendment—accorded to the Advisory Bodies from the World Heritage Fund—this is a replacement of the word Centre—to accomplish their tasks, and requests that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies optimize their working and collaboration methods in order to strike a balance between the resources required and the services to be provided and to report on the measures taken at its 35th session in 2011.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, again any comments, objections on that Draft Decision? I see none; therefore Decision 34.COM5B is adopted as was read by the rapporteur.

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5C. Roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5C

Decision: 34 COM 5C

Next item on the Agenda is 5C: Role of the World Heritage Centre and of the Advisory Bodies. This item is presented in Document WHC-10/34.COM/5C and I would like to give the floor to Mr. Kishore, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre, in order to quickly present this item.”

Mr. Kishore:

“Thank you. This document, as The Chairperson read out, reviews the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in implementation of the *Convention*. As you recall it was the 2007 audit of the World Heritage Centre which required that such a review should be carried out. We presented this document as part of the Secretariat report at the last Committee session in Seville. However, the Committee did not have the time to look into this document and requested that it should be presented as a separate item at this session and therefore we are doing so.

We have used basically the same document as was presented last year but we have had an additional round of reviews both by the Centre and the three Advisory Bodies and what you have is a document agreed amongst us. The document is very simple; what we have done is also to extract the provisions in the operational guidelines that describe the role and function of the Secretariat and of the Advisory Bodies. As you can see from the list provided the roles are quite distinct and clear but there are several activities that have to be implemented in a shared manner.

The management audit also required that we should focus on three areas of work. One is the joint missions that we carry out between the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, then the drafting of a State of Conservation Report which is also a shared responsibility and finally the management of various studies, including climatic ones.

If you look at part B, C and D of the document you will see that while the first two functions are quite clear and we implement them in a shared manner between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. We also try to constantly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of these activities that we implement jointly. However the work of climatic studies is distinctly a role and function of the Advisory Bodies. The Centre does not get involved in them, unless there is a sharing of the additional workload that the Advisory Bodies may feel the centre could carry out, or, when the resources or convenience make it possible for the Centre to coordinate some of these climatic studies.

I may point out that there is one additional item of work which has risen recently, as we move into the second period of periodic reporting, and that is the review of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Values. This has caused additional workload, both for the Secretariat Centre and the Advisory Bodies, both in terms of capacity as well as resources. This is something we need to address as we move ahead in executing these functions.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, any comments or suggestions from the members of the Committee on this item?”

Barbados:

“I just have this one minor amendment to propose regarding paragraph 3. Given the explication offered by the deputy director I would like to propose the deletion of the words *opinions on* and replaced with the words *assessment of*. I think that would be more appropriate in this context. So, delete *opinions on the state of conservation* and replace it *assessment of the state of conservation*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. You are talking about the Decision now? I would rather listen to comments on the report first. Australia, you asked for the floor.”

Australia:

“Our comment was on the Draft Decision so I shall hold that off.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there no requests for comments on the report? Yes, Brazil would like the floor.”

Brazil:

« En lisant avec attention ce que contient le document qui a été préparé par le Secrétariat, on ne trouve aucun repère c'est vrai. Cependant dans la pratique, les Organes subsidiaires et le Centre du patrimoine mondial vont parfois au-delà de ce qui était prévu dans le décret dans le document que nous examinons. Cette préoccupation a déjà été manifestée à plusieurs reprises et notamment lors de la dernière session du Comité du patrimoine mondial et pas seulement par la Délégation du Brésil, mais aussi par d'autres membres du Comité et d'autres États parties.

C'est que nous trouvons que les trois Organes subsidiaires et le Secrétariat parfois ont pris de l'avance sur cette *Convention*, allant plus vite que les organes intergouvernementaux. Cette préoccupation n'est pas reflétée dans ce document bien sûr. Nous ne pouvons pas critiquer le document tel quel, mais la préoccupation subsiste. Peut-être qu'en mettant en avant cette préoccupation on pourrait clarifier le rôle de façon plus précise ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Brésil, je vais demander au Secrétariat de prendre note de ces observations. Un commentaire de Monsieur Rao? »

Mr. Rao :

"Thank you. I am not sure I understood the intervention correctly. I recall that you said that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies have sometimes gone ahead of the *Convention* in implementing various activities. Like we discussed in the morning, the activities that we implement are those taken by the Committee and are based on the decisions that you take in these sessions. If there are certain activities that we want to implement we move ahead and execute those decisions. I would need some concrete examples from your side; if you could point them out, we could perhaps give more clarification on the activities—that you feel—were not appropriate to be implemented by the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. Whatever we do is done in consultation with you or following decisions taken by the Committee. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

« *Thank you*, Je voudrais savoir s'il y a d'autres commentaires sur le rapport de la part du Comité ou des observateurs. Il n'y en a pas.

Nous allons donc procéder au projet de décision 34 COM 5C qui a été amendé par plusieurs membres du Comité et je donne la parole au rapporteur qui va nous donner plus de précisions ».

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much, I am trying to decipher the last amendment that came in. You have Decision 34 COM.5C.Rev in front of you. I would like to take the opportunity here to encourage all members of the Committee to send us the draft amendment in advance,

because this gives us the possibility, as it has just happened, to distribute the revised Draft Decision before the item comes up and makes it easier for you to consider the amendment.

I will read out the Decision as it stands and I will read out in paragraph 3 the amendments read out by Barbados and Australia. The first two paragraphs remain unchanged:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/5C,*

2. *Recalling its Decisions 31 COM 19, 32 COM 17, 33 COM 5A, as well as the recommendations of the 2007 and 2009 audits.* This is an amendment that has been presented by the Swiss Delegation as a replacement to the previous references that were given in the original Decision.

The following paragraph 3 is in its original amendment by the French Delegation which has now been amended again by the Delegation of Barbados, and the last part that I am reading now is the amendment that has just arrived from Australia. I shall read it slowly because of the new amendments:

Reaffirming the division of the roles between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that shall in particular provide independent and professional assessments of the state of conservation of the properties—Now I have to ask Australia: Are you coming in here?—requests for assistance and the evaluation of nominations for inscriptions on the Tentative Lists and refers to the upcoming meeting—I assume it is the upcoming session of the Committee? Perhaps the Australian Delegation has to give us more information: I think the amendment is not clear.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. On my list I have Australia and Barbados, asking for the floor for amendments. Barbados you are comfortable with what was read? Sweden also wants to have the floor but Australia asked first. Please.”

Australia:

“A point of clarification and apologies to the rapporteur for some handwriting, the best way to understand our amendment is to refer to the original paragraph 5C where there was a paragraph:

takes note of the above mentioned document and our amendment continues there takes note of the abovementioned document and refers it to the upcoming meeting, to take place on the role of the statutory organ of the Convention.

Under the revised Decision 5C it will become a self standing paragraph. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia: Sweden now.”

Sweden:

“Thank you, we have looked at paragraph 3 and there is a discrepancy between the French and English text and I believe that the French text is the correct one, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madame. Mexico has the floor.”

Mexico :

“Mexico will have exactly the same proposal as was made by Sweden; we back up what Sweden said: the French and English do not tally with each other. One mentions the Tentative List the other does not; this makes it very confusing. I think we need to dot the ‘i’s, to clarify, otherwise we do not know what we are talking about.”

The Chairperson:

« Thank you Sir, you are absolutely right. Je vois que la France et la Suisse ont demandé la parole. Je propose que le rapporteur lise le paragraphe 7 en anglais lentement pour donner le temps aux interprètes de traduire. Puis, nous reviendrons sur la version française. La France êtes-vous d'accord ? Vous demandez toujours la parole, non ? Donc la France est d'accord, la Suisse aussi ? Oui, donc très bien, écoutons la version proposée par l'Australie en anglais du paragraphe 7 ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Paragraph 7, to be added at the end of the 6 paragraphs that I will be reading in French in a moment, submitted by Australia reads:

Takes note of the abovementioned document and refers it to the upcoming meeting, to consider the operations of the statutory organs of the Convention.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à notre rapporteur. Maintenant je donne la parole pour lecture de tout le projet de Décision en français et sur lequel l'adoption se basera ».

Rapporteur:

« Merci, Le projet de Décision 34.COM/5CREV :

Le Comité du patrimoine mondial,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-10/34.COM/5C,*

2. *Rappelant ses décisions 31 COM 19, 32 COM 17, 33 COM 5A, ainsi que les recommandations des audits de 2007 et 2009,*

3. *Réaffirmant le partage des rôles entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives qui doivent en particulier fournir des avis professionnels et indépendants sur l'Etat de conservation des biens, les demandes d'assistance internationale et l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial,*

4. *Soucieux d'assurer la bonne coordination de la gestion de la Convention,*

5. *Invite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives à clarifier, sur la base d'une analyse de la charge de travail actuelle et prospective, la répartition et les implications financières de leurs tâches et des responsabilités respectives,*

6. *Demande au Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial de lui faire rapport des 7 points à la 35^e session en 2011,*

7. *Prend note du document susmentionné et s'y réfère pendant les réunions à venir en octobre 2010 à Bahreïn, sur les procédures décisionnelles des organes statutaires du patrimoine mondial.*

Merci beaucoup. »

The Chairperson:

« Merci à notre rapporteur. Je ne vois pas d'objections sur la lecture en français du projet de Décision. Il n'y pas d'objections ? La France vous avez la parole. »

France :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour ce qui concerne l'amendement qui a été présenté par la France c'est en effet la bonne version qui a été lue : *La Liste du patrimoine mondial* et non pas la *Liste indicative* comme il était indiqué dans la version anglaise. J'avais une interrogation en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 5 de la Décision :

Invite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives à clarifier sur la base d'une analyse de la charge de travail – je m'interrogeais sur la mention : d'actuelle et prospective, que veut-on dire par prospective, je crois que nous pourrions tout à fait supprimer ces deux adjectifs et nous en tenir : sur la base d'une analyse de la charge de travail. »

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France, moi je suis d'accord avec vous, cet amendement a été proposé par la Suisse qui demande la parole. Je vous la donne ».

La Suisse :

« Merci, l'idée de ces deux adjectifs est de montrer qu'il y a évidemment une vision pour l'avenir. Si l'adjectif prospectif ne convient pas, on peut, peut-être en trouver un autre. Mais je pense qu'il est important de montrer ici que l'on a une analyse de la charge de travail qui voit les choses un petit peu à l'avance et qui se projette. Car ce n'est que sur cette base là que l'on peut établir des priorités. Je crois qu'il est de plus en plus important que l'on puisse mettre en place des programmes spécifiques en hiérarchisant les choses que l'on veut vraiment obtenir. C'est dans ce sens-là que nous avons proposé *charge de travail actuelle*, celle d'aujourd'hui, et celle de demain, la vision, les idées que l'on a. Comme je l'ai dit si l'adjectif prospectif ne convient pas on peut sûrement trouver, avec l'aide de la Délégation française, un autre adjectif ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse, je vois que l'Égypte, la Barbade et le Mali ont demandé la parole. Avant de leur donner la parole, Monsieur Bandarin souhaite faire un commentaire ».

Monsieur Francesco Bandarin:

« Oui je souhaite m'exprimer, car ce paragraphe n'est pas très clair à mon avis sur ce qu'il faut faire exactement. Il y a tout d'abord une demande d'analyse des tâches respectives et je pensais que le document présenté cette année c'était ça. Peut-être que l'on n'a pas fourni la bonne information, mais effectivement on a produit un rapport qui porte sur l'analyse respective des tâches respectives du Centre et des Organisations consultatives.

Deuxièmement, je ne vois pas ce que l'on veut dire par les implications financières. On a des budgets qui sont approuvés par le Comité. Le Centre et les Organismes consultatifs ont leur budget. Est-ce que c'est la matière financière qui est traitée dans le cadre des budgets ?

En troisième lieu, on a déjà fait une analyse de notre charge de travail, vous vous en souvenez cela a été discuté, donc, je me demande s'il faut refaire cette analyse de la charge de travail du Centre qui est lourde et coûteuse ou plutôt considérer que l'analyse déjà faite est toujours valable et que l'analyse concerne les Organisations consultatives ou je ne sais qui. J'avoue que ce paragraphe dans sa formulation manque de clarté à mon avis pour le contenu de ce que vous souhaitez refléter à travers celui-ci et pour pouvoir satisfaire vos demandes ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, le Mali a demandé la parole. »

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais faire un commentaire par rapport au paragraphe 3 où on parle du *rôle entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives* par rapport à un certain nombre d'éléments. Notamment, les demandes d'assistance et d'évaluation des dossiers de nomination à la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Pour ces différents éléments, le Comité a son mot à dire, même si ce projet de Décision est initié par le patrimoine mondial, il ne serait pas inutile de rappeler le rôle que le Comité joue au niveau de ces deux grandes étapes. De rappeler le rôle du Comité qui est partie prenante dans ce partage de rôle. Je ne suis pas sûr de bien me faire comprendre. Je répète, je ne suis pas sûr de bien me faire comprendre ».

The Chairperson:

« Je comprends tout à fait. Je vous remercie. Pour le moment on va poursuivre avec les autres interventions et on reviendra sur le projet avec des explications complémentaires.

Barbados you have the floor.»

Barbados:

“I would like to indicate that the wording of paragraph 4 is really not quite what I would hope. It is not really clear; I would suggest some efforts be made to shorten it. For example, there is no need to have management and administrating in the same paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you tell us what you suggest exactly, and reading it slowly?”

Barbados:

“I think the concern is to ensure good management of the Convention. It's not a *good*—by the way—but *the good* and *improve management* whatever, this does not read really quite as it should. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Je vais donner la parole à l'Égypte. Auparavant, je voudrais rappeler que nous avons en lecture la version française et par la suite la traduction sera proposée ».

Barbados:

“I have sensed that when the rapporteur read the French version it was a lot better. Perhaps it was lost a little bit in translation and maybe she should it read again. From the French we might capture the essence.”

The Chairperson:

“Ok, Egypt has the floor.”

Egypt:

« Mon intervention concerne le point 5. Au début, je souhaitais appuyer l'intervention du distingué représentant de la Suisse en ce qui concerne le maintien des adjectifs *actuels* et *prospectifs* même si on les change en *en-cours et à venir*, on confiera ça au représentant de la France et cela sera dans de bonnes mains. Cependant, depuis l'intervention de Monsieur Bandarin, je me demande s'il ne vaut mieux pas reformuler la phrase de façon claire et précise pour tout le monde. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Avez-vous un texte à proposer ? »

Egypt:

« Laissez-moi deux minutes et je fais passer un amendement ».

The Chairperson:

« Nous attendons le texte que nous proposera l'Égypte, entre temps la Thaïlande a la parole ».

Thailand:

“I think we have to try to find new wording and I have a very humble proposal, whether it can be accepted by France or not. Paragraph 5 could read:

Invites the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to clarify the division of labour.

I would like to propose these words to replace the *current and perspective workload* and etc.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Thailand. Nigeria, you asked for the floor, Sir.”

Nigeria:

“We would like to side with the comment made by Barbados on paragraph number 4 regarding the concern on ensuring good administration of the *Convention*. I think that the concern here is to ensure the efficient implementation of the *Convention* for those who drafted the resolution. I think it would be better if it read as follows: *Concerned about*

ensuring the efficient implementation of the Convention and proceeds to the next draft resolution. I do not think it would be wise to use the two words *administration* and *management* at the same time. Either we say: *Concerned about ensuring the good mandate* or we say *Concerned about ensuring the efficient implementation*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you please send your amendment to the Secretariat. We are going to postpone for a moment the adoption of these Draft Decisions, and we will come back to it once the rapporteur has dealt with all amendments.

What I suggest is that we move to the next Item, 5D, which is a response to the study on the existing and desirable links between the World Heritage *Convention* and sustainable development. Australia does not agree. You have the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry Chairman, we are in a dark corner here. We asked for the floor in relation to Decision 5C. It concerns paragraph 3, where it talks about the sharing of roles between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. I think what we are saying in the document talks more about a division of labour than an overlap. We would propose reaffirming the division of the role between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The second point in relation to this paragraph is that the articulation in the operational guidelines of the role of the Centre do not relate to the *Centre providing professional opinion on the state of conservation or evaluation of nominations* so we would propose ending this paragraph after the phrase *the Advisory Bodies* and deleting the words *that show in particular* and so onwards until the end of the paragraph. The reason for deletion is that those words are not a phrase for reproduction of the role as is articulated in the Operational Guidelines.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you give your amendment to the rapporteur? I see that more and more amendments are coming regarding that Decision and we will move on to item 5D, and after that we come back to the Draft Decision of item 5C. Could you accept this proposal, which will save time? I see no objection, so thank you very much.

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5D. World Heritage Convention and sustainable development

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5D

Decision: 34 COM 5D

The Chairperson:

We now move on to Item 5D on our agenda, which is the study of existing and desirable relationship between the World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development. I invite you to consider document WHC/10/34.COM/5D. Before we start with this item, I would like to express how grateful Brazil was to host the first meeting on this issue in March 2010 in the city of Paraty.

I would like to invite Mr. Giovanni Boccardi from the World Heritage Centre to deliver its report.”

Mr. Giovanni Boccardi:

“As just said, this is a brief presentation on the outcome of the meeting held in Paraty, thanks to the generous support of the Brazilian government. I would like to start with a few words on the issue. As you know article 5 of the *Convention* calls for the role in the life of communities of World Heritage. Other policy documents adopted in the context of the *Convention* such as the Budapest Declaration are even more specific in calling for an appropriate and equitable balance between Conservation, Sustainability and Development etc. These principles are enshrined in the *Convention* and are present in many policy documents.

What we noticed is that these principles are not translated in the concrete operational procedures and policies in our guidelines that would, for example, apply them in practice. At the same time, and we notice it every year, World Heritage properties face tension arising from conflict between conservation interests and pressure from development. There are of course cases where development poses a threat to conservation of heritage. But there have been also cases—perhaps less recurrent in this forum—where policies for conservation promoted by the World Heritage Convention in its name, have been perceived as having a negative effect on the development needs of local communities.

Now at the same time we also need to clarify what is the relationship between heritage conservation and sustainable development. This is a complex matter of course. Does heritage contribute inherently to sustainable development in its quality of heritage, as memory of our past and a symbol of our identity, or should it rather contribute through specific, economic social and environmental dimensions? How are these defined; what is the paradigm, in other words? How can we apply these principles in practice in our *Convention*?

Against this background the Committee took a number of Decisions which are shown on the slide behind me, in the context of the reflection on the future of the World Heritage *Convention*. It drafted an action plan following the draft vision that it had adopted by Decision 32COM10 and decided to place this item on the agenda of this meeting in Brasilia.

I would like also to note that the reflection on the relationship between conservation heritage and sustainable development should be seen as one step within a larger initiative that UNESCO is undertaking presently to promote positive linkages between culture in its broader sense and development. Hence the proposal to organize this expert meeting, which Brazil supported and took place in March this year.

Briefly, the key results that were achieved at this Paraty meeting: first of all a discussion on the conceptual framework as to how we can understand this relationship and interaction. This is followed by a very interesting review of many case studies, experiences and practices that are currently being implemented by a number of actors in the field. One of whom, the *Man and Biosphere* Director, is sitting next to me. Also, there are many multilateral agreements that were part of this meeting with the World Bank and other players. We noticed that a lot of interesting work is being done out there which the World Heritage *Convention* could benefit from. This resulted in proposals that are included in the document in front of you for an action plan.

The last slide I am presenting deals with the main conclusions of this meeting. The first was a call for mainstreaming sustainable development into the implementation of the *Convention* for the reasons I have just described. It is enshrined in the spirit of the *Convention* but it is not happening to the extent that we would like at present. We should

make sure that our policies are effective in making sure that conservation of World Heritage contributes to sustainable development.

What the meeting noted and the cases discussed demonstrated is that the contribution of heritage conservation to sustainable development is already happening in many places. However, this is often done in a reactive way. In other words it is not an intentional objective of conservation planning at the beginning. As conservation policies are implemented, when they meet different kinds of resistance of other various interests, then negotiations take place. These are often difficult and result in social tension because they were not considered at early planning stages, so some opportunities are lost in the process.

The idea of this Paraty meeting is that we should develop as World Heritage Centre, policies that would make the contribution to sustainable development an intentional and explicit objective of World Heritage conservation. Integrating concerns for social, economic and environmental dimensions in heritage work from the start. This approach would benefit from other narratives, tools and methodologies that were discussed in Paraty and would also bring World Heritage closer to many other trends within other institutions and frameworks at the UN level contributing to the Millennium Development Goals adopted at the broadest UN level.

These ideas are reflected in the proposals, in the action plan for you to consider. Mr. Chairman if we have another minute my colleague from the *Man and Biosphere Programme* would like to bring his own perspective.”

The Chairperson:

“Of course. Please have the floor.”

Mr. Natarajan Ishwaran:

“Thank you and good afternoon, delegates and Ladies and Gentlemen. I am not going to add too much to what my colleague has said. We in the *Man and Biosphere Programme* act as the counterpart to designated areas of the World Heritage sites and are making an effort to collect information, which already exists at the ground level. Where integration of conservation with socio-economic improvements, the livelihoods and the well being of people have been experimentally achieved. Our own effort to progress in these areas of sustainable development, thinking and action is to learn from practice and enable exchange between different sites in different parts of the world.

There are about 90 sites in the world which have twin designations (World Heritage and Biosphere) and there are some in that set of 90 where there might be some interesting experiences for us to register. We did have a lunchtime event with our Brazilian colleagues presenting their experience and we are open to other solutions from other countries and places where we can look at them. I will stop there for the moment and I will be willing to answer any questions and comments. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, I now give the floor to the representative of ICCROM for a joint statement by the Advisory Bodies.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you. I would actually like to ask Carolina Castelaños, who attended the meeting on behalf of ICOMOS, to read out the statement for us.

The Advisory Bodies welcome this first step in exploring a critical issue for World Heritage. State Parties and managers of World Heritage properties have long been confronted with the need to see the management of properties within a broader sustainable development context. Indeed many managers have had to address the way management issues link to a wider development framework. It is essential that the World Heritage community engages more effectively with the sustainable development agenda and all the actors involved, so that World Heritage properties become essential contributors to sustainable development rather than being considered as obstacles to be worked around.

It is clearly an essential principal that such engagement should be based on the primary and central purpose of the World Heritage *Convention* which is to protect cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Values. In order to allow for this to happen and to begin to set out a more helpful framework to allow properties to contribute to sustainable development goals, it is clear that appropriate guidance and tools need to be developed for World Heritage properties. It is essential that this guidance incorporates knowledge and lessons learnt from other fields.

In conclusion, the Advisory Bodies support the Action Plan as a step to further develop this reflection. We would note, however, the need for resources to allow for its implementation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, now I open the floor to members of the Committee and observers, strictly on the presentation on Item 5D. After we will come back to the Draft Decision. On my list I have Sweden, Bahrain, Barbados, France, Brazil, Switzerland and Mali.”

Sweden:

“Thank you, chairperson. The Swedish Delegation welcomes this excellent report from the expert meeting in Paraty, Brazil. The report provides a good analysis of sustainable development and World Heritage and will serve as a constructive basis for the work that lies ahead in linking sustainable development to the *Convention*. Sweden supports the outcome of the experts’ meeting but would like to make two comments.

Regarding the definition of Sustainable Development, we do not see a need for adding a cultural dimension. The standard definition of Sustainable Development with its three dimensions is based on the Brundtland Commission and the Johannesburg Declaration. It is well known and widely used. The cultural aspect of sustainability and the role of heritage need to be articulated but we should not complicate it by introducing something that is already there.

Our understanding of the concept is that the cultural dimension is already included, since it has been covered by the social and environmental dimensions. Culture is what we, as social beings, do in and with the environment. This view is based on a wider interpretation of what is included in the concept of environment. Our experience is that it is wiser and more fruitful to argue from within the discourse of the established definition.

We would also like to comment on the 2012 Action Plan. The proposed actions are all relevant but some of them should be prioritised, as implementing them all before 2012 is perhaps not realistic. The Centre should focus on the revisions of the Operational Guidelines, the proposed organisation of the consultative meeting and collaboration with the *Man and Biosphere Programme*. The rapporteur has received our amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madame. Next on my list is Barbados, you have the floor. Actually I am sorry it is Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. As mentioned by the Swedish delegates, we would like, as Bahrain’s delegates, to express our appreciation to the expert team which prepared this important document which forms a future guide for the World Heritage *Convention* on Sustainable Development. However we do have two remarks to make here.

The first: we have noticed that many of the natural sites which are on the List of World Heritage in Danger is a result of activities like hunting, fishing, poaching, uncontrolled agriculture, wood cutting or irresponsible tourism. The question is how to change the way of life and help local communities to adopt alternative activities which are profitable and sustainable. How we can, through a suitable management plan and involving communities, help them to adopt concepts like the economic value of a living elephant or a living rhinoceros, or that a whale is a more profitable and sustainable revenue for the community than a killed animal. How we can change the attitude of hunters to become ecotour guides.

We can learn as mentioned in the presentation from traditional practices throughout the world. Here, we would like to give an example from the Arab region. A sustainable way of using natural resources by local communities in the Arab region for hundred of years is known as *Hima*. This local practice allows local communities or tribes to manage and share natural resources in a sustainable manner to secure the need of the present and future generations, whether it is in arranged land, forest or even using water resources. A good example of a World Heritage site depending on the principle of *Hima* is the Aflaj World Heritage site in the Sultanate of Oman. Bahrain agrees that a close cooperation between World Heritage sites and *The Man and Biosphere Programme* is very important for this issue. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain. Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“We would like to support Bahrain and Sweden complementing in what we consider to be an excellent report. The issues presented herein are critical to sustainable development

in particular as it relates to Small Island Developing States, However we would like to be convinced and assured that the Barbados Action Plan which emanated from the 1994 UN Conference on Sustainable Development was actually part of the deliberations and we would like the Centre to speak to that matter. We are happy with the association of sustainable development and the way we have set out the link between Heritage Conservation and the associated multilateral environmental agreements. These two go hand in hand and are new and critical for the Sustainable Development Concept and for the further advancement of World Heritage as a *Convention*.

We are happy at point 7.1 of the Draft Decision and we note that special interest will be once again in terms of the integration and advancement of this concept. Barbados would like to signal its intention to be part of that process and would like to be duly informed when we move near such an exciting opportunity.

In closing, however, we would like to revert to a statement made in a previous session where we felt that:

“Although sustainable development is an international issue, it is still extremely critical to pay special attention to the issues related to Small Island Developing States, as the economic challenges, the land-use issues, the grappling income and economic factors produce very stringent and challenging environments in which Small Island Developing States elaborate.”

Why are we asking for special mention to be made of that? It is against that background that we fear if we do not maintain the SIDS programme within the context of sustainable development, we can develop international concepts which put the SIDS at a disadvantage, and in so doing, restrict our opportunities to present our World Heritage, our world to the World Heritage System.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for your comment. Now the floor is to France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais en premier lieu remercier le Brésil qui a joué un rôle fondamental dans cette question du développement durable, qui a accueilli cette rencontre de Parati, et je voulais revenir sur les propos qui ont été tenus par le ministre de la Culture Brésilien sur la question du développement et du développement durable qui me paraît particulièrement importante et devoir guider notre réflexion aujourd’hui dans le cadre de ce Comité.

Je voudrais en second lieu souligner l’intérêt de la France pour le développement durable. Pour nous la question culturelle fait partie intégrante du développement durable et c’est pour cela que nous avons proposé un amendement dans le projet de résolution afin de bien renforcer l’intégration du développement durable dans les préoccupations de la *Convention*.

Enfin, je voulais signaler un troisième point qui a trait aux développements des synergies entre le programme l’Homme et la Biosphère et la question du patrimoine par le biais du développement durable. Nous savons par exemple qu’en Afrique plusieurs sites du patrimoine mondial correspondent avec des réserves de biosphères créées dans le cadre du programme de l’UNESCO l’Homme et la Biosphère. Nous sommes tout à fait favorables au développement des synergies entre la *Convention* du patrimoine et le programme l’Homme

et la Biosphère, cela a d'ailleurs été évoqué hier lors de la séance d'ouverture par la directrice générale et nous appuyons tout à fait cette orientation. Nous savons combien cela est important notamment pour l'Afrique. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. Le suivant sur ma liste est le Brésil ».

Brazil:

« Tout d'abord, je souhaiterais remercier la France pour ces paroles adressées à notre Délégation. Pour le Brésil c'est un honneur et une priorité de soutenir l'effort entre la conservation du patrimoine mondial et l'objectif du patrimoine mondial.

Let me switch to English. Mr. Chairman, one of the main purposes of holding this reflection, for my Delegation, was to build closer links between the *Convention* on World Heritage and the environmental ones that were adopted and conducted, either during the same period of the 1972 *Convention*, or after its onset. Some of the Conventions that were adopted at the time and after have changed the conceptual framework in which conservation of environment is nowadays undertaken and that is what Sustainable Development has contributed to the new conceptual framework.

The notion of Sustainable Development is defined in Agenda 21, which was shown by the World Heritage Centre in its presentation so we do not need to redefine it. I take the point that was mentioned by Sweden in which that we should not complicated matters. Like Barbados, we believe that stronger links should be fostered between the *Convention* and the Multilateral Agreements on Environment (MAE). Some languages are already contained in the Plan of Action but Sweden has already made a point by saying that some of these actions are probably over ambitious for such a short period, so perhaps we should prioritise.

The choice of Sweden is one that we are convinced by. That we should focus on the operational guidelines. This is the way which the *Convention* has operated so far, by reviewing and evolving Operational Guidelines. It was interesting to see the slides presented by the Centre showing three overlapping circles. That in a way represents the mechanics of the different elements that compose Sustainable Development and in particular may serve as a model for reflecting on the role of Sustainable Development in the context of World Heritage.

This exercise that we are willing to undertake in the next two years should bring concrete results by 2012. We do not wish to go beyond that date, in particular with significant meanings attached to that date both for the World Heritage Convention and the UN Sustainable Development activities, given that in the same year Rio de Janeiro will again host a World Summit on Sustainable Development some 20 years after its onset.

I think that most of these interventions we have had so far are very supportive of the results of the Paraty meeting. We are very glad with that. I will just add that we want to have some language added to paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision to take account of the relationships with the Multilateral Agreements on Environment, UNEP and CBD.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Regarding the issue of amendments proposed by the members of the Committee, I would reiterate that you need to send your amendment early enough, to give sufficient time to the Secretariat. Item 5D has at least five amendments so it is not practical to receive them that late. Switzerland has now the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Il va sans dire que le développement durable d'une manière ou d'une autre, et très concrètement, fait partie de tout le complexe culturel dans lequel nous nous trouvons. Hier dans la réunion de préparation pour les néophytes que nous sommes, le Secrétariat a montré avec beaucoup de précision un projet, que moi je connais par hasard assez bien, celui de Luang Prabang. Par exemple, il est clair que tout le concept de développement durable tel qu'il est pris en compte et préparé par les Nations Unies doit trouver sa place d'une manière ou d'une autre dans le cadre du suivi réactif dont nous avons parlé hier.

Dans ce contexte, je trouve que le rapport qui nous est soumis notamment sur la réunion de Parati est extrêmement utile et montre bien quels sont les enjeux. Nous devons progresser dans le cadre du développement durable, l'inclure, mais, je dirais, il est déjà inclus dans notre façon de voir le patrimoine. Nous devons aussi garder les pieds sur terre.

Le concept de valeur exceptionnelle qui est celui qui doit nous guider ne se négocie pas, à mon avis, et ne se dilue pas dans un programme de développement comme certaines choses sont présentées dans ce document. La *Convention* n'a pas pour objectif, me semble-t-il, de soutenir une stratégie de développement durable bien qu'il soit clair que la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial contienne l'objectif de ce développement de manière intrinsèque.

C'est dans ce sens-là Monsieur le Président, que nous avons formulé un certain nombre d'amendements du projet de Décision pour refléter ce souci d'équilibre en quelque sorte entre les idées qui sous-tendent au développement durable et qui doivent trouver le chemin dans le cadre de la *Convention* et le maintien strict des objectifs de notre *Convention*.

Le rapporteur a reçu nos amendements, nous en discuterons ultérieurement. En ce qui concerne le Plan d'action, je suis tout à fait d'accord avec le délégué de la Suède. Le Plan d'action qui nous est soumis ici est énormément touffu, je dirais. Tout est pertinent, mais une fois de plus il y a une nécessité à établir des priorités, nous ne pouvons pas faire simplement du listing, nous devons faire des choix dans le cadre qui nous est imparti. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Je vais vous demander d'être un peu plus précis dans vos interventions, et de ne pas répéter ce qui a été plus ou moins mentionné par d'autres États membres. Le Mali a maintenant la parole ».

Mali:

« Merci, je serai bref. L'intitulé Patrimoine mondial et Développement durable est à la une. C'est un sujet qui nous intéresse à plus d'un titre, et en tant que gestionnaire de sites nous le vivons au quotidien. En ce sens qu'il s'agit de conserver et de préserver des sites et de les transmettre aux générations futures, mais aussi d'accepter les mutations qui se passent. On ne peut rien contre le développement économique, mais il doit prendre en

compte ce patrimoine qui existe. Donc, nous devons trouver un équilibre entre le développement et la conservation de ce patrimoine.

Mais dans la plupart des cas, notamment dans le cas des centres urbains, il y a des mutations qui font que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site est parfois entachée ou menacée. Il se trouve que de l'autre côté, les États parties sont engagés à partir du moment où ils ont ratifié la *Convention* et sont tenus de respecter le patrimoine. Moi, je pense que pour l'instant il y a lieu de rappeler fortement l'importance de la dimension culturelle dans l'élaboration des plans de développement. Donc, la composante patrimoine culturel doit être prise dans l'élaboration des plans de développement et on doit imaginer un outil qui va renforcer la prise en compte du patrimoine culturel dans les plans de développement des différents États parties. La gestion c'est prévoir, et il faut prévoir à l'avance que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ces sites ne soit pas entachée. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, encore une fois je vais vous demander d'être plus bref. J'ai sur la liste le prochain intervenant le Mexique, puis l'Australie et le Cambodge et s'il n'y a pas d'autres demandes je vais clore la liste. Le Nigeria s'est rajouté sur la liste. La parole au Mexique ».

Mexico:

“Thank you very much. I am going to be very concise, but I do want to support some of the comments made by some of my colleagues before me. We welcome the synergy between the *Man and Biosphere Programme* and World Heritage and would like to say that Mexico is very active and committed to that Programme. In our natural World Heritage sites, sustainable development with the participation of our local communities is essential. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci Madame pour votre précision et intervention très brève. La parole est à l'Australie ».

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia also welcomes the report and some of the suggestions that are included within it. We obviously strongly support maintaining the Universal Outstanding Values of properties while contributing to Sustainable Development. We have a question as to whether the proposed Decision, especially in paragraph 4, may exceed the mandate of this Committee. It would reinterpret the *Convention* by adding Sustainable Development as an explicit objective. In making that comment we want to make it clear, Chair, that Australia supports the principle and we suggested some words that would avoid the problems of being seen as if this Body changed the *Convention* whilst still maintaining the principles.

We would definitely like to see this matter progress but we do agree in terms of the overall Action Plan with some of the comments made by Sweden and Switzerland that we would need to priorities the actions within that Action Plan, given that there are some financial implications. We therefore suggest that the Action Plan should be considered by the

proposed consultative meeting which will occur within the refined work on the future of the *Convention*. With both these suggestions Mr. Chair we have provided some amended text. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the representative of Cambodia has the floor now.”

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je prends la parole pour la première fois au sein de ce prestigieux Comité et je remercie les autorités du Brésil pour leur accueil. Je me félicite de l'excellent rapport issu de la réunion multipartite, je rejoins le collègue de la Suède sur la dimension sociale et environnementale et la France sur la dimension culturelle. Notre expérience d'Angkor, où nous mettons en œuvre depuis plus de dix ans le rapport conservation et développement durable, me permet de penser que dans ce contexte seul l'opérationnel peut porter des résultats ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci beaucoup*. Nigeria now has the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you. Nigeria would like to commend the experts who have prepared this document for a job well done. We thank you very much. We also appreciate that the experts have noted the relative newness of this concept of Sustainable Development and wish to emphasise the idea to establishing a new World Heritage Thematic Programme on the integration of the concept by developing guidelines and capacities in the management of World Heritage properties that will link conservation vis à vis tourism with the largest issues of poverty reduction, the fight against diseases, promotion of literacy and etc.

We would also like to reiterate the need for improved synergies between the World Heritage *Convention* and other UN related instruments to promote Sustainable Development.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, now I give the floor to the World Heritage Centre for their views on the comments made and to reply on questions asked.”

Mr. Giovanni Boccardi:

“Thank you Chairperson. There were many comments, so I will try to respond to those I captured. There was a request from Barbados concerning the extent to which the Barbados Action Plan was taken into account in Paraty. The answer is that in Paraty we did not have a specific presentation on this point. You have to take into account that this was a preliminary meeting of a few experts, about 30, and it was organised very quickly so we could not bring to the meeting all those we would have wished. It is only a first step in a long

process so I am sure that there will be opportunities for integrating this crucial aspect in the discussion.

Then, there was a comment from Switzerland, which may be more substantial, which stated that we should be careful because the Outstanding Universal Value is not negotiable and contributing to Sustainable Development is not the aim of the World Heritage *Convention* per sé. This was discussed at length in Paraty; however the experts, including many site managers with many direct responsibilities in conserving sites, agreed that if Sustainable Development is not taken into account then conservation, including that of Outstanding Universal Values, does not happen in the long term. In a way it is a condition for conservation, hence the need to integrate it in the process from the beginning.

The other point that I would like to stress is that it is only the beginning of a reflection. We are not coming to conclusions which are final, as is reflected in the different view points that were expressed here. There is still scope for further reflection on the paradigm, the three pillars of Agenda 21, the cultural dimensions etc.

On the priorities that were proposed by Sweden and supported by others with respect to the Action Plan, we fully agree. We think that of course the meeting in Paraty came out with many ideas and we felt it would be a pity to lose them at such an early stage but we agreed that it would be important to focus on the institutional process, the revision of Operational Guidelines, consultation with State parties then strengthening linkages and synergies with other UN mechanisms starting with the *Man and Biosphere Programme*.

The point made by Switzerland was reiterated by Australia, which said that point 4 went a bit too far. We will be happy to see the proposed amendment, as, if it can integrate the idea then it will be fine. They are all the points I managed to pick up on, if I have forgotten someone, I apologise and can answer later.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, would the representative of the MAB Programme add further comment?”

Mr. Natarajan Ishwaran:

“Firstly, thank you for recognising the potential for collaboration between MAB and the World Heritage; there was also reference by the distinguished delegate of Brazil to the relationships between World Heritage and other conventions. I must stress the point that MAB is a Programme of UNESCO, not a convention, but given the overlap in sites designated under these two programmes, there might be some interesting work that could be done which might bring out relationships in Sustainable Development at the local and context specific level which can perhaps inform as to how the operational guidelines of the World Heritage *Convention* might adapt to accommodate this notion of Sustainable Development.

We look forward to working and collaborating with the World Heritage Centre. We have several sites, both cultural and natural, which overlap with Biosphere Reserves. Brazil is probably the best example, with all Brazilian Biosphere Reserves including natural or cultural heritage sites. So we look forward to interacting and bringing out the specifics of what each of these programmes can contribute properly to the accepted notion of Sustainable Development.

My last point is the adoption by the 35th UNESCO General Conference last year of resolution 31 which calls for the *Man and Biosphere Programme* and the whole network of Biospheres Reserves to be more broadly used within UNESCO for Sustainable Development

related initiatives. There again World Heritage got special mention and that too justify this closer interaction in the coming years which has been requested here as well. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sir. Advisory Bodies would you like to comment.”

Advisory Body representative:

“Just three points that are based on a discussion between the Advisory Bodies noting a very rich debate: Firstly, from an IUCN perspective we recognize many of the interventions featured MEAs and the MAB Programme, but they might not resonate in all Heritage sites. So, there is this issue to reflect on a model of Sustainable Development that can be relevant to sites listed for cultural or natural values and that would seem to be one important point to reflect on.

Secondly, we can undertake to bring these messages to others for dissemination. Certainly those of the MEAs and the one that come to mind would be the CBDs meeting in Nagoya later this year. One point that was too late to include in our report is the cooperation with GTZ with the Centre and other partners; we intend that the Youth Forum Element will bring young people from World Heritage sites to bring messages to the CBDs, and we can certainly take this debate to other fora.

The third and final point is that we would recommend that the operational aspect of this should be the focus in setting priorities. In that regard, a central concern is how to connect the management of the World Heritage site itself to the wider area within which it sits and that might be a very simple way of thinking about a commonality of approach and guidance to all World Heritage sites. I think it is with that regard that the *Man and Biosphere Programme* offers a very interesting model.

There is a also the initiative on global Geoparks which for earth science sites provides another interesting model to adopt to make the connections that have already started to turn this concept into something operational. We would suggest that the capacity building strategies that we will later consider should reflect how these messages are actually turned into training opportunities and support site managers to really implement these sorts of approaches.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for offering your comments and observations. Now we are moving to the examination of the Draft Decision included in the document WHC-1034.COM/5D. I asked the Secretariat to be prepared and we will now listen to our rapporteur to get more information on the amendment we received.”

Rapporteur:

“We have received amendments from six State Parties; since most of them provided different options, we felt that we needed to use the screen to visualize better by placing the Decision on it. I suggest we are going to proceed paragraph by paragraph until we come to the paragraph that has two different options which will be pointed out to you. We have both language versions on the screen.

I will read the paragraph in English and I will highlight to you the State Parties that have submitted the amendments. We are looking at Decision 34.COM/5D.

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/5D - This remains unchanged."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections? I see none, so paragraph 1 is adopted."

Rapporteur:

"2. Recalling Decisions 32 COM 10 and 33 COM 14A.2, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections? I see none so paragraph 2 is adopted."

Rapporteur:

"3. Thanks the State Party of Brazil for supporting the organization of an expert meeting on the relations between the World Heritage Convention, conservation and sustainable development, held in Paraty (Brazil) from 29 to 31 March 2010.

This paragraph remains unchanged."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections? I see none so paragraph 3 is adopted."

Rapporteur:

"Before starting with the next paragraph I would like to apologise for the podium up here and for my colleague turning his back to you. The reason is that we are still having technical problems so we have to turn around to follow decisions paragraph per paragraph. This paragraph 4 has amendments by Australia.

4. Welcomes the outcomes of the above-mentioned meeting and agrees that it would be desirable to further consider, in the implementation of the Convention, policies and procedures that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of properties, and also contribute to sustainable development."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections on the paragraph 4 amendment by Australia? I see none so paragraph 4 is adopted."

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 includes an amendment by Switzerland:

5. Further welcomes the proposed Action Plan for 2012 developed during the Expert Meeting at Paraty and presented in the above-mentioned Document, notably to reflect and to pursue the efforts to strengthen linkages between the World Heritage Convention and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).”

The Chairperson:

“Any objections on paragraph 5? I see none so paragraph 5 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6 again incorporates in its first part an amendment by Switzerland and further on, as indicated on the screen, amendments by France and Australia that were merged into one paragraph. I read:

6. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to pursue the study of the revision of the Operational Guidelines, to integrate sustainable development, to further consider these matters within the framework of the reflection on the Future of the Convention.”

The Chairperson:

“Any objections on paragraph 6? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Very minor, just to improve the reading of it, where it says *to further consider* just put in the word *and*.”

The Chairperson:

“Any further comments on paragraph 6? I see none, so paragraph 6 is adopted as amended.”

Rapporteur:

“For paragraph 7 you may remember further guidance from the members of the Committee as we have two alternating proposals. I will read both to you. The chapeau of paragraph 7:

*requests the World Heritage Centre, in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to seek extra-budgetary funding to—*And now to facilitate the reading of both options we suggest deleting the last four words. And then we have the first continuation by Sweden which will read—: *organize, within the framework of the reflection on the Future of the Convention, a consultative meeting on "World Heritage and Sustainable Development"*

with all States Parties and concerned MEAs, ideally ahead of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012, and further requests the World Heritage Centre, within the limits of its capacity, to seek extra-budgetary funding for the implementation of the other activities mentioned in the Action Plan for 2012 mentioned in Document WHC-10/34.COM/5D.

The alternative option proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland would leave the addition of the chapeau paragraph: *funding to implement activities. The organization within the framework of the reflection on the Future of the Convention of a consultation on the theme "World Heritage and Sustainable Development" with all States Parties and opportune MEAs, before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012.* Then Switzerland proposed to delete the following, and the proposal from Australia was to delete the entire addition, or so I understood, which would be a third option for this paragraph. Though, it seems that Australia might have been misunderstood."

The Chairperson:

"Australia has the floor."

Australia:

"Just to be clear. Australia was proposing the same deletion as Switzerland, so not something different, so we can live with either of these options."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Sir. I would like to ask the representative of Switzerland to reflect on the proposed amendment from Sweden. Le représentant de la Suisse si vous avez des commentaires c'est à vous ».

Switzerland:

« Merci, c'est tout réfléchi : elle nous convient. Moi il y a deux mots qui me gênent, ce sont les mots *de préférence* et dire *nous demandons avant la 36^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial*. L'ajout de *demande en outre* nous convient tout à fait, merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. *I think we can go with the amendment from Switzerland. Would you like to take the floor again?*

Non, donc je pense que l'on peut procéder avec l'amendement proposé par la Suède avec les modifications apportées de la part de la Suisse. Je demanderai au rapporteur relecture de ce paragraphe ».

Rapporteur:

"I read paragraph 7 as it would stand in the final version:

Requests the World Heritage Centre, in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to seek extra-budgetary funding to organize, within the framework of the reflection on the Future of the Convention, a consultative meeting on "World Heritage and Sustainable Development" with all States Parties and concerned MEAs, before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012, and further requests the World Heritage Centre, within the limits of its capacity, to seek extra-budgetary funding for the implementation of the other activities mentioned in the Action Plan for 2012 mentioned in Document WHC-10/34.COM/5D."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections on paragraph 7? I see none so paragraph 7 adopted as amended. Now paragraph 8."

Rapporteur:

"Paragraph 8 has incorporated amendments by Brazil and Barbados as indicated to you on the screen. It reads:

Also requests the World Heritage Centre to identify opportunities, for collaboration with the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other MEAs, in participation with other MABs programme—There seems to be a repetition here—and taking into account the needs of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), in the form of pilot projects to address the relation between conservation and sustainable development at regional/ecosystem scales.

I think we have to merge the two proposals and reformulate. We can replace for *collaboration with in participation with*. Would that please Barbados? I read:

to identify opportunities, for collaboration in participation with the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other MEAs, and taking into account the needs of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), in the form of pilot projects to address the relation between conservation and sustainable development at regional/ecosystem scales."

The Chairperson:

"Any comments or objections on paragraph 8? I see none, so paragraph 8 is adopted."

Rapporteur:

"Paragraph 9 has some minor modifications suggested by Barbados:

Further requests the World Heritage Centre to report on the progress accomplished in the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011."

The Chairperson:

“Any comments or objections on paragraph 9? I see none, so paragraph 9 is adopted. If there are no further comments or objections on the Decision WHC-10/34.COM/5D then it is adopted from paragraphs 1 to 9. Thank you.

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5E. The World Heritage Convention and the other UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5E

Decision: 34 COM 5E

The Chairperson:

We move to item 5E which concerns World Heritage *Convention* and the other UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture. It is the subject of the document WHC-10/34.COM/5E. I would now like to give the floor to Mr. Bandarin to quickly present this item.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you, I would like briefly to present to you an issue which is very complex. I would then like to apologise to broach this problem of the relationship between the *Convention* and other international treaties that are deposited and managed by UNESCO in such a short time, and so much superficial time and approach. It is an area which requires a lot of cautious and judicious judgment and competence and skills, especially in the area of legal and judicial affairs.

We have tried to show you in document 5E some relationships that exist between the cultural Conventions, with the notable exception from the 1946 Convention, its second protocol which is not a text; it is up to our own interpretation. As you know, in international law, every international treaty is autonomous, there is no relationship between them. They have their own members States and signatories. A treaty belongs to member States and can rule and regulate affairs between the member States that have signed it.

In fact we could close the discussion by saying there are no relationships between the Conventions. It does not exist in legal terms; the only one we can talk about is when those Conventions are managed by the same organization, which is the case with UNESCO, as in fact they belong to the same approach and culture of an international organization.

We have examined four of the eight UNESCO Conventions which seem to have possible connections in terms of methodologies, interpretations, concepts and etc. with the World Heritage *Convention*. Remember that UNESCO within its normative action also manages 13 Recommendations and three Declarations. I would like to give you some superficial elements on these Conventions.

Starting with the 1944 Convention which is the first Convention created in the field of Cultural heritage: It is ruled by two texts: the 1944 Convention proper and the 1999 second protocol which has a different group of State Parties as signatories. The 1949 has 123 member States whereas the 1999 second protocol only 56 member States. The scope of the

Convention may seem similar to that of the 1972 *Convention*. It is the protection of immovable cultural properties such as architecture, historical monuments, properties and etc. but also of movable properties. The way the protection is done is completely different. It is based on the second protocol's enhanced protection mechanism. This protection is managed by a Committee which at the time has not granted any protection. The first application has just arrived this year, it will be the first inscription in this new List that UNESCO is going to manage when the Committee for the 1954 Convention will be convened in Paris in November.

A Convention which deals with the protection of Heritage in case of war bears some significance for the 1972 *Convention*. Some of the sites are in conflict zones and therefore sometimes the two Conventions overlap and apply. Some of the mechanisms could be seen also as parallel: e.g. preparedness and elements of protection of vulnerable heritage could be similar. Again the link is virtual in this case. As I said at the beginning, the only formal link that exists between the two Conventions is expressed in the second protocol, where it states that when talking about enhanced protection for Cultural property it is presumed that the Committee of the 1954 Convention subject to other relevant considerations will consider that removable cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List satisfies the conditions of greatest importance for humanity. This is the only formal link that we found between the Conventions.

This means that the 890 sites of the World Heritage Convention might eventually satisfy the conditions of Greatest Importance for Humanity and might eventually be inscribed on the Enhanced Protection List of the second protocol of the 1954 Convention. As a side note, in my other function as DG of Culture, I called for a reflection and meeting on that point because it seems to me that we may give birth to another List and this is important for UNESCO as a whole to understand where a new List is growing after this provision of the 1954 Convention.

The other Convention we examined was the 1970 Convention which deals with prohibiting illicit import/export and ownership of cultural properties. This Convention has been signed today by 120 member States and has a different scope from the World Heritage *Convention*; essentially it protects movable cultural properties which could be looted or illegally exported and sold, whether they are pieces of archaeology or historic heritage, literature, art and science, any form of heritage that has a movable nature. Therefore, as the World Heritage *Convention* deals with the removable nature of World heritage, the 1970 Convention can only be seen in a complementary way.

But in fact it is true that many sites, especially those in a conflict zone, you all remember the case of Angkor and etc., were subject to pillaging and looting and therefore this Convention was a tool for the protection and prevention of the destruction of World Heritage sites. Also, the object is different, as there is a convergence in the mission and spirit of these two Conventions.

The 1970 Convention has an importance and I think the World Heritage *Convention* has stressed the importance of this convention in our debate. As you may notice it is today the anniversary of this convention. As we are planning also the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage *Convention* in 2012, I have decided, in my other function as DG culture, to celebrate this anniversary, and we will have a meeting at UNESCO at the end of the year which of course will indicate the future for this *Convention*.

The third Convention that we have examined is the one for the protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage, also known as the 2001 Convention. It has been signed by 31 member States, it is not a big number and it is in fact one of the problems of this Convention which has yet to reach important numbers of member States like the other ones. The 2001

Convention protects all heritages and traces of human existence that have been submerged partially or totally for at least 100 years.

It is an important Convention in the sense that it protects areas that are within territorial waters and which could benefit from other types of protection, and also areas that are outside of territorial waters which are linked with overseas law. Some sites are also on the World Heritage List, but not very many: actually one, Mahabalipuram in India. In general, it could be seen as an interesting match for the World Heritage *Convention*, as it deals with very specific heritage which is not very highly represented in the World Heritage *Convention*. It is also important because it establishes guidance for underwater archaeology.

The last Convention that we have considered in this List is the Intangible Heritage Convention. It was signed by 127 member States. You, of course, know it as it is a very famous text which was in part modeled on the World Heritage *Convention* when it was designed in 2003. But the scope of this Convention is completely different from the World Heritage *Convention*. It is essentially complementary. The only point that we found similar, and an interesting link, is the fact that the Intangible Heritage Convention links its definition of values to be protected to the life of the communities. This point has become in the World Heritage *Convention* an important one and we have been discussing up to now on this issue. You remember the inclusion of the communities as an additional strategic objective and the debate we just had on sustainable development is clearly linked to the life of the communities.

It also manages two Lists, so in a way it is similar. And if you follow the life of UNESCO you have noticed that these Lists have become very big and fast-growing. In a way they have created a lot of stress in the Secretariat which has tried to help and work together in developing methodologies and practices in order to manage this convention which is developing so fast. Some of the elements which are protected under the Intangible Heritage Convention are in fact also on the World Heritage List, though the elements defined are different.

For example Petra, in Jordan, is a World Heritage site and at the same time the life of the Bedouin communities is being listed as an element of the Intangible Heritage Convention. We could go on like this: Jamal El Fna square in Marrakech, which is also an element of the Intangible Heritage List; these are direct links. But there are also indirect links; for instance, we have traditional knowledge which the Intangible Heritage Convention tries to identify and protect. We have many cases when water management and earthen architecture and other elements of these sorts are keys for the conservation of World Heritage sites.

So there are convergences and complementarities, although the system and definition value are completely different. This is a very quick presentation and overview. It is just to point out as UNESCO we have an interest to look at the Conventions and try to understand how each can complement and cover different aspects of the cultural world. But again, we know that they belong to different legal systems that cannot communicate in legal terms with the one notable exception that I have indicated to you. Therefore, they have their own lives and have to be maintained in their own independent lives.

I thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, now I would like to know if there are any comments. The floor is open for your reactions, if any. I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Mr. Chairman, I am honoured to represent my country in this very important committee, as a new member, as it is our first time here. I want to show my appreciation to the World Heritage Centre for having prepared the document on the different Conventions. I do not want to seem so disappointed but I have to say from our experiences in dealing with recovered looted items, we rely on this *Convention* and others.

I am sorry to say sometimes it does not apply, especially to artifacts from the archaeological field before and after 2003, which have been smuggled outside our borders by dealers. I have noticed that our colleagues outside Iraq have encountered the same problems. I am not saying that we need a new Convention but arrangements when dealing with such kind of problems that Iraq and other countries face when trying to recover their looted items. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. France has the floor, followed by Barbados.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le rapport qui nous a été présenté. Les analyses comparatives sont toujours extrêmement prometteuses et apportent beaucoup d'éléments à la réflexion, et c'est le cas. Elles montrent aussi assez rapidement ses limites. Comme Monsieur Bandarin vient de conclure, chaque convention a bien sa spécificité. Je voudrais insister sur la spécificité de la Convention du patrimoine culturel immatériel par rapport à la *Convention* du patrimoine de 1972.

La notion de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle est une notion qui est complètement absente de la philosophie même de la Convention de 2003 sur le patrimoine culturel immatériel. Lorsque l'on parle de savoir-faire, bien sûr qu'il y a des rapprochements entre la *Convention* de 1972 et la Convention du patrimoine culturel immatériel, mais c'est une approche complètement différente.

Dans le cas de l'immatériel nous partons du savoir-faire, dans le cadre de la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial nous partons de sites, donc la logique est inversée. On peut trouver des points de convergence, mais à partir de points de départ très différents les uns des autres. Donc, je crois qu'il est très important de maintenir l'indépendance non seulement juridique, mais la spécificité des approches des différentes conventions dans le domaine de la culture qui sont une des richesses de l'UNESCO.

Mon second point a trait à la Convention pour la protection et la sauvegarde des diversités culturelles. Le document y fait une très brève mention tout à la fin en une ligne seulement alors que nous traitons des relations entre la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial et celle de la Culture en général. Je crois qu'il serait bon, et nous avons proposé un amendement dans ce sens, qu'il serait utile que nous puissions approfondir les liens entre la Convention sur la Culture et celle sur la Diversité culturelle. C'était d'ailleurs une demande du Comité de la Convention sur la diversité des expressions culturelles à l'heure où nous avons parlé du développement du lien entre patrimoine et développement : le développement durable c'était notre point précédent à l'ordre du jour. Il est important que nous puissions également inclure la Convention sur la diversité et les expressions culturelles dans notre approche comparative et c'est en ce sens qu'il me semble que nous pourrions la

mentionner dans le projet de Décision et nous avons proposé des amendements qui vont dans ce sens. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. I would like to associate myself with remarks made by both State Parties. First of all, Iraq has mentioned a very important point with respect with the lack of convergence with the protection of archaeological heritage in particular, but also other items of esteemed values. They often come into the context of World Heritage site. I want to note in particular that when you look at a number of states of conservation reports and nominations dossiers, invariably the mention is, although you cannot say that the Outstanding Universal Value is captured within the collection, nevertheless many State Parties utilize their existence as active demonstration of Outstanding Universal Values.

So, it is not possible to de-link the importance of this form of cultural heritage tangible properties in relation with World Heritage sites, and I would completely support our colleagues in that respect, in the need for recognition that both Conventions should do more together in terms of protection of cultural property and in fact interpreting it to the value and importance of the collection to the site. I want to make this as my first point.

I do support our colleague from France when he points out the specificities between the Intangible heritage Convention and the World Heritage *Convention*, and it is in fact critical. I will just elaborate on one point here: we need to recognize, as is mentioned in your report, the valid importance of the consideration of communities in respect of the World Heritage *Convention*. How is this articulated often in the continuation of traditional practices in the communication of traditional knowledge about the site and indeed the representation of the value of that particular country and region emanating from the community?

We missed the connection between the 2003 potential contribution to the World Heritage *Convention* work. Certainly for the Caribbean, where 90 per cent of the population that currently exists in many of the islands was forcibly brought from Africa to exist in a country where they were no longer in contact with their physical cultural heritage and had to rely on intangible expressions as giving forms and relevance in a new space. We cannot ignore the value and importance of the intangible and cultural Convention in this respect.

I totally support France in their analysis in the need to include the 2005 Convention on cultural diversity; it is of increasingly important value to the work of this Committee. If I may join the others: the report as it is set out is an important first step for me. It brings out both the difference in values, but also the potentialities of what can be done to draw the two together, not to converge them but to make them work in greater complementarity between the two or the three. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Sir, I would like to praise the quality of the report produced by the World Heritage Centre. I believe and fully agree with the comments made by the preceding Delegations—in particular those of Iraq, France and Barbados—in that it is an important first step that we may have a more integrated view of the various Conventions that allude to the field of culture. Also, on behalf of the Brazilian Delegation, I would like to stress the importance of each Convention having its own specificity, as was pointed out by the French delegate, and that the convention on intangibility, although it has converging points with the 1972, also has its own particularities which are different.

Finally, to conclude my remarks, I would like to say that I support the idea that mention should be made more specifically to the diversion of cultural expressions in the *Convention*. This seems to us an extremely important legal tool that could be part of the document. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. No other members of the Committee would like to make a comment? If not we give the floor to Zimbabwe and Guatemala.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Chair, I think it is quite a topical issue that has been raised. I believe definitely that the problem, as it stands, is the need to ensure its focuses on strategies, there is an effort to bring about a balance. For example if you look at the sub-Saharan African context, if you look at the 1954 Convention, you'll find that the rate of ratification in Sub-Saharan Africa is very low, and yet, statistically it is the continent or sub-continent that has the highest level of conflict. In the Eritrea- Ethiopia war the Commission for Ethiopia and Eritrea found that no effort had been made to promote the 1954 Convention and they had recourse in that situation to the 1907 Convention on Customs of Law.

Similarly, you find that a Convention that was very much promoted by developing countries in particular in South America and Sub-Saharan Africa, the 1970 Convention is totally undersubscribed as only 19 out of 123 States have ratified it. Yet, it is quite clear that the problem of illegal trafficking and restitution of property is very pertinent to that. The point is that if you contrast it with the 2003 Convention, which in the same region has been very much ratified, but it has little to show for it.

What I am trying to propose is that in the past the Secretariat of UNESCO was very pro-active in trying to promote the ratification and understanding of these Conventions. I believe it should be its role to try and do the same for all Conventions and that this will be a way to do justice to the document we have before us.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Guatemala, you have the floor.”

Guatemala:

“Thank you for giving me the floor. I feel that the analysis from the Centre is very important to understand the links and overlaps between the various Conventions dealing with culture. I notice that many countries from many continents have ratified the Convention on traffic of illicit cultural goods. Specifically, some countries have ratified the Convention and undertaken the commitments of the Convention, but after having done so, they are then adopting domestic Laws that round against their obligations under the international Convention.

I think it is quite an important matter, especially in countries in Latin America which are suffering from illicit traffic with cultural goods being shipped to developed countries. We need diplomatic missions and contacts with people that are exporting and importing illegal goods. We need a review of the legal framework of countries that have ratified that Convention. It is a very significant problem that we need to try to address. The contribution of the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO in this matter would be very important.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to make comments? If not, the rapporteur will read the single amendment made by the French representative: You have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous avons reçu en révision du projet de Décision un amendement présenté par la France. Je propose d’adopter cette Décision sur la base du document en Français. Je vais le lire paragraphe par paragraphe. Projet de Décision 34.COM/5E:

Le Comité du patrimoine mondial,

1. Après avoir examiné le document WHC-10/34.COM/5E,

2. Prend note avec intérêt du document susmentionné;

Le texte initial reste inchangé avec un nouveau paragraphe proposé, le 3 :

3. Invite le Centre du patrimoine mondial à approfondir les liens entre la Convention de 1972 et la Convention de 2005 sur la sauvegarde et la protection de la diversité des expressions culturelles;

4. Invite également tous les Etats parties à la Convention de 1972 à devenir parties aux autres instruments normatifs de l’UNESCO dans le domaine de la culture et à coordonner les initiatives qu’ils développent pour la mise en œuvre des différentes conventions;

5. Rappelle ses décisions 28 COM 12 (Suzhou, 2004) et 7 EXT.COM 9 (Paris, 2004) qui demandent un renforcement de la collaboration entre les secrétariats des conventions dans le domaine de la culture, dans le respect de leur spécificité;

La fin de la phrase a été supprimée.

6. Encourage l’échange d’informations et la participation aux sessions des comités des différentes conventions notamment celles de 1972, 2003 et 2005 ;

Le dernier paragraphe reste inchangé.

7. Prend note des résultats de la « Conférence internationale portant sur la culture et la diversité biologique » qui s'est tenue à Montréal (Canada), du 8 au 10 juin 2010, avec la participation des secrétariats des conventions de 1972, 2003, 2005, ainsi que du secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (1992) ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to the rapporteur; would anyone like to comment? The floor is to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We have noted in the original paragraph five only two Conventions are mentioned, 1972 and 2003. We think that equally important for the World Heritage *Convention* to cooperate with are the 1970 Convention on illicit trafficking and the 1954 Convention, they should in our opinion therefore be mentioned in paragraph 5 which has been renumbered and we have left you an amendment on that.”

The Chairperson:

“The rapporteur will take into account the comment from Sweden: Would anyone else like to comment? The floor is to Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. In the English version, I would like the Secretariat to clarify the last paragraph which states: *the participation of the 1972, 2003 and 2005 Convention*. I do not think the Conventions themselves would participate. Is it the Convention Secretariats? It needs clarification. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you: M. Bandarin, please give the Secretariat explanation.”

Bandarin:

“Yes it is the *Secretariats*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Bandarin. Any one else would like to comment? Can we start approving? No, France would like the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaiterais revenir sur la proposition faite par la Suède. Je crois qu'il ne faut pas nous lancer dans une énumération exhaustive des Conventions. Je pense que si le fait de mentionner seulement les Conventions de 1972, 2003 et 2005 ne satisfait pas la Suède, nous pourrions simplement nous arrêter à une définition générale sans mentionner de Conventions. Sinon il faut faire une Liste, celle-ci n'est jamais exhaustive et exclut d'autres textes, donc il vaudrait mieux nous en tenir à un intitulé générique et à simplement arrêter le texte après : *des différentes conventions* ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“We can accept that more general sentence: *on the Conventions for interest of the World Heritage Convention*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you, can we agree to the approval of the Swedish representative, which joins with the French proposal? Yes, in that case the Decision is approved.”

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5F. Report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5F and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5F.1 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.5F.2

Decision: 34 COM 5F.1

The Chairperson

Moving on to item 5F of the Agenda on the Report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes: It is presented in Document WHC10/34.COM/5f that I invite you to consider during this discussion, which is supplement by WHC1034.COM/INF.5.F.1 on the international office progress in tourism in World Heritage and natural sites in the Mogao Caves in China in

September 2009; the informative document WHC10/34.INF.5F.2 on the action plan on semantic programmes on prehistory.

And document WHC10/34.COM/INF.5F.3 regarding the final report of UNESCO Heritage Tourism Programme Evaluation. I would like to invite the Deputy Director Mr. Kishore to make a brief presentation on this item. I understand that M. Kishore will give the floor to his colleagues who are in charge.”

M. Kishore:

“Thank you very much M. President. This document, 34.COM.5F, contains reports on each of the 8 thematic programmes that the Committee has instituted. I will briefly summarise the progress reports on the Small Island Developing States Thematic Programme and the Marine and Forest Programme and will pass the floor to Mr. Bandarin, who will present the progress report on the remaining thematic programmes.

On the Small Islands Developing States Thematic Programme, a detailed report was presented to the 21st session of the Committee last year and the members will recall the discussions that took place. At that session we had a new site from an unrepresented State Party, which was Cape Verde, and at the present session there are two nominations for consideration, which are Kiribati and the Marshall Islands. In the nominations part of the session there is representation from the Small Islands Developing States. Further there will be a Development Assistance request from Haiti, together with the States of conservation reports from 6 sites in this Small Island Developing States.

Additionally, the Pacific World Heritage Workshop was held in December 2009 in French Polynesia to build capacity on World Heritage in the same region. A similar workshop is planned to be held for the Caribbean region in Cuba in September and the Caribbean meeting on SIDS is scheduled to be held in Barbados in January 2011. Further, a major SIDS event is planned to be held together with the 35th session of the Committee in 2011 in Bahrain.

As for the Marine and Climatic Programme, a very productive partnership was established with the Swiss watch make Jaeger-Lecoultre and the *International Herald Tribune*, which has enabled us to hire a programme coordinator in September 2009 for a period of three years, which reinforces the capacity of the World Heritage Centre to implement activities in this Climatic Programme.

The Centre, together with IUCN and funding from the government of Germany, organized a workshop in June 2010 to address underrepresented regions and to improve guidance for nominations. This will form the basis for the IUCN Committee on Climatic study which will be presented in Bahrain at the 35th session.

In addition, a capacity building programme is also being developed with the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, and a resource manual for site managers is being developed. The first meeting of site managers is planned with the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and the US National Parks Service, which is proposed to be held in December 2010 in Hawaii, and a network of Managers of Marine World Heritage Sites is proposed to be established and maintained.

Regarding the World Heritage Forest Programme: currently there are 97 World Heritage Forest Properties, covering an area of 76 million hectares. Most of the activities on this Programme are undertaken with extra budget resources, as we have very limited finances and staff resources within the Centre to take this forward. We have major extra budgetary project under implementation. One is the Central African Forest Initiative, with

financing from the EU and the government of France. The World Heritage Biodiversity Programme in India covers two forest sites.

This year, in February 2010, a nomination was submitted for a transboundary forest site between Cameroon and the Central African Republic which will be considered for the 2011 session in Bahrain. We have also instituted a five-year capacity building programme for site managers in the Asia-Pacific region on business planning for Natural World Heritage sites and 27 Forest sites are expected to participate in this programme over the next four years. The governments of Belgium and the Netherlands have financed the development of a practical guide to carry out a detailed Climate Change Risk Assessment of World Heritage properties and we are exploring the possibility of initiating some projects on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation under the REDD mechanism for Forest World Heritage sites.

As you all know, 2011 has been declared as the international year of Forests by the UN, and the Centre is attempting to raise some funds in support for observing this year in a befitting manner, perhaps by helping to build capacity and strengthening the Conservation sites, especially in the African region. Thank you M. Chair, I now ask Mr. Bandarin to report on the remaining Thematic Programmes.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you. I would like to summarise before getting into the Thematic Programmes that we held at the Centre. The first one is the Tourism Programme which was established almost ten years ago in Helsinki in 2001 with the idea essentially of supporting the work of the Desk Unit of the Centre in this emerging and very important area of work and concern of the World Heritage Committee, and to increase capacity of World Heritage site managers.

For the past ten years the Centre has conducted a vast number of initiatives and projects that I cannot summarise now, but I think this experience has given us a very solid grounding in how to try to interpret and understand how tourism affects World Heritage sites and what kind of measures can be proposed and presented in order to cope with the future and evolution of this important industry.

In the course of this decade we have had many opportunities to discuss and meet the policies and thematic issues related to tourism. Many countries of the Committee such as yours supported our meetings. Recently we had meetings in France, Switzerland and here. In general, the Committee was supportive of the activities, which, largely, were supported by extra budgetary resources, and I would like to recall that this has been an area of major cooperation with the United-Nations Foundation. However, the Committee was increasingly concerned regarding the orientation and use of this information.

The Committee required the organisation of a meeting in Mogao in September last year, under the title “*Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites*”, which was aimed at assessing the situation and looking at the future in terms of policy development. The results are in one of the documents that have been transmitted to you. The meeting opened up avenues of discussion. I believe the entire matter belongs clearly to the area of discussion of the future of the *Convention*. We are facing a rapidly developing industry which is affecting most sites. I think that the definition of policies, of strategies of the World Heritage *Convention* for the protection of sites fits very much into this discussion.

We also sent you today—an apology for the delay, but it was impossible to draft earlier—an evaluation which we asked the United Nations Foundation to finance. We felt that it was very important for the Committee to have an independent evaluation of its activities. This report given to you only in English for the time being will be later translated, again

apologies for those who do not understand English. It is part of the mid-term discussions and reflections and on the way we can organise activities around tourism.

I tend to agree with some of the conclusions of that report, which states that over the years the Centre has developed many projects but was dispersing them into many micro activities and lost the capacity of deriving policy results that are usual for the Committee. Clearly, it is an indication of moving from this fragmentation of activities and experiences towards a more structured, policy-oriented activity. This result by the Committee and the Working Group is very useful, as it is very important for us to receive a clear indication of the directions we should head towards.

The other Thematic Programme: the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme. This was established in 2001 and since then we have conducted several experiences. This is very important for us. An inventory started the programme in order to try to understand how many sites were concerned and to find out that Earthen Architecture characterises many sites. We have developed both a system of specific activities directed to site: for example in Timbuktu, Mali, in Italy and etc. We have tried to bring together existing funds such as the France UNESCO foundation to support this area. Then we have done regional consultation and meetings in the Arab World, in Latin America and other regions. We are trying to address the issue of Earthen Architecture sites through different tools.

Recently we have launched a very important project which I hope will become symbolic and perhaps famous in the future. We are, through a fund, going to address the conservation of the site of New Gurna near Luxor in Egypt, which was the main and most famous and important result of the activities of the architect Hassan Fathy between 1946 and 1952. He is the father of the Architecture for the Poor movement in modern architecture. He is definitely one of the most iconic figures of architectural thinking of the 20th century.

We have worked and obtained results thanks to this report and the Egyptian Government and of the Luxor Governorate—I actually would like to acknowledge the presence of the Governor, Mr. Samir Farag, he has been a great supporter and friend in the definition of this project. We are going to address the conservation of New Gurna and create a Centre which will be called: The International Hassan Fathy Centre for Sustainable Architecture, which will be built in the years to come. Earthen Architecture is a lively and dynamic Programme with the potential of giving a lot of visibility to the World Heritage *Convention*.

The third Programme is the World Heritage Cities; as you know, this programme has accompanied one of the important reflections of the World Heritage Committee on the issue of urban conservation and in particular the discussion on the historical landscape as an approach to urban conversation. In the past years, at least seven, the Cities Programme has addressed this important theoretical and doctrinal aspect with important results. I do not need to go into detail because you know that thanks to the solicitation of the World Heritage Committee, the General Conference of UNESCO has asked the general director to produce for the next session in 2011 a text of a new UNESCO Recommendation for historical landscapes which is going to be the first recommendation of UNESCO in the area of Urban Conservation for the past 35 years.

Focus was mainly on this normative effort but the Programme worked also on many situations and collaborated with many institutions (The Organisation of World heritage Cities, the Getty Conservation Institute, many cities in Europe and other regions to create opportunities to study ways and define practices and best management practices for this most important heritage, which is perhaps the most numerous in the World Heritage List).

Finally, I would like to update you on the situation of the World Heritage of Prehistory Programme. As you know, last year the Committee adopted this Programme and at the time requested the World Heritage Centre to reconsider the term prehistory, which did not please

some of the countries. We have done important work during the year; we have consulted many experts from around the world, held discussions, etc. This was in order to find terms that would better recognize the continuing culture in indigenous communities and ensure a global representation in the identification and conservation of those properties. At the time the Committee had also asked for the presentation of an Action Plan. With these two results achieved we have redefined the name of the Programme, which is not Prehistory any more but Human Evolution Adaptations Dispersals and Social Developments, which read as a nice acronym: HEADS. This new definition was accepted by everybody and is now final and makes up the title of the Programme.

Within this programme we will include in this definition of Human Evolution properties that are related to bio-cultural processes regarding human lineage as part of the record of life and earth history and processes that include biological and cultural changes (dispersions, migrations, cognition) and all the related adaptation at the global level. We will also look at the origins and diversity of the Genus Homo (genetically, biologically and anatomically) and the aspects of colonisation, new environments and dispersions. As you see, it is a very broad scope but certainly one that reflects indications that we received from the Committee last year.

There is also an Action Plan that we presented last year to you. It was of structures according to the five Cs: Credibility will look to ensuring support framework applying to disciplinary research and developing comparative analysis; Conservation in creating twinning, in particular with World Heritage sites; Capacity Building addressed through the UNITWIN network (the academic and exchange network) that UNESCO maintains; Communication focuses on a web page for the Programme that will be launched soon after the Committee in September 2010, and finally the Communities because the Action Plan foresees strengthening the cooperation between local communities and assessing participatory methodologies.

We are planning a meeting in Ethiopia supported by the African World Heritage Fund and the Spanish Fund, which have supported this initiative from the beginning. One important result of this activity is the creation of a Category 2 Centre which will be established, hopefully in the coming weeks, that will be one of the supporters of this activity in the coming years.

The year's activity has been quite intense and the result is very visible. We have mobilised the scientific community around human evolution, over 100 specialists worldwide have been involved, and there has been presence in international scientific congresses. I think that the scientific community around human evolution, now, knows very well the interest that the World Heritage Convention carries for this sector of activity. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Messrs. Bandarin and Kishore Rao for your reports. I would like to know if there are any comments about what was just presented. The floor is to Mexico."

Mexico:

"Thank you very much. It is a real pleasure to greet you again on this full day dealing with important issues. We have an extremely important document before us replete with information to such an extent that we do not know where to start, as everything is important. There are issues which our country has been involved in: Tourism for instance. We have seen what happened at the Sian Ka'an reserve and how it developed, we looked at Earthen Architecture; it seems to me it is an essential issue because there are many sites on the

American continent that are made of Earth and we have to think about how to properly conserve these archaeological sites.

However, in the final part of Mr. Bandarin's presentation, we noted the initiatives and we need to welcome the one regarding the opening of a Category 2 Centre that will focus on issues related to Human evolution. We are aware and have been informed that recently the Spanish Culture Department in July sent a letter to the Director General and talked about progress made and commitment to set up this Category 2 Centre within the issue which is covered here, as absolutely essential.

In the Seville meeting we had noted the need for members of the Committee to be pro-active in that our List needs to be better balanced. We notice a total absence of sites that relate to the evolution of man on our continent, whereas there are some sites in Africa and Europe. On our continent there is a need to do some in-depth work and I believe that the establishment of this Centre in Spain could be an opportunity to deal with this initiative. We are very happy that we have been given the floor and are able to reiterate to the Centre that these problems are very important for the future of the *Convention*. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of South Africa."

South Africa:

"South Africa is particularly supportive of the Thematic Programmes and has participated actively on the programme on Prehistory and Astronomy. These Programmes deepen the application of the *Convention*; they create linkages between different sites and regions. They provide opportunities for under-represented regions and States Parties. The Thematic Programmes also contribute to the strengthening of cooperation, mutual assistance and exchange of skills and information across borders. The enhanced international cooperation is to the benefit of all parties and in the interest of a more credible and representative World Heritage List. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to Egypt."

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte souhaiterait féliciter et remercier Messieurs Rao et Bandarin pour la présentation du rapport fourni par le Secrétariat. L'Égypte a également participé au Programme thématique Astronomie et Patrimoine mondial lors de l'atelier qui s'est déroulé au Caire l'an dernier. Je souhaiterais ici souligner l'importance du projet Nouveau Gournà à Louxor qui présentera à la fois un intérêt pour l'Égypte, mais aussi pour l'Architecture en Terre. J'ai juste une remarque sur les différents programmes.

Ils sont très importants pour les pays qui font partie de la Convention et ils sont financés par des ressources extra budgétaires. De notre point de vue ils ont un thème commun qui touche différents sites, dans différents pays. Ce que nous regrettons c'est que ces programmes vont faciliter les antennes régionales du Centre du patrimoine mondial et pourront aussi être une raison pour obtenir des fonds, mais la coopération à travers ces programmes s'est toujours limitée au niveau bilatéral avec le Centre et dans le futur nous

souhaiterions qu'il y ait une coopération multilatérale, car l'UNESCO est avant tout une organisation internationale multilatérale. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président et Monsieur Bandarin pour votre rapport sur ces différentes thématiques qui sont en cours. Comme vous le savez, la Suisse est particulièrement intéressée au Programme sur le Tourisme durable et se félicite du travail effectué dans cette activité. Mais comme le document sur l'audit du Programme Tourisme vient juste d'être envoyé, après en avoir discuté avec d'autres Délégations, nous souhaiterions demander l'autorisation d'ajourner le point 5F sur le point 1, Programme du Tourisme du Patrimoine mondial, ainsi que les paragraphes 3 et 4 dans le projet de Décision après le traitement du point 8 de l'ordre du jour.

Normalement, il faut distribuer les documents huit semaines avant le Comité. On comprend qu'il y a une certaine marge, mais de là à distribuer un rapport d'audit, ici cet après-midi, cela ne nous permet pas de mener une discussion approfondie sur ce thème important ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to Ethiopia.”

Ethiopia:

“Thank you and I also thank Mr. Bandarin for the report on Thematic Programmes. Personally, I support the one on Human Origin which is going to be a sensation in Ethiopia, so we welcome this Thematic session and we are ready to host it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now to Australia”.

Australia:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair and to the Director of the Centre for outlining the Thematic Programmes. We certainly welcomed the change of name as mentioned by Mr. Bandarin, as it recognizes various countries and regions that have continuing cultures that are in occupation of a land and that particularly applies to Pacific Island countries as well as other parts of the world.

Secondly, I note that under the SIDS, workshops are listed which were held in Pacific countries and this has been a singular area of success in the past years. There have been two workshops with increasing numbers of people, increasing seniority of representation and increasing sophistication of discussion. That is evidenced by the fact that this year the Committee has in front of it two nominations from Pacific Island countries.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I note that in relation to Tourism we would like to second the proposal put forward by Switzerland, that in view of the report we received on the evaluation of the Tourism Programme, we need more time to consider it. It is a long and welcome report but clearly this programme has in front of it some re-orientation and a broad future, but I think we need time to consider that and as Mr. Bandarin has proposed this can be done under the discussion on the future of the *Convention*.

Two more points: we have made a small amendment to the Decision. The amendment is to recognise the very good work that has been undertaken in relation to the Marine World Heritage Bahrain Plan of Action. Finally, if I may pose a question through you Mr. Chairman to the World Heritage Centre in relation to the Human Evolution Programme: As I said we welcome the change of name, but I wonder if the Centre can provide some guidance on what the end point in time for that Programme may be? Clearly the starting point of that is way back in the mists of time, a hundred of thousand years ago, may be even older, but I wonder up to what point approximately that Programme may cease to apply its focus. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now to Jordan.”

Jordan:

“Thank you chair, I would also like to extend our thanks to Mr. Bandarin. The report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes is very important. The workshop on Prehistory is essential for a better understanding of human evolution. In addition to the earliest human evolution in Africa, I would like to propose a workshop or a conference on transitions between food gathering societies and first settlement or food production, as being discovered in many parts of the world. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie Monsieur Bandarin pour son exposé complet sur les thématiques. Je voudrais apporter une petite contribution en ce qui concerne les Architectures en terre. Au passage nous remercions sincèrement le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour sa collaboration effective dans les sites de Djenné et de Tombouctou concernant les Architectures en terre. Mais je voudrais spécifier le fait qu'il y a certes des formations au niveau de l'Afrique et de ses régions. Cependant, j'aurais souhaité que l'on crée une forme de synergie entre les différentes régions concernées qui possèdent cette architecture en terre, afin que cette thématique soit vue de manière transversale et non pas seulement que l'on reste au niveau des régions. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you. Barbados would like to join others in congratulating the Centre in the elaboration of this report. Its format allows for a quick understanding of the objectives achieved and the success rate of the various Thematic Programmes. We note—as we have mentioned with preceding reports, notably those on sustainable development initiatives and then the one previously with respect to World Heritage and the alliance for the relationships between World Heritage *Convention* and other Conventions—that there is a need to recognise that there needs to be acknowledgement that not all States have the same level of opportunity for application and implementation of these programmes and the *Convention* at the levels which should be achieved.

Why am I saying that? I am very pleased to see the activities outline with respect to Sustainable Tourism, World Heritage Cities Programmes and World Heritage SIDS. We spoke last year in terms of recognising the important achievements of the SIDS Programme in terms of the Pacific Islands. We are now moving ahead with plans for similar sorts of activities in the Caribbean. But, at the end of the day, what needs to be recognised is that small Islands have small economies and have to be able to develop capacities that deal across the board with a number of these initiatives. In our experience, they are not separated; they have to be developed in a way that allows us proper integration of the management and coordination of these initiatives.

This is why I have spoken the way I did with respect to the *Convention* Programme. For us to be able to implement those Conventions we do need to be able to see the convergence of the activity and the interrelationship between them. I say this now in relation to the Thematic Programmes because in a number of different ways, we are not going to be able to separate these and achieve them successfully; we have to work towards the goals that are laid out on a number of different levels and wear a number of different hats.

I just urge the World Heritage Committee to pay attention to the fact that when we are elaborating this Programme, when we talk about the need to look across the board, as our colleague from Mali did when talking about Earthen Architecture, and recognising the importance of SIDS conditionalities in particular areas, it is for this reason. There is an economy of scale that can be achieved and we hope that you are sensitive to that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now to France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je voudrais à mon tour remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour la qualité de ces rapports qui nous ont été remis et qui permettent de profiter de cette expérience accumulée sur le long terme de façon tout à fait synthétique et globale, et de la mettre en valeur à travers les différentes évaluations thématiques. Je reviendrais juste un instant à un point précis sur l'évaluation concernant le tourisme.

Je crois en effet que cela mérite un débat à part entière, que nous ne pouvons pas l'évoquer au milieu d'autres sujets d'autant plus que nous venons de recevoir le document d'évaluation de plus de 45 pages presque 50, il n'y a que quelques heures, et il n'est qu'en anglais. Il est donc difficile d'apprécier toute sa portée et je soutiens donc la proposition de la Suisse de reporter le débat et traitement sur ce point. Je l'ai parcouru rapidement et vois en effet qu'il mérite un débat approfondi.

Page 42 il est fait mention de *standard* or nous sommes, nous Délégation française, très attachés au fait qu'il faut respecter la diversité des contextes et situations et qu'édicter

des *standards*, c'est une difficulté parfois qui ne s'applique pas à toutes les situations. Cela mérite donc un débat approfondi et nous soutenons ardemment la proposition de la Suisse ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“I would like to agree with the preceding Delegations and also to congratulate the World Heritage Centre through Mr. Bandarin for the quality of the report that was presented to us. It seems to me that it is an important step that was made about the Thematic Programme of the World Heritage Centre. I believe that the document is objective, concise with many proposals. So, once again I would like to say that Brazil congratulates those that have prepared those documents.

I asked for the floor because I would like to add to the comments made by my colleague from Barbados regarding the Programme for SIDS. We know that these are countries that often have problems with economy of scale, problems that have to be surmounted. Brazil would like to abound with Barbados in that there should be a common effort made by the Centre, UNESCO and the member States to acknowledge that these specificities are important. In the spirit of international cooperation we should help these countries to overcome their difficulties. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil, I would like to know whether there are any other countries or Committee representatives that would like to make comments, otherwise I give the floor to the observers, ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS :

« L'ICOMOS est heureuse d'annoncer dans le cadre des programmes thématiques que sa coopération avec l'Union Astronomique internationale a permis de réaliser une étude thématique dans le domaine du patrimoine de l'archéoastronomie et de l'astronomie. Nous sommes très heureux de pouvoir présenter ce document qui est disponible pour les membres sur le site du Patrimoine mondial. Nous serions ravis de pouvoir le présenter dans une salle annexe au cours de la session ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you ICOMOS, Uruguay you have the floor”.

Uruguay:

“Thank you Chair. The Delegation of Uruguay would like to express our thanks like other Delegations to the presentation and express support for the Thematic Programmes that have been presented in such an excellent fashion. We would like to refer to the Thematic Programme on Prehistory and the proposal to put in place international archives. Here, we would like to express our thanks to the Spanish cooperation for their support. Indeed, we

would be happy to have this document available in Spanish, as it would make our work easier. Uruguay is interested in digital archive tools and Cave Art, as this is extremely important in development of this particular Heritage. Our Delegation would also like to participate in conjunction with the institutions that have been identified and would ask the World Heritage Centre to please take into account the countries that already have Cave Art sites on the Tentative List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Uruguay. New Zealand, you have the floor.”

New Zealand:

“Thank you Mr. Chair, I would like to make particular reference to astronomy and archaeoastronomy and World Heritage and to acknowledge the seminar and conferences that have culminated in the ICOMOS IAU study referred to in this report. New Zealand has been associated with the initiative since the beginning and believes that consideration and adoption of Astronomical Heritage represents Scientific Heritage in its cultural context and is critical to the evolution of the World Heritage *Convention* and its implementation.

The time has come to recognise Astronomical Heritage, then Astronomical Heritage of sites, monuments, landscapes and cultural landscapes. Dark skies are the windows of knowledge of the great universe, the stars and planets, a part of natural heritage. They are related to the cultural practices of human kind throughout history, so I submit to Mr. Chair that Astronomical Heritage is indeed universal.

The thematic study is a scholarly, balanced, coherent statement covering all regions and all ages. It provides the bases on which member States can proceed to nominate specific sites for inscription. New Zealand is particularly pleased that Lake Tekapo, as a case study, has been included as an example. I note though that there is no provision made in the Agenda for a presentation.

New-Zealand then supports Professor Cotte’s suggestion that he, as one of the principle authors of ICOMOS, has a specific event scheduled, so that the thematic study can be presented and approval secured. Mr. Chair, New Zealand endorses the study and the adoption of paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision and further requests that the World Heritage Centre seeks nominations for Tentative sites from member States. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Angola you have the floor.”

Angola:

“Angola would like to thank Mr. Bandarin for its report, which it found of very fine quality, and also because it focuses on our country and the efforts we have made and have been monitored by international agencies so that our part of the Congo basin is included as World Heritage. We also have discussed the creation of Category 2 Centres, because, we African countries certainly need to be supported in these areas. Angola finds this is a fine quality report and we are referenced here because there will be a workshop scheduled for October or January of next year. We would like to say that the Angolan government is involved and engaged in order that this event may be successful.

For this purpose, ourselves, Spain and Brazil, and the monitoring it has provided as well as UNESCO itself, we hope that our project will be successful and this is why we asked for the floor to thank these institutions.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Angola, I apologise but we are in doubt here. It seems that the representative of Iran requested the floor: Is that right? No, I apologise then. Sometimes it is difficult to see the request for the floor of those who are further back so I apologise.

We consider the Draft Decision on Item 5F to be postponed to tomorrow and before we adjourn I would like to give the floor to the Secretariat for a few announcements and I would like to wish you a nice rest, an enjoyable evening and may you pay a visit to the exhibition on the work of the architect Lúcio Costa. After Mr. Bandarin’s speech the Session will be closed. Thank you very much to all of you.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. En ce qui concerne l’architecture en terre, il y a un événement, une présentation prévue le 30 juillet de 14 h à 15 h, donc, si vous êtes intéressés. Il y a d’autres annonces ».

Mme. Lemaistre:

« Trois annonces pour l’ensemble de l’assemblée. Le Secrétariat réitère l’appel qui a été fait tout à l’heure au déjeuner pour les experts dont la participation a été financée par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial ou le Fonds nordique du patrimoine mondial, ils ne se sont toujours pas présentés tout à l’heure à 14 h, s’ils peuvent maintenant aller au Bureau B pour contacter Madame Ribeiro.

Deuxième annonce, le ministère de la Culture, l’IPHAN, le District fédéral du gouvernement, la maison Lúcio Costa ont l’honneur d’inviter tous les participants de la 34^e session à visiter l’exposition sur l’architecte Lúcio Costa au Musée national de la République. Il y aura un groupe musical. Les moyens de transport vous attendront à l’extérieur de l’hôtel à 16 h 30.

Le Secrétariat aimerait faire juste un petit rappel : la première réunion du groupe de travail sur la révision des orientations aura lieu demain matin de 8 h 30 à 9 h 30 dans la salle du Bureau. Merci de votre attention ».

The Chairperson:

« La session est donc terminée, cependant encore une annonce ».

Mme Lemaistre:

“There is an additional announcement: Mr. Themba Wakashe, Chairperson of the African World Heritage Fund and Director of the Department of Art and Culture, and Madame Christina Cameron, whom you all know, as she is the patron of the African World Heritage Fund, request the pleasure of your company for the official opening of the exhibition located Robben Island—*A struggle for freedom—our African heritage* at 7pm at the venue of the 33rd Session of the World Heritage Committee, so just outside here. And the Venue will be followed by a cocktail; thank you and have a nice evening.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 26 July, 2010

Tuesday, 27 July 2010

THIRD MEETING

Morning session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
M. El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

The Chairperson:

“Could you please all take your seats, so we can proceed? We are already running a little late. Good morning. I wish you all a good day and now give the floor to Mr. Bandarin who is going to report on the Bureau meeting and the suggestion of the Bureau for today’s agenda.”

Francesco Bandarin:

“I would like to spend a minute to inform the Committee on some of the orientations that came out today at the meeting of the Bureau. We looked at the time management issues and at the items that still need to be discussed. As you know we still need to finalise decisions on items 5F and 5C.

The members of the Bureau suggested postponing the decision on 5F after the conclusion of the work of the working group. As on one of the items, the one related to tourism, there was a request to have more time to study the document transmitted by the Secretariat. The members of the Bureau then suggested postponing the decision on 5F, but Mr. Chairperson this is up to the Committee to take this decision.

Regarding 5G which is the audit of the World Heritage Centre, clearly this item will have to be moved to the Budget Working Group, so perhaps this item will be opened but not discussed at length as it has to be seen within the context of the Budget Working Group.

The Bureau also looked at the organisation of the working groups, and please take a look, as there are some changes that might be of interest. As you know, we have three working groups (one on the Operational Guidelines, on the future of the *Convention* and on the Budget).

The Operational Guidelines Working Group already started its work this morning from 8:30am until 9:30am in the room of the Bureau downstairs. This room has a capacity for interpretation. The Future of the *Convention* Working Group will start its work today from 2pm to 3pm in the same room downstairs. Conversely, regarding the Budget Working Group, we have proposed to start work tomorrow instead of today, as we have too many side events during lunch and in the evening which creates a logistical issue. This is, I believe, acceptable because the Budget Working Group will only meet two to three times at the most, so we can easily shift it to tomorrow.

In order to allow members of the Committee and observers to attend all working groups, the proposal was made to organise the Budget Working Group from 1pm to 2pm and the Future of the *Convention* Working Group from 2pm to 3pm. Those who want to participate in the working groups will then be able to do so.

The Budget Working Group will not have interpretation and will meet in Room E downstairs, which is in front of the Bureau room. To summarise: today we have already started the Operational Guidelines Working Group from 8:30am until 9:30am; this will continue in the coming days. The Future of the Convention Working Group will start today at 1pm and will continue in the coming days. As for the Budget Working Group, it will start tomorrow at 1pm in Room E without interpretation.

We will also add one side event, as was suggested by New Zealand and supported by many members of the Bureau and of the Committee on *Astronomy and World Heritage*. We will inform you in due time where this event will take place.

Finally, Mr. Chairperson, I would like to inform the Committee that all the nominations are now available in electronic format in a room which is just outside here on your right, the VIP room, for those who want to consult them.”

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5C. Roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson :

“Thank you very much Mr. Bandarin. I would like to know if all agree with the guidelines for today. If there are no objections, let’s move to the first item of today’s agenda which is Draft Decision 34 COM 5C REV. 2. You all have a copy of this Draft Decision. Now I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The revised Decision on item 34.COM/5C has been distributed this morning under REV2. It is the second revised document on this item that you have received. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairperson, to read through it briefly and see if there are any comments of the Committee. We have tried to synthesise all your different amendments in the current paragraphs presented to you:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/5C,*
2. *Recalling its Decisions 31 COM 19, 32 COM 17, 33 COM 5A adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33^d (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively, as well as the recommendations of the 2007 and 2009 audits:*
3. *Reaffirming the division of the tasks between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and the World heritage Committee on the state of conservation of the properties, International Assistance requests, and the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the World Heritage List;*
4. *Concerns about ensuring the efficient implementation of the Convention;*
5. *Invites the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to pursue the analysis of the work load, the division of their tasks and the corresponding financial implications;*

6. Takes note of the abovementioned document and refers it to the upcoming meeting, in October 2010—it should read not 2011—in Bahrain, to consider the operations of the statutory organs of the Convention;—Please replace 2011 by 2010 on your print out.

7. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre to report on this item at its 35th Session in 2011.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, I would like to confirm with you all that item 5F was postponed until the work of the Future of the *Convention* Working Group ends, is that ok? If you have any comments on the presentation of the rapporteur please go ahead. France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Simplement pour signifier que la France peut approuver ce projet de Décision avec cependant une précision concernant le paragraphe 3 :

Réaffirmant le partage des tâches entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives et le Comité du patrimoine mondial. Je crois que la Délégation du Mali avait proposé l'ajout de : *et le Comité du patrimoine mondial* et je remercie cette Délégation d'avoir évoqué ce sujet qui est effectivement d'importance.

Je crois, toutefois, que dans le cadre de ce point 5C, ce que nous devons traiter c'était le rôle respectif du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des Organisations consultatives, uniquement ces deux aspects. Il me semblerait donc plus opportun, dans ce cadre précis, d'enlever la mention du Comité du patrimoine mondial et de nous tenir très précisément à l'objet même de notre ordre du jour. Cela nous donnerait un paragraphe 3 comme suit :

Réaffirmant le partage des tâches entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives puis la suite *sur l'État de conservation des biens*, et etc. sans changement. Je crois que nous aurons, grâce à l'intérêt manifesté par la Délégation du Mali, l'opportunité de traiter des relations entre les trois Organes à d'autres moments du Comité. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Someone else would like to take the floor? The floor is to the representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Just a clarification, did I understand correctly from the Rapporteur's review of the document, that paragraph 6 refers to a meeting in October 2010? Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Ok, anyone else would like to take the floor? The resolution on the Draft Decision is then considered as adopted, ok? Let's continue with item 5G on the Audit of the World

Heritage Centre by external auditors, documents WHC-10/34/COM/5G. I would ask you, please, to present these documents.”

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5G. Audit of the World Heritage Centre by the External Auditors

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/5G

Decision : 34 COM 5G

Representative of the DG:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. This document presents the report of the auditors of UNESCO. The external audit of the World Heritage Centre was carried out in December 2009 and I would like to clarify that this was undertaken in accordance with the financial regulations of UNESCO.

This audit was not called for by the Committee. As you know, there was a management audit in 2007 which was mandated by the Committee; this is a policy orientated audit which is periodically carried out by UNESCO on different programmes. So, it is in that cycle of audit that the external auditor’s report was prepared in December 2009. This was considered by the UNESCO Executive Board in April of this year and, as you can see from this document, we have annexed the Decision of the Executive Board of UNESCO.

To begin with, I think it would be very interesting to look at the table on page seven of the report. What I would like to highlight is that between 1997 and now the number of audits that have been carried out are no less than eight. So there have been audits almost every year and sometimes even more than once a year. You are also aware that the General Assembly has called for two more audits of the Partnership Unit and of the Global Strategy. We are then preparing for yet another cycle of audits.

The audit covers five major groups of chapters: on the activity of the World Heritage Centre; its activities and programmes; the organisation, the structure, budget, staffing and etc.; the financial situation—that is the various sources of funding that is available to the Centre—and how it implements the programme; the role of the management in relation to various projects and activities that are carried out by the Centre. A few projects have been investigated in detail, like projects dealing with Jerusalem, Aksum and World heritage Sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

As you can see, the general director of UNESCO has responded to this audit and accepted the 15 recommendations that have been made. He also pointed out that there are two recommendations: Recommendation 13, which deals with the reinforced monitoring mechanism and Recommendation 15 which deals with tourism, which specially concerns the mandate of the World Heritage Committee.

While accepting the 15 recommendations, the general director has referred these two recommendations to the Committee. Of course, the Decision which was adopted by the Executive Board also calls for the entire report to be presented to the Committee. I would like to very briefly point out that we have already initiated action on the recommendations.

For example, for Recommendation 10 which deals with budget and financial issues, we have proposed in the Draft Decision of the budget document that we have prepared the

budget figures in consultation with the Bureau of Financial Management of UNESCO. We have already implemented that Recommendation.

On Recommendation 11, we are already implementing the policy of UNESCO on extra budgetary projects. Recommendation 12: we have prepared the draft terms of reference for the two audits to be carried out, and which you will be considering in the agenda later on during this session.

On the dissemination of reports from the reinforced monitoring mechanism process, we have provided for a Draft Decision in Document 34/Com/7.2 which you will consider tomorrow. And then on disseminating best practices, guidelines and resources material, we have recently issued the first resource manual on Disaster Preparedness which is one in a series of resource manuals that will be issued.

As the Director of the Centre and The Chairperson have clarified, this document and its recommendations will be considered in detail in the Budget Working Group, so I will not go into further detail at this stage. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you very much. The Decision on this point will be made after the Budget Working Group meets. We should probably not debate this issue today and leave it for later on, after the budget meeting takes place. OK?

Let’s move on to the next item, which is the Progress Report on the African World Heritage Fund. I would like to ask the Director of the African World Heritage Fund to present. France wants the floor first.”

France:

« Pardon Monsieur le Président. Je réagis un petit peu en retard, mais je voudrais revenir un instant sur le point précédant le 5G. Je comprends en effet l’utilité de traiter du projet de Décision dans le groupe de travail sur les questions financières. J’observe toutefois que l’agenda de ce groupe de travail est déjà bien chargé puisqu’il aura à traiter en effet de la question de la présentation du budget et de la présentation importante, avec différentes options, des ressources supplémentaires pour le Fonds du patrimoine mondial. C’est déjà un programme extrêmement lourd.

Je pense que nous pourrions d’ores et déjà peut-être avoir un échange général sur le rapport d’audit et que le projet de Décision restera à discuter dans le cadre du groupe de travail. C’est en tout cas la suggestion que je ferai : avoir un échange général sur le rapport et renvoyer le projet de Décision au groupe de travail comme cela a été évoqué précédemment ».

The Chairperson:

“We accept the proposal from the French delegate and let’s give ourselves 15-20 minutes to discuss. The floor is to Mexico.”

Mexico:

“Thank you, Chair. Mexico subscribes to what was suggested by the representative from France. I believe that we can already begin to look at the general areas in which we

need to reach an agreement with the Working Group. Maybe we could start that discussion right away. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Fine, it has been agreed that we sided with the French delegate’s suggestion to open the floor to any delegates that wish to voice their views on this point. The floor is to France.”

France:

« Merci. Je vais essayer de centrer mon intervention sur certains points qui me paraissent particulièrement saillants à la lecture du rapport de l’auditeur externe. J’aimerais tout d’abord, au nom de ma Délégation, savoir où en est la Recommandation qui demandait la nomination d’un directeur général adjoint du Centre du patrimoine mondial chargé des questions administratives et financières. C’est une demande qui a été évoquée, il y a plusieurs années déjà. Nous savons qu’il y a eu un long processus de nominations avec de nombreux aléas et retours en arrière. Nous ne savons pas aujourd’hui si ce directeur général adjoint a été nommé et ce qu’il en est du processus de nomination. Je fais référence à une décision du précédent Conseil exécutif qui justement demandait au Secrétariat de finaliser ce processus de nomination dans les meilleurs délais.

Le second point a trait à des aspects plus budgétaires. Il y a deux recommandations qui m’apparaissent plus importantes parmi d’autres dans le rapport des auditeurs externes. Notamment la Recommandation 8 sur le recouvrement des fonds extra budgétaires. Nous voyons en effet qu’il y a une spécificité dans le cadre du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de la *Convention*, qui est que le Centre a la responsabilité d’une partie en direct du recouvrement de ces fonds extra budgétaires, alors que la règle générale dans le cadre de l’UNESCO est que c’est le Bureau des contrôleurs qui a la responsabilité de ce recouvrement. Nous souhaiterions savoir quelles sont les intentions du patrimoine mondial et comment il entend mettre en œuvre cette recommandation de l’auditeur externe.

Il y a également la question de la comptabilisation de ces fonds, c’est la Recommandation 10 à laquelle il a été fait allusion. Nous comprenons qu’un début de mise en œuvre est en train de se mettre en place, ce dont nous nous félicitons. Cependant, nous souhaiterions savoir si la totalité de la recommandation a été prise en compte et où nous en sommes plus précisément dans le début d’application de cette recommandation de l’auditeur externe.

Enfin, il y a la question très importante à nos yeux des partenariats extérieurs, la Recommandation 12 sur la compatibilité de l’utilisation de l’emblème avec les objectifs de la *Convention* et également sur l’évaluation qui a été demandée à un auditeur. Mais je crois que nous ne pouvons pas attendre les résultats de l’évaluation dont nous allons discuter les termes de référence dans un autre point à l’ordre du jour de ce Comité, pour mettre en œuvre cette Recommandation de l’auditeur externe, à savoir : la compatibilité de l’utilisation de l’emblème avec les objectifs de la *Convention* et également une répartition équitable des charges et des engagements entre les partenaires extérieurs, l’UNESCO et la *Convention*.

Je souhaiterais donc avoir des précisions sur ces trois points : Nomination du directeur général adjoint, recouvrement des fonds extra budgétaires et également partenariat extérieur. Car je pense que nous ne pouvons pas attendre les conclusions de l’audit avant de mettre en œuvre cette Recommandation de l’auditeur externe. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is to the Secretariat to answer your requests.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The delegate from France asked three questions. The first question regards recruitment for the job of deputy general manager; I am pleased to inform you that the recruitment has been completed. The evaluation panel has made its recommendations to the director general and very soon she will take her decision. I suppose that it should be available in the next couple of weeks. That process has been completed.

In relation to Recommendation 8, which is basically dealing with centralising all financial fund calls within the Bureau of Controllers; this was the practise in the past. For the sake of convenience, all the letters that I sent out calling for contributions to be made to the World Heritage Fund are issued by the World Heritage Centre. But the letters are checked by the Bureau of Controllers before these letters are sent out. This kind of facilitates the work rather than them being sent out by the Bureau of Controllers. This is just a matter of convenience. And as the delegate is perhaps aware, recently the director general has reorganised the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of Controllers into what is now known as the Bureau of Financial Management. We have to see now how things will work. I think it is more convenient for the Centre to pursue the contribution and to keep track of where the contributions are coming, and which State Parties have not contributed. Monitoring is also important and facilitates our work.

In relation to recommendation 10. As you have rightly pointed out, we have already amended one of the tables in the budget document to take into account the recommendations from the external audits. As I said yesterday when I presented the budget document, we have verified these figures, all of those that have been reflected in the budget document with our Bureau of Financial Management. These are credible and verified figures, not something that has been collected by the Centre. Most of the recommendations have been implemented and we will continue to refine this practise in the coming year.

This year we are not presenting the budget but the utilisation of the budget of the previous biannual and the utilisation of the budget of the first six months of the year. It is not really planning for the budget for the next biannual. Next year the Committee session will consider a new budget and we hope that we will be able to implement the Recommendation fully.

On private partnerships: If you read carefully the Recommendation of the external auditor, it simply says that: “further this analysis through the audit requested by the General Assembly of State Parties at its 17th session”. Now the General Assembly of State Parties has really asked for the Terms of Reference to be developed, for the Partnership Unit to be audited in detail, and for the Global Strategy to be audited. We will be presenting in Item 9 the terms of Reference and we will take it from there. Obviously, we would like for that audit to be completed, but I can assure you that the partnerships that we entered into, with the private sectors, are entirely for complementing the work of the Centre on World Heritage and it is to either raise awareness of the World Heritage *Convention* as a whole, or to facilitate the implementation of various activities.”

The Chairperson:

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

Mali:

“Thank you very much, and thanks to the World Heritage Centre for this very good presentation. On page 8 of the document you have a situation about the audit. When considering that page, from 2004 to 2008 audits were carried out every year but from 1997 to 2004 there were no audits carried out during this period. May I have an explanation on this point please?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Mr. Rao.”

The Secretariat:

“As I mentioned, the cycle of audit by UNESCO of its various programmes is determined by UNESCO, and the last cycle by external auditors of UNESCO was carried out in 1997. Subsequent auditing was done in 2009; this is the cycle of UNESCO audits. But, in between, other audits were carried out. The 2004 audit was done by the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO itself, not by external auditors and other audits were done on the request of the World Heritage Committee.

The 1997 audit was a very comprehensive audit covering both the financial and management aspects with a lot of recommendations to follow up. The Centre and UNESCO also required time to implement these; there was no point in carrying out more audits and making more recommendations without ensuring that the previous recommendations were implemented. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Egypt. No? Then to the Swiss representative.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je vais pouvoir être bref après les explications données par M. Rao sur les trois points soulevés par l'honorable délégué de la France. Points qui marquaient des préoccupations que la Suisse partage je dirais à 120 %. Je voudrais simplement dire qu'en ce qui nous concerne, ce qui est important c'est qu'il y a une évolution dans le domaine de la gestion et pour nous c'est quelque chose de fondamental.

En effet nous avons besoin d'une cohérence et transparence budgétaires et nous proposons qu'il y ait une gestion future qui soit axée sur les résultats. Dans ce sens-là, Monsieur le Président, la Suisse soumettra des propositions de modifications au projet de Décision qui nous sera soumis et que nous discuterons après évidemment avoir pris note et discuté de toutes ces questions dans le cadre des réunions de travail. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Mexico.”

Mexico:

“Thank you very much Chair. We are going to refer back to some of the recommendations made by colleagues previously. In my view the priority should be placed on important issues. Nevertheless, if you take a look at the most relevant highlights or facts, at how the Secretariat operates internally, there is one issue which is very sensitive for us, and this has to come with the issue of geographical representation of personnel hired by the Centre.

If you examine the hiring, we have more people from North America and Europe, 62 per cent of the entire staff, and this seems important for us to point out when we talk about some sort of balanced representation. As well, when it comes to the whole issue of internal operation, there is a high number of temporary personnel or consultants whose compensation is not covered by the UNESCO general budget, so it is obvious that there is a lack of balance between permanent and temporary posts. This means a constant turnover and destabilisation of the core people working within the Centre. These issues may well appear secondary to others, but are of primary importance for me because it means that the Centre is not operating at top efficiency. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

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

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Chairman. I would like to echo some of the comments made earlier by those who spoke before me on the matter at hand. May I also congratulate all of those who prepared the documents for the wealth of information it brings about. It is an informative and thorough document indeed, which does reflect the key concerns of the member States, as regards the working of the Centre. However, I must underscore the excellent work carried out by the Centre and that time is required for recommendations to be implemented.

I am not questioning exactly how many audits the centre has undergone thus far. The Brazilian Delegation gets the impression that the successive external audits that have been carried out thus far, as well as other audits undertaken in the Centre, have not given enough time to put in place the relevant recommendations. I do not at all wish to detract from the value of these audit exercises, they are important, and it is equally important that member States are able to follow on the matters that the Centre works. It is likewise important to underscore the important efforts carried out by the Centre, especially under Mr. Bandarin's term in office as part of his job and now with his new job as ADG.

I think, and so does the Brazilian Delegation, that it is important that we deeply acknowledge the effort, as we know too well that there are constraints in terms of the number of staff available, as well as financial constraints, that make it more difficult for some of the tasks to be carried out.

The Brazilian Delegation would like to voice its stance on the matter at hand while echoing the comment made by my dear friend and colleague from Mexico regarding the geographical representation or distribution. It seems to me that the criteria on geographical representation or distribution could be taken into account with a view to striking a greater degree of balance, which I think would be more suitable. Also, regarding the status of

permanent, or temporary staff members, we would like this very much to be improved, gradually, as much as is possible.

Once again our congratulations to the Centre and also congratulations on the wonderful report, as the Secretariat has worked indeed to complement the relevant work of the Centres to member States.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much; the discussion and comments on point 5G are now provisionally closed. We now go back to point 6, the Progress Report on the African Heritage sites, with my apologies for the delay.”

ITEM 6: PROGRESS REPORT ON THE AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/6

Decision: 34 COM 6

African World Heritage Fund, Mr. Themba Wakashe²

“My name is Themba Wakashe, I am The Chairperson of the African World Heritage Fund and Dr. N'doro is our CEO. So I will make a few remarks and Dr. N'doro the presentation.

I just wanted to bring to the attention of the house, that during its 35th session of the General Conference, UNESCO unanimously approved the African World Heritage Fund to become a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO. This will enable us to become more visible on the international platform and to raise awareness about the state of conservation and management of World Heritage sites on the African continent.

In 2008-2009, the African World Heritage Fund consolidated its operation so that it has begun to fulfil the promise of its funding principles. In this manner we are actually trying to address the issues of substance. It is heartening to note that the World Heritage nomination training courses which are aimed at creating a credible and balanced World heritage List are really beginning to bear fruit. The World Heritage Centre received five nomination files from Africa. It is a remarkable achievement emanating from the training programmes and support of the African World Heritage Fund.

Last year, 2009, was a difficult year for many organisations and State Parties due to the worldwide economic crisis. The African World Heritage Fund is therefore grateful and appreciative for the unrelenting support of the State Parties through these difficult times. Our Board of Trustees has made a landmark decision on the management of the Endowment Fund. A total of US\$6 millions have been invested with Standard Bank in South Africa. This follows the tendering process in which portfolios from five investment houses and banks were considered.

Chairperson, on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the African World Heritage Fund, I would like to thank all countries and organisations that have contributed to the Fund and its Programmes. At the same time I take the opportunity to appeal to the international community to continue to contribute to the Endowment Fund. We are committed to a balanced and credible World Heritage List. We call up on the rest of the World to share with us this noble vision.

Lastly chairperson, we have started to assemble a team of distinguished personalities to champion our cause. In this respect I would like to champion Dr. Cristina Cameron from

Canada and Ms. Viviane Wade from Senegal for their roles as the first patrons of the African World Heritage Fund. Thank you Chairperson.”

Mr. N'doro:

“I will continue with the report on the activities of the African World Heritage Fund. As you are aware our main focus has been on four main areas. The first area is the harmonisation of Tentative Lists from Africa and in this regard we have conducted workshops in Nigeria and Egypt, and this year, we would like to conduct another one in Central Africa. As you all know, Tentative Lists are important in order to ensure that we have credible Lists.

The second area, which we have been concentrating on, has been the initiation of projects to manage and conserve our World Heritage sites, particularly in West Africa. In this regard I would like to thank IUCN for collaborating with us, in trying to put programmes in West Africa which would ensure effective management of sites in that part of the world.

Our main project or programme has been to try and ensure that we have a nomination from Africa. In this regard we have initiated capacity building training courses and the first ones took place in 2008 and finished in 2009. These courses were in English, French and Portuguese. These courses were implemented with the support of all Advisory Bodies and together with all the regional Training Institutions like CHDA and EPA. I would like to thank these two institutions for helping us and making sure that capacity building training is taking place on the continent of Africa. As already indicated, there are going to be nine sites coming from Africa in the next World Heritage Committee meeting. Out of these nine sites, five are the result of training courses which were initiated by the AWHF.

Apart from the training courses, we have also concentrated on trying to make sure that we communicate with our stakeholders. And in this regard I would like to bring to your attention the fact that we are trying to improve our website which now exists in the four main languages (English, French, Portuguese and Arabic). We hope this will become a tool to provide information to the continent.

In terms of fund raising, as you know this is one of our main activities. For us to be able to conduct training courses and regional workshops, we need funding. As I already pointed out, 2009 was not a very good year, but, nevertheless, we were able to implement certain projects. We were also able to continue lobbying member States so that they could contribute and support us. In this regard our effort was also targeting West Africa, and I am glad to say that a number of West African countries have already begun to pledge support to the African World Heritage Fund.

So far in terms of the Endowment Fund, it has already been pointed out that the money has been invested and we hope that in five years' time we will be able to sustain the operation. However, we are still far from the target which was supposed to be of US\$10 millions at the end of 2010. We are continuing with our efforts to make sure that this target will be reached.

The next two years will be very critical. Capacity building is not a single event. It takes many years for us to be able to build the capacity. Therefore, this year, we will be starting the second round of capacity-building courses; the first one will be in English, followed by the French and Arabic ones. We have already been told about the disaster that affected one of our sites, the Kasubi tombs in Uganda. The African World Heritage Fund was able to try and help in this regard. We were able to assist in hosting a stakeholder workshop. The Fund will continue to work with the Ugandan authorities and UNESCO to ensure that there is support, and that the site is reconstructed.

The issue of the Kasubi Tombs highlights another area of concern, which is the Risk Preparedness of the African World Heritage sites. We all know that the Africa 2009

Programme did a lot to encourage State Parties to develop management plans. However, I think it is important that we also begin to address the issue of Risk Preparedness to ensure that we limit the disasters, like the one we have seen in Kasubi. Therefore, the African World Heritage Fund will be working together with the Advisory Bodies and the regional institutions like CHDA and EPA to try and bring about a training programme or workshop which will address this issue of Risk Preparedness. This will be something which we will be concentrating on in the next strategic plan for the next five years.

Everybody recognises the challenges that Africa faces in the implementation of the 1972 *Convention* and well meaning efforts have been initiated by various players. We have heard actions of Advisory Bodies, all of them indicating initiatives on the continent of Africa. Several State Parties also are playing a part in trying to make sure that there is capacity building on the African continent. But, unless we coordinate these activities, our efforts might be limited. We feel that there is need for effective coordination and the need to strengthen existing African Institutions so that they can deliver and can also make sure that our World Heritage Sites are protected. Like what the South Africans would say: "Together we can do more". *Obrigado.*"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much for the quality of your report. I will do my part in raising awareness and push the Brazilian Government to contribute to the strengthening of that Fund. I would like to remind you that in my opening speech I stressed the importance of increasing the number of UNESCO sites on the African continent. Congratulations once again, and I would like to excuse myself as I have an appointment. I now leave the presidency to Mr. Zahaby and will return as soon as possible. Thank you."

The Vice Chair (hereafter called The Chairperson):

"I will proceed further with our activities and would like to open the floor to any members of the Committee or Observers if they have any comments. On my list I have Sweden, Nigeria, China, Brazil, France, and Mali. Sweden, you have the floor Madame."

Sweden:

"Thank you chair. We would like to congratulate the African World Heritage Fund on this report demonstrating an active and successful first year as a Category 2 Centre. We would especially like to commend the Fund's activities supporting the implementation of the Global Strategy recognising the benefit of regional collaboration. We also want to express our support for collaboration between the Category 2 centres and congratulate them on the Memorandum of Understanding with the Nordic World heritage Foundation. In further support of the Global Strategy we would particularly like to encourage the collaboration on developing new nominations, capacity-building and the exchange of professionals. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Madame. The next on my list is Nigeria to have the floor."

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Let me also congratulate the African World Heritage Fund for an excellent report and presentation. It is obvious that the Fund has now good practise emerging from Africa. It has not only done well within its resources for undertaking strategic activities for the benefit of Africa but it does also effectively communicate its activities through its website, newsletters and other published reports.

One area that stands out in the report is the issue of capacity-building and training. This is very important for Africa, bearing in mind the critical need to increase the number and quality of experts in the field, as well as nomination for the World Heritage List, which is one of the strategic goals of the Fund. We therefore appeal for the support of State Parties to enable the Fund to realise this strategic objective.

With regard to advocacy and resource mobilisation, I wish to suggest that the fund needs to engage in greater South, South collaboration with the countries of Latin America, Asia, China and so on. It will also need to reach out the African Diaspora, because there are a lot of resources and areas of expertise out there waiting to be tapped.

Two meetings are taking place later in the year in Nigeria, which I think the Fund should use as opportunities for advocacy: One is the Global Conference on Black Nationalities which is due to take place in August in Oshogbo, one of the World heritage sites, and also the Meeting of the African Ministers of Culture which is schedule to take place in Abuja in October 2010. Once again I congratulate the Fund and I wish them success.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now the floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have been following closely Mr. N’doro’s work and I appreciate the rapporteur’s report on the Fund. The Chinese Delegation joins others in congratulating on the significant progress the Fund has achieved in the past year. We are happy to see that the Endowment Fund has been created and runs well. We believe that the fund will make further contributions to capacity building, as well as nomination, preservation and management of all the heritage properties in Africa, a region which is still seriously underrepresented on the World Heritage List. That is why we are very happy to see new developments.

I would like to stress here, like the previous speaker, that we should give enough importance to the Category 2 Centres established in Africa and in other parts of the World, especially in the area of World heritage and Preservation. I think networking is a developing trend nowadays in international cooperation.

Within UNESCO’s mandate, may I recall what has been discussed yesterday by the three Advisory Bodies? What I have noticed reading through their papers is that there is a very good development. I am sorry to go back in time, but it’s a relevant point. They are establishing a network of scientists for site inspection. The scientists are invited from different regions. All in all, this very good trend of development should be encouraged and elaborate on as it would create new synergies of all efforts from all parties, especially in the World Heritage preservation area. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Now the floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Chair. I would like first of all to congratulate the rapporteurs for the report. It seems to be very comprehensive and shows all the successes attained by the African Fund; it is a very important document. Brazil would like to congratulate Mr. N'doro for the presentation. We would like to congratulate them for the wealth of information in the report, but also because this report shows a positive direction that the Fund is following to develop its activities. We would like to stress in particular our full support for the Action Plan, the Global Strategy and to congratulate the Group, especially as to training and the World Heritage efforts.

There is an imbalance in terms of the World Heritage List for certain geographical areas, and I would include Latin America also, but now we are talking about Africa. Brazil is very aware of and involved in this issue and I would like to remind you that before the very successful FIFA World Cup that took place in South Africa, we were part of the activities of the Fund and that we did this and were very proud of doing it with our African brothers. We feel solidarity with Africa, and it is just not rhetoric.

I would like to announce that Brazil will make a financial contribution to the Fund together with countries that have already done so. And we would also like to propose a close collaboration between Category 2 centres that were just set up whose Memorandum of Understanding was just signed with the Director General and the Ministry of Culture in Brazil.

Our Centre will be headquartered in Rio de Janeiro and we will see more South, South cooperation. I think it is important that we work together with the same objectives, targets, improving our capacity building/training experts because it is one of the ways that we can achieve a better, equal balance of the List. I would like once more to congratulate you and tell you that you have the support of my country; thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“*Thank you.* Le représentant de la France vous avez la parole ».

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais également à mon tour, comme les orateurs qui m'ont précédé, remercier les Hauts représentants du Fonds du patrimoine africain pour la présentation du rapport qu'ils nous ont faite. La France veut apporter ici de façon solennelle tout son soutien au Fonds et surtout à ses différents objectifs. Cela nous semble être un devoir de solidarité indispensable envers l'Afrique et une illustration concrète de ce que doit être la priorité Afrique, qui est une priorité de l'UNESCO et pas seulement une priorité rhétorique comme vient justement de le rappeler l'ambassadeur du Brésil.

Alors le soutien à ces objectifs quels sont-ils ? La France est en effet engagé pour soutenir les objectifs du Fonds. Tout d'abord, elle le fait en utilisant la coopération décentralisée et nous en aurons ici plus tard un exemple tout à fait important avec le Bénin notamment. Cette coopération décentralisée c'est très important, cela permet à des collectivités locales de coopérer au niveau le plus précis pour justement préparer des dossiers d'inscriptions au patrimoine mondial et également d'échanger des expériences, des bonnes pratiques qui sont si importantes sur le plan de la gestion. C'est une illustration très

concrète, je crois, des objectifs que poursuit le Fonds, dans une sorte de constellation de moyens, d'instruments qui contribuent à des objectifs semblables.

Le second instrument bien sûr qui est convergent avec les objectifs du Fonds, c'est la Convention France UNESCO qui a été mise en place en 1999 et dont les projets portent essentiellement sur l'Afrique. Il y a deux thèmes sur lesquels je voudrais insister qui sont mis en œuvre dans le cadre de la Convention France UNESCO : c'est bien sûr l'assistance préparatoire. Nous savons en effet combien il est difficile de préparer des projets d'inscription, combien les exigences, et c'est bien normal, se développent d'année en année et cette assistance préparatoire est un instrument essentiel de rééquilibrage de cette Liste et de promotion des sites africains qui sont extrêmement nombreux et mériteraient d'être inscrits au patrimoine mondial.

Il y a aussi des actions structurantes qui sont à mener notamment dans le cadre du Plan de gestion. Nous avons compris toute l'importance qui s'attachait au Plan de gestion qui fait partie intégrante de la notion de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Et ces actions structurantes, la Convention France UNESCO les a menées aussi avec le Sénégal, Madagascar et d'innombrables pays qui appartiennent au continent africain. Cela nous semble d'une importance considérable.

Je terminerai là-dessus : il y a une constellation d'instruments, nous avons des objectifs convergents, partagés, il faut les mettre en œuvre avec tous les moyens que nous avons à notre disposition et la France est très engagée dans ce sens. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France, le Mali vous avez la parole ».

Mali :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie beaucoup Monsieur N'doro et notre ami de l'Afrique du Sud pour cette bonne présentation. Je rappelle au passage que ce programme du Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'Afrique est un programme vivant, mais aussi concret dans la mesure où, comme nous l'a précisé le rapporteur, ce sont cinq dossiers sur neuf qui seront présentés. Ces cinq dossiers ont été appuysés par le Fonds.

Comme il a été dit précédemment, ce programme met en œuvre la *Convention* dans le cadre et l'optique d'une Liste crédible et équilibrée. Le Fonds du patrimoine africain mène des activités en termes de renforcement des capacités d'harmonisation des listes indicatives, de préparation des dossiers de nominations, mais aussi de suivi des sites du patrimoine africain en péril, et ceci est aussi très important.

La deuxième raison pour laquelle la Délégation du Mali soutient fortement ce programme c'est qu'il est continental. Il s'adresse à toute l'Afrique, pas seulement l'Afrique du Nord ou subsaharienne, mais il touche tout le continent africain. Cependant, comme l'a dit le rapporteur tout n'est pas rose, c'est un programme qui se suit, qui veut s'appliquer, qui a des ambitions, mais qui est limité essentiellement par le manque de ressources. Alors, profitons de cette occasion pour lancer un appel à l'UNESCO et aux autres partenaires et surtout aux autres pays africains d'apporter des contributions pour la continuité de ce programme.

Enfin, les structures techniques qui permettent l'applicabilité de ce programme devraient, elles aussi, être renforcées et appuyées, à savoir le CHDA et l'EPA. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci au Mali*. I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We concur with the voices of those who congratulated the African World Heritage Fund on their excellent work today. I would like to briefly mention some, perhaps, relatively unknown aspect of its success which relates to its influence beyond Africa.

The Fund has cooperated strongly with countries in the Pacific to help them determine the best ways in which they might look to develop sustainable funding arrangements for World Heritage activities in that region. The discussion has been going for a couple of years now and the Fund has provided a great deal of valuable input.

The Pacific countries in reflecting on the issues, of course, face different circumstances from the African countries. The Pacific clearly has overall a much lower population and a lower density which is characterised by large distances between countries over the ocean. The result of this is that Pacific countries have determined perhaps a different pathway than the one in Africa. But I think it is worth putting on the record that the pathway that they have chosen has been strongly influenced by the Fund, and that the Fund has been very generous in giving time and advice for doing that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next on my list is Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you. I would like to congratulate the African Fund for the progress accomplished, especially last year. I would like to express our support for the Fund, knowing that Bahrain is hosting the Arab region Centre and we are in the process of starting the operation of the Centre soon. A network with the Category 2 Centre is one of our priorities. However, the African Fund would be seen as a special case for the Arab Centre, keeping in mind that seven Arab States are under the umbrella of the African Funds. So, for several activities we will cooperate with the African Fund and we are hoping that we will start establishing strong relations with you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The next speaker is Barbados; you have the floor, please.”

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. Barbados would like to address the subject very briefly, simply to say we entirely endorse the statements made earlier by France, China, Brazil in particular and now Australia in terms of the congratulations and the support for the direction in which the African World Heritage Fund is moving and the success rate it is achieving as a result of this effort.

At the previous World Heritage Committee meeting, Barbados has expressed its support for the African World Heritage Fund as a successful model that we in our region would look into to ensuring the development of similar funding systems or tools, for the development and increase of the success rate of nominations coming forward from the Caribbean region, and the management and conservation of such sites once they have been inscribed on the World Heritage List; and indeed the expansion of knowledge about the World Heritage *Convention* beyond just the listed sites.

I am particularly happy to see the exhibition that has been presented here at this session. I would like to express directly that the theme of this exhibition is of extreme importance to Barbados and our Caribbean neighbours, and we would like to suggest that ways and means be found to show that exhibition in the Caribbean sub region, possibly during the SIDS meeting which is planned in Barbados for January next year.

At that point, I would like to stress that it is as a result of the inspiration of the African World Heritage Fund that we are looking towards moving forward with such an instrument. At this time of the discussion, I would really look forward to having the input of the African World Heritage Fund to advise our Caribbean neighbours on the way such a facility can be achieved.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. The floor is now to the representative of Egypt, Madame, you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Au nom de l'Égypte, pays africain, je souhaiterais chaleureusement saluer le travail du Fonds nubien qui s'est exprimé ces dernières années. En même temps je suis entièrement d'accord avec les interventions de mes prédécesseurs, membres du Comité, sur le fait qu'il faut effectivement mettre suffisamment de moyens pour soutenir les actions du Fonds et le programme culturel prévu pour les années à venir.

L'Égypte était très heureuse d'accueillir l'une de vos réunions annuelles, notamment en novembre 2008 via l'organe du ministère de la Culture égyptienne et je renouvelle l'invitation non seulement pour une réunion, mais peut-être d'autres volets de coopération. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Egypt. Now, I give the floor to Jordan and as I cannot see any additional requests for the floor, ICCROM will follow and I will close the list.”

Jordan:

“Jordan would like to strongly congratulate the African Group of State Parties for their fruitful work with the Heritage Fund. Their success gives evidence on the positive continuous efforts they are exerting. We, once more, congratulate them for their joint planning and accomplishment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Jordan, the last speaker is ICCROM.”

The Advisory Bodies:

“Thank you Chair; this intervention is on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN). I would first like to take the opportunity to thank Mr. Wakashe and Dr. N’doro for this excellent presentation. I would also like to note that Mr. N’doro was a former staff member of ICCROM and we are happy that he is in the position that he is now at the African World Heritage Fund.

The Advisory Bodies would like to congratulate the African World Heritage Fund for the progress made over the last year. We know that the African World Heritage Fund has partnered with the Advisory Bodies on a number of initiatives including the involvement of all three Advisory Bodies in the training workshops on nominations. The partnering of the African World Heritage Fund with the African 2009 Programme on a number of activities and, in particular, I would like to point out, a workshop on Cultural Heritage and Poverty alleviation. Also, a joint programme with IUCN on managing World Heritage sites in West and Central Africa.

We take note of the interventions of both Director Generals of UNESCO and The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee at the opening ceremony, and the intervention made during agenda Item 5B yesterday, and for this agenda Item which stated the need to prioritise activities in this region. The African World Heritage Fund is an important partner in this respect and the Advisory Bodies remain committed to continuing to work with the African World Heritage Fund and other international and regional partners to build capacity in Africa.

In the short term, IUCN will contribute financial assistance in cooperation with the MAVA Foundation, and all three Advisory Bodies will be involved in the implementation of the next phase of the nomination courses. At the same time, and perhaps more importantly, discussions are underway for a follow-up to the Africa 2009 Programme and the African World Heritage Fund has been involved in these discussions very actively. It is hoped that this will lead to the development of a new long term programme for capacity building which combine attention for both cultural and natural heritage with the African World Heritage Fund as a partner along with the Advisory Bodies and institutions such as EPA, CHDA and other regional institutions.

To conclude, all the Advisory Bodies look forward to continuing our collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund in the future. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia, I would like to give the floor to the rapporteurs of the African World Heritage Fund, if they have any further comments.”

African World Heritage Fund:

“Thank you Mr. Chair, Just to thank the State Parties and the members of the Committee for their continuing support. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to move for adoption of that Decision including document WHC-1034/COM/6, paragraph 10. I am asking the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments.”

Rapporteur:

“I have received no amendments Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Would you please read the Draft Decision paragraph per paragraph?”

The rapporteur:

“The Draft Decision 34.COM 6 reads as follows:

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/6,*
2. *Recalling Decision 33 COM 6A adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the progress report made in the implementation of the activities of the African World Heritage Fund;*
4. *Welcomes the decision of the 35th General Conference of UNESCO to establish the African World Heritage Fund as Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO;*
5. *Expresses its appreciation to partners at all levels for their financial support and assistance to the African World Heritage Fund during the years 2009 and 2010;*
6. *Encourages the African World Heritage Fund to develop a campaign strategy aiming at fundraising for activities and the Endowment Fund;*
7. *Also encourages the African World Heritage Fund and the World Heritage Centre to define a core of activities to be jointly implemented in Africa in the framework of the UNESCO - African World Heritage Fund agreement signed in January 2010;*
8. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to present a progress report on the African World Heritage Fund's activities for examination at its 35th session in 2011.”*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; are there any objections? I see none, Decision WHC-10/34.COM/6 and its eight paragraphs, adopted, thank you very much.

ITEM 7.1: HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE

Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.1 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.7.1
Decision: 34 COM 7.1

The Chairperson:

We are moving to Item 7.1 on issues on Historic Urban Landscapes. This item refers to two documents, WHC-10/34.COM/7.1 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.7.1. As for document WHC-10/34.COM/13, it will be read in conjunction with these two documents.

I would like to invite Mr. Francesco Bandarin to present the outcomes of the expert meeting on the inclusions of Urban Landscapes on the Operational Guidelines which was requested by the World Heritage Committee last year and that was held in Rio de Janeiro 7-11 December last year. Mr. Bandarin will also update us on the preparation of UNESCO recommendations regarding this item.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to present to you the outcomes of this meeting that was held earlier in Brazil. But I firstly would like to give you a little bit of background because I think it is necessary to understand how it has evolved in the past few years and what kind of processes it has generated.

This issue of Historical Landscape and the subsequent updating of the text of the *Convention Operational Guidelines* and its annexes are linked to a decision that was taken in 2003 by the World Heritage Committee to deepen the understanding of the issues of conservation of historic cities. At that time, and it is still the case, Historic Cities have been coming back very often to the World Heritage Committee on the problem of management: how to manage Historic Cities, the evolution and the economic and physical changes?

At that time, the Committee asked the World Heritage Centre to organise an important meeting to analyse these issues. It was held in Vienna in 2005 and a document was published: the Vienna Memorandum which was the first attempt to address and define the issues of conservation of historic cities. Subsequently, the Committee welcomed this document which has no official status and is a working document and guidance for the ongoing processes, and asked the director general of UNESCO to consider drafting a new UNESCO Recommendation on this issue.

The reason why the Committee felt that UNESCO should be mobilised is, because the previous recommendations on urban and historic areas dated from 1976, it was thought that in 30 years some of the concepts and tools had changed and evolved and needed to be updated. The director general proposed that the General Conference of UNESCO draft this Recommendation and the General Conference approved the idea in the 2009 session, asking the director general to propose a new text for this Recommendation for the next general Conference in 2011.

The General Conference also asked the Secretariat to organise two meetings. One of technical nature called in our jargon Category 6, and the other institutional, Category 2. The Category 6, the expert meeting, took place in February and helped the Secretariat to write a draft which will be distributed to the UNESCO members in the coming weeks. It has been finalised as a draft and will be distributed in the next two/three weeks in order to respect the deadline of the statutory process which requires that this text be sent to member States fourteen months prior to the General Conference, which is scheduled for October 2011. The member States have a few months to look at the text and comment on it. Then, earlier next week, the Secretariat will organise a Category 2 meeting, intergovernmental, that will look at the text, amend it and send it to the General Conference for approval.

This is the process that has been taking place and I am sorry to have taken so long, but it is very important, as it has become a UNESCO process. It does not deal only with

World Heritage anymore. It does not use the language of the *Convention* nor its principles or mechanisms. But it is a very important and relevant process for what we are doing here, therefore it is important that it is followed and it will influence the way in which UNESCO recommends and its Members States deal with the Recommendation on Historic Cities in general, not only World Heritage Historic Cities.

The Committee also looked at its own regulations and guidelines, which are also outdated in terms of terminology and concepts. We agreed with the Advisory Bodies that the current definition that came from a previous version of the Operational Guidelines is quite restricted and limited. As an example: we still define Historic Cities as Groups of Buildings. This is a definition which is used nowadays. If a World heritage City nomination is proposed you will see that it will be defined as groups of Buildings. We all agreed that this is very limited and restricted and that it certainly has to be updated.

The Committee has looked at its own regulation and asked for the expert meeting that took place in Brazil last year. The experts met and it was also important to discuss the principles that will be also reflected in the process. So there is some osmosis but let's keep and consider them independent as they reflect the requests of different bodies, different principles, different type of heritage so they are not connected, they are just parallel and we better know what's happening in the other field.

The meeting essentially looked at ways in which the Committee could be given better tools to address the challenges that affect Historic Cities, and ways to improve the text that affects the regulation. It studied definition of Historic Landscape, coming to the conclusion that Historic landscape is not per se a different category from cities. It is a management approach to deal with issues of conservation.

The approach essentially stresses comprehensive, holistic views as cities as integrated systems of values that include many elements, some physical, and some intangible, others economic and social. It is a call for a more integrated and less sectorised view on urban management of conservation, including aspects related with views and relationships of the city's territories and surrounding areas, the underground, the archaeology and many other elements that are part of the composition of this very complex category. So, it is not a category, it is an approach. This is very important to remember.

It is an approach that looks at different components of the City and tries to link conservation of urban heritage to sustainability. Issues that have been discussed in this Committee yesterday, and reflected very clearly in this debate and discussions on urban conservation. The economic function of a city is a very important part of its life but also its development, and if we want to understand how to manage changes in the cities, we have to fully understand how its economic life evolves along time.

The meeting recommended two types of adjustment to our text. They are in your documents. I believe this will also connect with the Working Group on Operational Guidelines. We are not going in too many details. There are some adjustments in the language of the Operational Guidelines and a proposal at some point to review and rewrite annex 3, which is dealing with Historic Cities as a Heritage Category, and may reflect an accumulation of concepts over a long time and does not look very coherent or up to date in terms of concepts and tools. These two systems of recommendation address both the Operational Guidelines and annex 3. Probably in the future the latter will have to be rewritten completely and reorganised.

You also remember that last year the Committee asked for some work on the guidelines, on the assessment and input of contemporary architecture insertions. This is one of the things that happens all the time and we will see more on this issue. Clearly there is a link between these types of guidelines, the reflection and re-arrangement of the Operational Guidelines, so it is important to consider this type of work in parallel. This work is very linked

to empirical work, so we have opened up—within the framework of the France UNESCO Convention and many collaborators, like the Organisation of the World Heritage Cities, the Getty Conservation Institute and some cities like Lyon, a member of the Organisation of the World Heritage Cities,—a process that will eventually will lead to the compilation of a manual that will showcase studies and best practices around the world on this issue of insertion of contemporary architecture in urban areas.

I think this summarises the results of the meeting. The process was complex, therefore it took me a while to clarify it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, now I would like to open the floor for comments or questions, first to the Committee members. I see Brazil, Barbados, Estonia, Switzerland, Sweden, France, Thailand, China, ICOMOS and Mexico. Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, Chair. It was very important that Brazil was able to host the recent meeting of experts in Rio de Janeiro, especially considering that the meeting was held in this city which is very conducive to this kind of reflection or discussion. Just as has been the case in many other countries, many of the issues end up reflecting and impacting on our domestic World Heritage policy very strongly.

Brazil comes from a heritage of tradition protection that is very much focused on architects, buildings and objects or monuments, so the broader idea of conceptually expanding the definition established, is some kind of strategy and protection that goes beyond the protective areas and perimeters and moves beyond the protected site or monument itself; in our view it involves a major challenge. The challenge of establishing the World Heritage *Convention* as a true qualification strategy about life in the city in a much more comprehensive sense, that goes way beyond a protected site or building itself.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Estonia has the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you Chair. Estonia welcomes the drafting of the UNESCO Recommendation on the Salvation of Historical Landscape. We also note that in connection with Item 13 on the agenda there is a proposal to include principles in the Historical landscapes in the Operational Guidelines. In the view of Estonia’s Delegation however, it seems to be more practical to finalise the recommendations first and change the Operational Guidelines thereafter.

The Recommendation that may hopefully be adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 2011 will also define the term Historical Landscape, and this should be reflected in the Operational Guidelines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

«Merci à l’Estonie. La parole est à la Barbade ».

Barbados:

“We recognise the efforts of the World Heritage Centre to ensure the idea of regional representation. However, we would like to be assured that the countries from the SIDS region would be given the opportunity to participate in this consultative process. We recognise that the approach is one of development tools to help design an assessment of cities and buildings and we also recognised that it is a challenge to keep the numbers for such an important consultation to a minimum.

However, we feel very certainly and strongly that we can benefit from contributing or from learning the discourse. It would be extremely unfortunate if we reach a point where we consider inclusion in the World Heritage manual and it is handed down to us as a method of management operation. We feel the situation is a unique one in terms of the pressures on our cities, on our landscapes. The historic development of these landscapes (coco plantations, sugar palm plantations, agriculture) represents a combination of several factors. Therefore we want to be assured that this level of appreciation is given its full ventilation and a very challenging and complex discussion.

But I would like to close by finally thanking you, the World Heritage Centre, for really putting together a very complex idea. This concept of Historic Urban Landscape is going to be continuous, complex and full of discussion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Barbados. I add to my list Australia, and will close my list with your permission. Thank you. Next on my list is South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Thank you chair. We welcome the initiative of the World Heritage Centre on this matter and we would like to express our thanks to Brazil for hosting the workshop for proposed changes to the Operational Guidelines. The proposed change in terminology from Historic Towns and Town Centres to Urban Areas and Settlements is welcomed as it recognizes the dynamism of urban landscapes.

In recognising the dynamic nature of urban landscapes, the proposed amendments to the Operational Guidelines should provide better guidance for the authorities to manage the changing and evolving nature of cities, whilst at the same time allowing for the retention of Outstanding Universal Value.

Lastly, from our perspective, we are particularly concerned that it is recognized that communities have intangible attachments to the places they live and work. This is often part of the Outstanding Universal Value of such places and recognition of this should be given a greater focus. At the same time, the demand to ensure an effective management of the urban landscape will demand innovative and sensitive approaches to various aspects of civil life, including infrastructure. In this regard, Chairperson, we strongly support the idea of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies developing a manual and case studies on the best practise. We trust that it will also include recognition of the intangible values of Historic Urban Landscape.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next speaker is Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous soutenons également l'approche du paysage urbain historique et nous voulons remercier tous les participants et spécialistes qui ont fourni un très grand travail et de gros efforts pour arriver à ces conclusions. Cependant, nous pensons qu'à ce stade, il reste encore beaucoup de questions ouvertes en ce qui concerne la mise en oeuvre concrète notamment des orientations. Nous aimerions rejoindre l'Estonie en disant que l'on devrait d'abord approuver la Recommandation générale de l'UNESCO puis après revenir vers les orientations. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. La parole est au représentant de la Suède ».

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Sweden welcomes the important outcomes of the experts' meeting in Rio de Janeiro last year and we would like to make some comments. There is a great variety of Urban Landscapes. They comprise all forms of human settlements, therefore planning can be complex. Aspects of the Historic Landscape approach should, however, be included in the ordinary planning processes.

Thank you Mr. Bandarin. You gave us important information, saying it is not a new category but an approach. Further development of planning instruments through various forms of the landscape is becoming an increasingly important theme, triggered by the need to plan for growing pressures. Interdisciplinary teamwork is needed to achieve this, in order to identify and understand the complex and intertwined characteristics of landscapes.

Sweden would like to highlight some aspects of the planning process. You must have more than holistic views, look for the alternatives and analyse the consequences. You have to involve the stakeholders from all levels; integrating guidance in the Operational Guidelines is necessary. However, the proposals are very holistic and some of them are general strategies and policies and should perhaps be considered in other guiding and documents. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. I give the floor to the representative of France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La France soutient, à son tour, comme d'autres orateurs précédents, l'approche qui a été développée concernant les Paysages urbains historiques. Comme Monsieur Bandarin l'a très justement rappelé dans notre optique, il ne s'agit pas d'une catégorie à part, mais bien d'une modalité, d'une approche. Et vous savez toute l'importance accordée à cette approche lors des précédentes réunions.

Alors, les menaces sont très grandes nous le savons, la pression immobilière, le développement du tourisme. Il faut agir, je crois le plus rapidement possible. Nous avons eu beaucoup de réunions d'experts par le passé. La France y a également participé en organisant, en juin 2009, un atelier sur les Paysages urbains historiques. La réflexion a progressé, elle est importante, je pense que nous ne pouvons plus attendre, il est temps d'inscrire des propositions en ce sens dans les Orientations sans attendre encore la rédaction du projet de Recommandation.

Il y a dans le cadre des travaux qui sont menés par le groupe de travail, des propositions d'amendement sur les Paysages urbains historiques, nous allons en discuter. Je pense que nous allons faire progresser, en l'amendant, l'orientation sur les Paysages urbains historiques, avant de passer bien sûr au projet de Recommandation. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The next speaker is Thailand, no? Ok, so the next speaker is the representative of China. Please.”

China:

“Thank you Chairmen. Firstly we would like to express our appreciation to the government of Brazil on hosting the expert meeting in December last year and welcome the outcomes of this meeting. Secondly, we would like to draw more attention to avoiding the impact of contemporary urban development adjacent to World Heritage sites, especially outside the buffer zones, through the establishment of more measures. However, a problem is that many development projects do not violate the law but may have adverse impacts on World Heritage sites. So, we are glad to say that more and more World Heritage sites have begun to pay increasing attention to strengthening the protection and conservation of urban landscapes, and to accumulate the experience.

We would like to suggest that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies work together to come up with some initiatives, sharing case studies and experiences of establishing new protective measures, and China would make a contribution to this.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Next speaker is Mexico.”

Mexico:

“Thank you, Chair. Now clearly Mexico would like to congratulate Brazil for having hosted the Rio meeting. It seems to us, actually we are quite sure, that this is a two-prong issue. Two basic characteristics are of prime importance, one is something that cannot be postponed and secondly we have to move on. When we come to the List of World Heritage, as we are dealing with today, there is a high percentage of cultural property on that List; I would say even more than 30 percent that have to do with what we would consider today as being urban landscape.

We agree with the vision of Mr. Bandarin on the fact that we are not only talking about urban landscape as a category but rather as an approach or concept. As part of this whole process, which is rather complex, the Advisory Bodies have an important role to play, both

with respect to the past and the future of the Committee and the measures to be carried out by the various State Parties to the *Convention*.

I would summarise if I could in a few words just a few important issues pointed out clearly on the holistic character of this approach: what guidelines should be adopted in order to involve the local populations and the creation of indicators. We have a big registry, something we have been basing ourselves on for the past 15 years, working in collaboration on conservation indicators. Nevertheless, it does appear important to us, and I end on this, to point out that we try to look at how we can take an objective approach to setting up a manual. This manual must include the different modalities that we see around the world. Because Historic Urban Landscapes are based on different conceptions of the world so it cannot just be a general approach.

We have some basic endeavours to be done in terms of conceptualising this approach and we must be much more rigorous in terms of how we study Historic Urban Landscapes. I am very pleased to see this initiative has come forward. Thank you Sir."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Now the last on my list of the Committee members is Australia. I see Nigeria has asked for the floor, but I am sorry we have closed the list. I have a schedule to respect, I hope you understand. Thank you. Australia, you have the floor."

Australia:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. We will join the other Delegations that congratulated Brazil on the meeting held in Rio on this issue that helped us to clarify the matter in front of us. I would like to join with Estonia and I think a couple of others who did vouch that given the development of the recommendation that is proposed, that the direct outline comes from the Executive Board, it would be sensible to await the outcome of that before we proceed with any changes to the Operational Guidelines. That seems entirely sensible, so that we do not have to review the Operational Guidelines twice in a short period on the same issue.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman if I can ask a question through you to the Director of the Centre: In paragraph 17 of the document in front of us, it notes that the World Heritage Centre is involved in the preparation of a manual of case studies and good practices in conservation management. However, in paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, the latter is asking the World Heritage to prepare a second manual. I wonder if we can clarify if we are talking about two manuals or whether it is really the same one. May I note that if we are thinking of two manuals, I think we probably need to find ways to bring the two together and only have one in this area. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, Australia. The last speaker on my list is the representative of ICOMOS. You have the floor Sir."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Advisory Bodies have been involved in the implementation of this initiative and we will continue to do so in recognition of the practical conservation issues that have stimulated the dialogue. As an approach, Historical Urban

Landscapes aim to consider urban settlements or areas not only as restricted units, but as part of a larger area of territories that takes into account not only buildings but also infrastructures, street furniture, urban spaces and natural heritage, which are intangible aspects of the urban environment.

This allows consideration of urban settlements as the interaction among this wide variety of components and as a tool to reinforce their potential contribution to sustainable development. The Advisory Bodies note that the development of a Draft Recommendation is the outcome of some five years of discussion among experts and other stakeholders involved in urban heritage management. To comment, first on the proposal to change the Operational Guidelines, the Advisory Bodies note that further reflection is continuing and required. Therefore, it seems entirely logical to consider changes to the management guidelines after the eventual adoption of the UNESCO Recommendation on Historical Urban Landscapes.

In terms of the Historical Urban Landscapes approach, the Advisory Bodies would like to offer the following approach:

1) We would like to emphasize, as was previously stated, that the concept of Historical Urban Landscapes is an approach towards conservation and management and not a specific Heritage Category. This difference needs to be emphasised especially regarding nomination to the World Heritage List.

2) One of the aspects included in the Historic Urban Landscapes discussion is the introduction of contemporary architecture in urban settlements or areas bearing historic architectural and environmental values. In this sense the Advisory Bodies would like to recall that efforts should be directed to protect and conserve these properties and not only to manage changes.

3) With development pressures appearing all over the world, there are also in certain regions pressures coming from lack of economic activities. In this sense the Historical Urban Landscape approach should allow us to tackle the whole range of factors that affect the heritage of urban settlements, with the aim of improving the quality of life of local populations and contributing to integral sustainable types of development.

4) It is necessary to work on the translation of the new approach of practical methods and tools. In this sense the Advisory Bodies recognise that there are synergies among UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and experts that are working together to achieve a better protection, conservation and management of our Heritage all over the world.

In relation to the proposal in the Draft Decision to produce resources on this topic, the Advisory Bodies note that there is an existing forward programme and budget for the joint development of World Heritage resource manual. The manual of management of cultural properties is under preparation and will contain some material of general application to the Historic Urban Landscape tool.

Moving forward and following the conclusion of the UNESCO Recommendation, the Advisory Bodies recall that additional alternatives might be worthy of consideration, such as compilation of case studies showcasing innovations. The Advisory Bodies offer their continued involvement and dialogue to determine the priorities following the conclusion of the UNESCO Recommendation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Bandarin to comment and reply on observations made.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais avant tout répondre à la question posée par le délégué de l'Australie sur le manuel. Vous avez effectivement lu dans le paragraphe 17 que le Centre a rejoint une initiative déjà lancée par d'autres organisations et en particulier par celle des Villes du patrimoine mondial. Ce n'est donc pas une initiative à caractère statutaire, mais plutôt bienvenue d'organisations qui travaillent sur ce thème et avec lesquelles le Centre collabore. Ce n'est pas une initiative statutaire du Comité, ni une initiative dirigée uniquement à l'usage des Paysages urbains à caractère historique. C'est une initiative très utile parce qu'elle nous permet de travailler et d'avancer dans nos travaux.

Ce dont nous avons besoin est indiqué dans le point 5 du projet de Décision dans lequel on demande que le Centre, en collaboration avec les Organisations consultatives, commence à travailler sur un manuel pour montrer les différents aspects au niveau du concept, ou les différents volets régionaux de la question. Il s'agit donc de deux choses différentes avec des volets différents.

Si vous me le permettez je souhaiterais aussi commenter sur la question qui a été un peu au centre du débat : qu'est ce que l'on fait ? Avance-t-on avec nos recommandations ou avec celles de l'UNESCO ? Je dirais que c'est la question de la poule et de l'oeuf. Ce n'est pas un processus qui doit attendre qu'une décision soit prise pour travailler. Le groupe de travail a proposé un certain nombre d'amendements, de mises à jour des recommandations qui, si vous les lisez en détail, ne sont pas reliés au problème de paysages historiques. Il s'agit d'améliorer le langage et de le moderniser. Je pense donc que le groupe de travail qui travaille sur les orientations pourrait bien regarder ces recommandations et voir si elles sont acceptables à ce stade. Si elles ne sont pas acceptables parce qu'il y a un problème vraiment fondamental on peut les renvoyer.

Soyez aussi rassurés, la définition et le concept qui ont été inscrits dans le projet de Recommandation pour la conservation des Paysages urbains historiques sont évidemment du même esprit. Ce ne sont pas deux groupes qui font des travaux séparément. Le Secrétariat a bien veillé à ce que les concepts soient les mêmes, qu'il n'y ait pas ici un risque de différences trop importantes dans les concepts.

Mon conseil serait de continuer le travail de révision des orientations et les collègues qui s'y attellent m'ont déjà dit que cela est très complexe, que ce n'est donc pas sûr que l'on puisse les compléter pendant cette séance et qu'il faudra les compléter pendant l'année. Sachez aussi que le groupe intergouvernemental de la réunion catégorie 2 devra définir le texte qui sera envoyé à la conférence. Comme c'est un groupe intergouvernemental, le texte qui sortira de cette réunion, qui sera probablement organisée en février prochain, sera un texte quasi définitif. C'est très difficile pour la conférence générale de rentrer dans un débat technique après qu'un groupe intergouvernemental l'a traité. L'année prochaine le Comité aura dans ses mains le texte, ce qui facilitera la prise de décision en ce qui concerne l'orientation du Comité. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Bandarin. Now I would like to go to the Draft Decision. We only have one, WHC-10/34.COM/ 7.1, I turn to our rapporteur: any amendments to the text?”

Rapporteur:

“I have not received any written amendments on this Draft Decision, so I will briefly read the text to you as it is in front of you, decision WHC-10/34.COM/7.1:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.1,

*2. Recalling its Decision **33 COM 7.1**, adopted at its 33^d session (Seville, 2009),*

3. Thanks the State Party of Brazil and IPHAN for having generously hosted the expert meeting which took place from 7 to 11 December 2009 in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), and the experts having contributed to the meeting;

4. Takes note with satisfaction of the outcomes of the expert meeting and the recommendations for the inclusion of an Historic Urban Landscape approach in the Operational Guidelines;

5. Requests the World Heritage Centre to develop, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, a manual on the applications and case studies reflecting best practices of the Historic Urban Landscape approach;

6. Further requests the World Heritage Centre to inform the World Heritage Committee of progress in the development of this manual at its 35th session in 2011.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections? I hear none, so the Draft Decision WHC-10/34.COM/7.1 is adopted in its entirety from paragraphs 1 to 6.

ITEM 7.2: REPORT ON THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM

Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.2

*Decision: **34 COM 7.2***

The Chairperson:

Let’s move on to Item 7.2., Report on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, and I would like to invite Ms Mechthild Rössler from the World Heritage Centre to present the activities undertaken under this item. You have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you, Mr. Chair. Document 7.2 provides a brief summary and a table of all sites to which the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism has been applied until now. You recall that this Mechanism was introduced only in 2007, following a Decision by the World Heritage Committee. I would like to highlight that the Committee stated that this Mechanism should be

applied only in exceptional and specific cases and no ambiguity to establish monitoring procedures should occur.

At the 35th session in 2011, we will provide you with a report on the effectiveness of this Mechanism; at this stage we keep the same ceiling as we proposed in 2009. Draft Decision WHC-10/34.COM/7.2 is in front of you as point 2 in your document. The Advisory Bodies are available also for any questions you may have, but they do not want to make any interventions at this stage. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to ask the Advisory Bodies to comment and ask Mr. Joseph King from ICOM to speak on behalf of all Bodies.”

ICOM:

“We did say that we do not want to make any comments at this stage, it was just mentioned. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Members of the Committee or observers, do you have any comments? Sweden, Estonia, Switzerland, Mali, that’s all for the moment. Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. President. As you may recall from the discussion in Seville last year, Sweden had a very strict view on how Reinforced Mechanisms should be applied: preferably on sites in danger, with extraordinary threats that might jeopardise the Outstanding Universal Values, and according to the three criteria for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and of course the timeframe. This year we have one site outside the In danger List, which is proposed for this Mechanism, Machu Picchu, and we will come back to comment especially on that.”

The Chairperson:

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

Estonia:

“Thank you for giving me the floor. Regarding the issue of the Reinforced Mechanism, the Estonian Delegation would like to draw attention to the point that the main purpose of implementing it should be resolving problems of the site and just not getting information. Therefore we suggest that the report that will be prepared for the 35th session in 2011 should focus specifically on the impact the Rainforest Monitoring Mechanism has had so far in resolving problematic issues of the sites.

It seems that there are some ambiguities between the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and already established procedures such as the Reacting Monitoring Mechanism and inclusion of their properties on the in Danger List. Therefore, it is really important in this report to make clear what are the significant qualitative differences between these

mechanisms in order to decide if and how to formalise the reinforced Monitoring mechanism in the Operational Guidelines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madame. The next speaker is the representative of Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, j'ai juste deux petites observations : 1) sur le contenu de ce papier qui donne des informations en général sur ce Mécanisme puis une Liste des biens soumis à ce Mécanisme. On peut d'ailleurs noter qu'il y en a plusieurs où cela ne s'applique plus suite à la Décision de Séville. Peut-être est-ce dû au fait que je suis nouveau ici, mais il me manque des informations, j'ai cherché les rapports effectués et je n'en ai trouvé qu'un seul. Est-ce que c'est le seul, y en a-t-il eu d'autres ? J'aimerais proposer que l'année prochaine nous ayons des informations sur les activités concrètes qui se sont déroulées concernant ce suivi réactif.

La deuxième demande que nous avons concerne la Décision de l'an passé qui avait souligné certains aspects qui ne sont pas tout à fait pris en considération, en application cette année par rapport au site en conservation. Nous allons revenir sur ce point lorsque nous évoquerons les sites. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, le Secrétariat va prendre note de votre remarque. J'ai sur ma liste le Mali, la Jordanie et l'Égypte et s'il n'y a pas d'autres demandes, avec votre permission, je souhaiterais clore la liste. Merci, la parole est au Mali ».

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, le Mécanisme de suivi renforcé depuis Séville si vous vous en souvenez était déjà ambigu. Car lorsque l'on se retrouve dans un contexte de suivi renforcé, c'est comme si on était en péril ou en voie d'être en péril parce qu'il y a des mesures correctives que l'on demande à l'État Partie. Dans la plupart des cas, lorsque ces mesures sont demandées il n'y a pas d'accompagnement pour permettre la mise en oeuvre de ces mesures correctives. Il y a, comme l'a dit la représentante de l'Estonie, une certaine ambiguïté.

Il faut faire la différence entre le Suivi renforcé et le contexte de site en péril. Je me souviens même qu'à Séville durant les débats on a demandé la suspension de ce Mécanisme de suivi renforcé, mais il revient encore ! Donc nous, nous sommes favorables à la suppression de cette mesure de suivi renforcé. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. La Jordanie a la parole ».

Jordan:

“Regarding the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, Jordan would like to comment that the US\$50,000 budget allocated for the Mughrabi Ascent in the Old City should be assigned to the entire Old City, as many parts of the City are threatened. Meanwhile the US\$50,000 has been spent on ten other properties beyond Jerusalem and we would like also to propose that this support should continue beyond 2010. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sir, the next speaker is the representative of Egypt. You have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, en fait j'ai en effet deux questions concernant ce Mécanisme qui, si j'ai bien compris, est appliqué d'après le Comité de Christchurch. La première question est que ce Mécanisme était fait pour le Mughrabi Ascent et puis maintenant quand on lit les papiers, les documents, nous avons dix sites là-dessus. Donc ça, c'est un point, d'autre part le budget prévu n'a pas bougé, il est toujours de 50 000 \$ US, c'est le même. Ce Mécanisme fait-il partie ou non des règles du jeu ou est-ce que c'est une parenthèse faite exprès pour ce site ? Merci et je suis désolé si cela était déjà clair et que je n'ai pas compris ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte, le Secrétariat va répondre à votre demande tout à l'heure. La dernière intervention est la France ».

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je serai très bref. Nous voulions de la part de la Délégation française exprimer tout notre attachement au Mécanisme de suivi renforcé, et ce, d'un double point de vue. Nous estimons que ce Mécanisme a un intérêt technique, nous l'avons d'ailleurs expérimenté nous-mêmes sur le suivi de la protection des biens, et bien sûr un intérêt politique pour l'ensemble des États parties et nous souhaitons vivement que ce Mécanisme soit maintenu parce que, de notre point de vue, il a démontré son utilité ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, France. Now I would like to give the floor to Mrs. Mechtild Rössler in order to answer the questions asked by the Members of the Committee.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. First of all, regarding the concerns raised by Estonia and Switzerland, we have taken note of the issues for the reporting for next year. As for Switzerland I would like to give a specific answer that we have provided the full report with all the detailed reports by site last year. This year is only an interim report because last year the Committee asked us to report back next year in view of the effectiveness and

efficiency of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, so you will get a full report concerning this issue next year.

Regarding the issue raised by Jordan on the budget: the budget so far was sufficient for the specific Reinforced monitoring missions proposed, but of course, this Committee is free to raise the budget if you see any additional missions to come up.

As for the question from Egypt on the procedure: This was a Decision taken in 2007 in New Zealand. This procedure has not yet been integrated in the Operational Guidelines, but the Committee already last year asked the World Heritage Centre to review the formalisation of this Mechanism for the Operational Guidelines and that will be reported to you in next year's document. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Ms. Rössler. Let's move on to the Draft Decision contained in paragraph 3 of Document 7.2, and I would like to give the floor to our Rapporteur for eventual amendments."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chair. I have not received any amendments on this Draft Decision. I would suggest, but I am getting a signal that I will get an amendment which has just arrived. It concerns paragraph number 6 which means that the first five paragraphs remain unchanged. So, unless the Committee Members insist, I would prefer not to read them out again, as they remain as they are in front of you.

The suggestion is a replacement of point 6, if I understand correctly and I will read it out in French:

Rappelle en outre la demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de présenter au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 35^e session en 2011, un rapport sur l'efficacité du Mécanisme de suivi renforcé dans la perspective de son institutionnalisation dans les Orientations. »

The Chairperson:

"Could you repeat it again? Just a question to France before: are you asking to replace paragraph 6 with this one? "

Rapporteur:

« Rappelle en outre la demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de présenter au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 35^e session en 2011, un rapport sur l'efficacité du Mécanisme de suivi renforcé dans la perspective de son institutionnalisation dans les Orientations. »

The Chairperson:

"Do you have any objections regarding the amendment proposed by France? Jordan you have the floor."

Jordan:

“If you give us a couple of minutes, with Egypt we are going to submit a Draft amendment for the Draft Decision, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“In this case I suggest adjourning the adoption of the Draft Decision and we will study it after we review Item 7.3. Is this ok for you? Thank you.

**ITEM 7.3: **PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGY
FOR DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AT WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES****

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/7.3

Decision: 34 COM 7.3

The Chairperson:

Item 7.3 is the Progress Report on the implementation of the Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction of World Heritage Properties, document, WHC-10/34.COM/7.3. I would like to draw your attention to this issue of Risk Disaster which is increasing on World Heritage properties. Last year I recall that in this perspective, the director general indicated in her address at the 34th session in Seville a number of World Heritage properties which have faced such tragedies: earthquake in Valparaiso, Chile, landslides and floods in Machu Picchu, Peru as well as in towns in Australia, structural collapse of a Mosque in Meknes Morocco and fire at the Kasubi Tombs in Uganda.

So I would like to give the floor to Mr. Joseph King from ICCROM and Mr. Giovanni Boccardi from the World Heritage Centre to present this item.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. From ICCROM we have in fact Mr. Gamini Wijesuriya sitting next to me. The document which is in front of you, Item 7.3, is a response to a request by the Committee in 2009 and presents a summary of developments that have taken place in the area of Risk Reduction since the Committee adopted, in 2007, a strategy on this subject.

This is a document that applies to the specific topic of the World Heritage broader framework established at the UN level through the so-called Hyogo Framework For Action, which is a policy adopted in Kobe in Japan in 2005. It should be noted, as mentioned earlier by The Chairperson and members of the Committee, that disasters are increasing every year due to higher exposure of people and property including, of course, heritage.

The UN has confirmed that disaster has become a primary factor of poverty and is undermining decades of development in disadvantaged areas of the world. Because of the contribution of Heritage to Sustainable Development, including to reducing disaster risks, this topic is crucial to the larger debate on World Heritage and Sustainable Development that the Committee has already discussed under Item 5D.

Despite the fact that Disaster Risk Reduction does not have a programme of its own in the World Heritage, nor specific funding allocated by the Committee, a number of initiatives were carried out over the past three years which contributed to the objectives of the strategy. The expert meetings, capacity building, communication activities and surveys which were developed—many of which could be implemented thanks to extra budgetary

support—are described in a synthetic manner in the document. They resulted in policies and guidance for State Parties and site managers some of whom have brought together experiences and set the basis for future cooperation among World Heritage properties, in partnership with institution such as the Ritsumeikan University of Kyoto and others specialized in this area. I would like to acknowledge among others in this respect the State Parties of Greece and Israel for supporting and hosting two key events that took place in their respective countries.

Now, the challenge is two-fold: first, moving from policy development to practical work at the level of the sites which continue to suffer more than they should from disaster, very few of them having real Disaster Risk management Plan, and on the other hand, ensuring the sustainability of this initiative through adequate means and resources.

At the site level, what is required is identifying and assessing disaster risks and developing the appropriate measures to reduce them. This requires technical assistance, training and awareness-raising. In terms of training, I would like to mention the recently published (electronically only for the time being) Resource Manual on Disaster Risk Reduction developed by ICCROM in collaboration with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It has been distributed to Committee members. This is how it looks like on this picture. It is accessible online to everybody, as a PDF file from our website. We have a few extra copies in case other observers are interested. If resources are available this will be translated into other languages and possibly printed out on paper.

Another interesting initiative is the pilot training workshop we developed in cooperation with the Category 2 Centre, the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research for Asia and the Pacific, which might be considered as a blueprint for a regular programme to be offered targeting the Asia and Pacific regions.

As for ensuring sustainability, the Centre has formulated various proposals for Technical Assistance Programmes that were presented to several donors. It is hoped that more support might come forward, as the international community becomes sensitised to the issue. For now, unfortunately, the partner is one that sees a major disaster hitting unprepared communities (like Haiti and etc.) when donors finally provide support responding to the mobilisation of the media and the public. In such cases however, funding must, as a priority, go to humanitarian interventions, while a considerable part of the Heritage is already irretrievably lost. At the same time and as recommended by the meetings, another model of cooperation appears to offer potential; that is the partnerships between sides sharing similar disaster issues, particularly through twinning arrangements. This is something the Centre strongly supports and encourages.

A number of interesting suggestions coming from the Acre workshop are also annexed to this document, just after the Draft Decision. This includes the possible establishment of an International Day on World Heritage Disaster Risk Reduction to contribute to raising capacity and risk awareness. This interesting idea is currently being explored by the Centre. One option is to developed special Risk Reduction Disaster Activities in the context of an International Day on World Heritage. Alternatively, we could develop specific World Heritage activities in the context of the already existing International Day on Disaster Risk reduction.

Mr. Chair if you allow me I will pass the floor to my colleague from ICCROM.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. This is a joint statement on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN). We are happy to report that all three Advisory Bodies have engaged in different capacities in all activities mentioned in the report by Mr. Boccardi. All

Advisory Bodies consider that Disaster Risk Reduction should receive high priority in our activities and programmes. I hardly need to emphasize the reasons, you have heard them. Disasters are on the increase and the impact on people and Heritage are at catastrophic levels.

In this context we welcome the support we continue to receive from the World Heritage Committee in promoting Disaster Risk Reduction activities and raising the awareness of the impacts of climate change. We are all committed to continuing to work in this regard. The resource manual you just received is the first output of this collective effort with the World Heritage Centre. ICCROM is happy to have provided the leadership to the process that led to its completion. I take this opportunity to pay our tribute to all those who contributed to the success of the manual.

We sincerely hope that the State Parties will use the manual to develop much needed Disaster Risk management Plans and Strategies for their sites. Issues related to Disaster Risk Reduction are built into the strategic direction of ICCROM and will certainly be included in the Heritage Capacity Building Strategy which is being developed.

Similarly ICOMOS and IUCN have placed very high importance to the subject. We are happy to take the lead role to pursue the programme of activities requested by the Committee. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for your presentation. Now I would like to open the floor for comments or questions from the Committee members and observers. I do not have requests from the Members of the Committee and just one request from an observer the United Kingdom. The floor is yours, Sir.”

United Kingdom:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The UK obviously welcomes the advances in Disaster Risk reduction and the publication of the manual. I would just like to ask: what is the status of the resource manual in terms of guidance to Member States of the Convention? How binding is it, that we should do what it says?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for your question, the floor is to the Secretariat to reply but before France is asking for the floor. Are there any questions or interventions from the members of the Committee? No. France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je serais très bref. Nous voudrions remercier le Secrétariat pour la qualité du document qui nous a été distribué et intitulé : *Gérer les risques de catastrophe pour le patrimoine mondial*. C'est un excellent document très didactique et illustré de manière tout à fait pertinente. À cet égard, je signale que dans le cadre des réalisations françaises qui pourraient être considérées comme des bonnes pratiques, il y en a quelques unes dont nous sommes particulièrement contents, celles notamment de la gestion des effondrements de terrain dans les bassins miniers. Par ailleurs, nous avons développé des mécanismes administratifs qui pourraient être aussi intégrés dans le cadre des bonnes pratiques.

Sur le fond, le document énonce de façon claire les principes et les conditions de mise en oeuvre d'une bonne gestion des risques de catastrophe, toutefois la difficulté majeure pour atteindre ces objectifs fixés c'est celle de la gouvernance et je souhaite m'attarder là-dessus. En effet, les gestionnaires des biens ne sont pas toujours ceux en charge des risques. Ainsi, les plans de gestion des biens devraient traiter de la bonne coordination des différents gestionnaires à tous les niveaux, que ce soit la sécurité civile, la police, les différentes administrations. Cette coordination est nécessaire en effet avant, pendant et après les catastrophes.

Enfin, pour conclure, je voudrais souligner que nous avons proposé quelques amendements au projet de Décision, notamment en ce qui concerne le questionnaire qui a été proposé aux États membres. Nous souhaiterions encourager les États membres à répondre à ce questionnaire car selon nous, il doit constituer la base des éléments d'informations qui doivent guider notre réflexion. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France, s'il n'y pas d'autres demandes, je demanderai au Secrétariat représentant l'ICCROM de répondre. Vous avez la parole ».

The Secretariat:

"Thank you. With regard to the question from the State Parties of the UK, I think that these are by definition guidance and they are not binding. They are supposed to help the State Parties but of course there is no obligation to follow to the letter what they are recommending. However, they are the results of extensive work and large consultations and we suggest that the State Parties consider them carefully.

With regard to the comments made by the Delegation of France: *[the presenter switches to French]* Je voudrais dire qu'effectivement la gouvernance est essentielle sur ce point. Elle est reprise dans plusieurs composantes de ce manuel. C'est-à-dire essayer de faire en sorte que les gestionnaires du site travaillent en coopération et coordination avec toutes les autres agences responsables de la gestion des risques. Effectivement ce point n'a pas été oublié mais il est essentiel qu'il soit appliqué en pratique. Ce sera tout Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Let's move to the adoption of Draft Decision WHC-10/34.COM 7.3. Meanwhile I would like to ask Egypt and Jordan to send their amendment regarding Item 7.2. I now give the floor to our rapporteur for some clarification on the amendment."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I have received an amendment from the State Party of France which concern paragraphs 6 and 7. I also have a suggestion from the rapporteur to insert paragraphs 1 and 2. It's a formal insertion and I will read it out to you very slowly. The new paragraph 1 suggests:

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.3,*

A new paragraph 2 would read:

2. *Recalling Decisions 28 COM 10.B, 31 COM 7.2 and 33 COM 7C adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004), 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively.*

You will find the document references in your working document but they were missing in the final Draft Decision, then paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 remain unchanged so I will not read them to you again. Paragraphs 6 and 7 contain new contents submitted by France in each case at the very beginning of the paragraphs and I will read them in French as it is the language they were submitted in:

6. *Encourage les États parties à examiner et à promouvoir les mesures proposées à l'issue de l'atelier d'Acre de novembre 2009 et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial, aux Organisations consultatives et aux États parties de les mettre en œuvre dans la limite de leurs possibilités;*

7. *Encourage également les États parties qui ne l'ont pas encore fait, à répondre au questionnaire sur les risques liés aux catastrophes et demande en outre au Centre du patrimoine mondial de soumettre un rapport sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des mesures mentionnées précédemment, pour examen par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 36^e session en 2012.*

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Now we are going to proceed to the adoption of the Decision, but before we proceed France would like to make a comment. You have the floor.”

France:

« Pardon Monsieur le Président, je voulais juste faire un petit commentaire qui permettra de clarifier l'adoption. Ce n'était pas deux paragraphes supplémentaires que nous proposons, mais des ajustements des paragraphes 4 et 5, donc de paragraphes déjà existants ».

The Chairperson:

«Merci à la France pour cette clarification. Je vais demander à notre rapporteur de faire une lecture du projet de Décision paragraphe par paragraphe ».

Rapporteur:

“I apologise to the French that I have misrepresented it, it is actually an adjustment of the current paragraphs 4 and 5. I start reading paragraph 1 which is a new paragraph:

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.3.”*

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none, paragraph 1 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 2:

2. Recalling Decisions 28 COM 10.B, 31 COM 7.2 and 33 COM 7C adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004), 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none, paragraph 2 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“The former paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 are moved to become paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, but remain unchanged. I am not sure I need to read them in this case. Paragraph 3:

3. Takes note with satisfaction, of the progress made in the implementation of the Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction at World Heritage Properties, since its adoption in 2007.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to paragraphs new 3, new 4 and new 5 which have been before paragraphs 1, 2 and 3? I see none, so paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Now the previous paragraph 4 which now becomes paragraph 6 has an amendment by France at the beginning of the text which reads:

6. Encourage les Etats parties à examiner et à promouvoir les mesures proposées à l'issue de l'atelier d'Acre de novembre 2009 et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial, aux Organisations consultatives et aux Etats parties de les mettre en œuvre dans la limite de leurs possibilités ».

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none, paragraph 6 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

« Le paragraphe 5 qui est le nouveau paragraphe 7:

7. Encourage également les Etats parties qui ne l'ont pas encore fait, à répondre au questionnaire sur les risques liés aux catastrophes et demande en outre au Centre du patrimoine mondial de soumettre un rapport sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des mesures mentionnées précédemment, pour examen par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 36^e session en 2012 ».

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none, paragraph 7 is adopted. The whole Decision WHC-10/34.COM. 7.3 containing 7 paragraphs with the first five in English language and the last two in French is adopted.

Thank you very much, we come back to item 7.2, the Draft Decision. We have a request from the members of the Committee to screen the last paragraph amended, so I would suggest we adjourn, so that the Secretariat has time to translate it and disseminate it, otherwise we cannot base ourselves on paper distributed.

I have one announcement to make regarding the evening session. We suggest starting at 7pm and running until 9pm, only two hours instead of three. Confirmation from Mr. Bandarin, the next session will take place from 3pm until 6pm and the night session from 7pm until 9pm.

One more announcement from the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Les Délégations de la Barbade, de l'Égypte, des îles Marshal, Monsieur Jean Gabriel Ellie sont priés de se rendre dès maintenant, 13 h, au Bureau B pour pouvoir régler des questions administratives liées à leur voyage ici à Brasília. Prenez contact avec ma collègue.

Deuxième annonce : un groupe de travail sur l'Avenir de la *Convention* aura lieu dans la salle du Bureau de 14 h à 15 h, c'est un rappel. Il y a également une présentation de 14 h à 15 h dans cette salle plénière ici même sur la Grande barrière de corail en Australie. Aussi, en même temps, la réunion du groupe africain qui était prévue dans la salle E, mais qui est désormais démenagée par manque de place, et nous nous en excusons, au fond de la salle plénière s'il est possible d'accommoder tout cela. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

«Merci à tous, je déclare la séance clôturée ».

The Secretariat:

“Sorry, my apology, I have an additional announcement. There is a guided visit to the National Congress and the Exhibition of *Brasilia, the idea of a capital*. Transportation is provided at 1pm in front of the Royal Tulip. If you want to go to the Exhibition, *Brasilia, the idea of a capital* this visit will be organized for today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. Thank you for your attention.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 27 July, 2010

Tuesday, 27 July 2010

FOURTH MEETING

Afternoon session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
M. Mohamed El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

ITEM 7.2: REPORT ON THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson:

« Nous allons commencer avec le projet de Décision, le point 34 COM 7.2.Rev. Ce projet de Décision a été distribué pendant le repas entre 13 h et 15 h, je demanderais à notre rapporteur un petit peu plus d'information sur l'amendement proposé, puis nous procéderons à l'adoption paragraphe par paragraphe. La parole est au rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. We have a new Draft Decision, 34 COM 7.2.Rev, in which we aim to incorporate all the amendments we have received from four State Parties (France, Mali, Egypt and Jordan).”

The Chairperson:

“Could you please take your seats?”

Rapporteur:

“If you compare the revised Draft Decision with the initial Draft Decision, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 remain the original text. Paragraph 5 has been replaced by a new proposal submitted by Jordan and Egypt. The current paragraph 6 is a newly inserted paragraph between the former 5 and 6, at the proposal of Jordan and Egypt. The new paragraph 7 is the former paragraph 6 with amendments by France and Mali.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Could you start by reading the first paragraph please?”

Rapporteur:

“I suggest perhaps, Mr. Chairperson, as the first four paragraphs remain unchanged, we could adopt them in block.

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7.2.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none; Paragraph 1 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“2. Recalling Decisions 31 COM 5.2, 32 COM 7.3 and 33 COM 7.2 adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none. Paragraph 2 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“3. Notes the update report on the implementation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism”.

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none; Paragraph 3 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“4. Reiterates its request to the World Heritage Centre, via The Chairperson, to provide to the members of the World Heritage Committee a report on each activity undertaken within the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism as soon as it is available.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none. Paragraph 4 is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 is a replacement of former paragraph 5 at the proposal of Jordan and Egypt:

*Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at USD 100,000 for 2010 in order to cover the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism costs for the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls in relation to Decision **34 COM 7A.20**.*

I would like to comment that I have just received an amendment to the reference in front of you which has replaced *for 2010* by *starting from 2010* at the proposal of Jordan.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you asked for the floor. You have it Sir.”

Australia:

“Australia has no problem with the first part of this paragraph or indeed with the concept of increasing the Budget for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to US\$100,000. However, as a matter of procedure we believe it is not appropriate to include the second part in a paragraph, because it includes a specific site, especially when the Decision has been taken by the Committee in relation to applying the Mechanism to that site.

So, we support the first part of the paragraph but believe it should be deleted after the word *2010*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. Jordan and Egypt, do you have any comments?”

Jordan:

“Well, the amendment was made for Jerusalem for this special status of Jerusalem. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any further comments from the member States? I give the floor to Mr. Bandarin for notification about the procedure.”

Mr. Bandarin:

“Thank you. I would like to remind the Committee that in the past sessions we have adopted a very clear practice, which is that we do not approve budgets during separate decisions from the budget decision, in order to avoid any confusion. Thereby, any decision that has a budget involved will have to be left in brackets and non-approved until the budget is finally seen by the Committee; then it is finally approved.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Jordan for further comments.”

Jordan:

“We agree with Mr. Bandarin’s proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“For the moment I do not have any further requests from the members of the Committee commenting on the Draft Decision. I would like to suggest that Jordan and Australia could meet for five minutes to find a solution. Otherwise we are going to proceed with paragraphs 6 and 7 and come back to paragraph 5. Paragraph 6 please, rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6 is a newly inserted paragraph at the suggestion of Jordan and Egypt and it reads as follow:

6. Also decides to study, on a regular basis, the increase of the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 6? I see none; it is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 7 is the former paragraph 6 with incorporations from suggestions from France and Mali. It reads:

7. Further decides to review the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in 2011 and recalls its request to the World Heritage Centre to present to the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 a report on the efficiency of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in view of its integration in the Operational Guidelines.”

The Chairperson:

“France and Mali, would you like to comment on your amendment? Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? I see none. Just a slight modification of the language. Mr. Bandarin has the floor.”

Mr. Bandarin:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman, reflecting on the word *efficiency*, which is a productivity measure, I think we should use the word *effectiveness*, which is the proper term.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Mr. Bandarin. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? I see none. Paragraph 7 is adopted. I am now turning to Jordan and Australia. We have a suggestion from the rapporteur which could be a compromise. So I am going to ask her to read it slowly.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. The suggestion that has actually been drafted by The Chairperson and the rapporteur reads as follows:

5. *Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at (USD 100,000) starting from 2010—and at the suggestion of Mr. Bandarin this would remain in brackets until the Budget Working Group has finalised the Budget Decision.*

Then it continues: *in order to support among other sites covered by the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, the costs of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the complete property Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.*

I read it again: *(USD 100,000) starting from 2010 to support among other sites covered by the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, the costs of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the complete property Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.”*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am now turning to the Australian Delegation. Jordan, would you like to comment?”

Jordan:

“We endorse the comments that have just been read by the rapporteur. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Australian Delegation, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you, Chair. Australia would still strongly prefer that we accept the principles, which is the amount of money provided. The paragraph would then end *after 2010*. We do not believe that it adds value to this Decision to specify particular sites. We are concerned that the description of the Old Walls of Jerusalem actually goes beyond our understanding of what the Decision was previously, which related to the Gate. So, we are concerned by the actual language that is being used. We think that the simplest thing is to finish with *2010* rather than adding the additional language which refers to specific sites.”

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse, vous avez demandé la parole, vous l'avez ».

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, et excusez-moi de prendre la parole à ce stade de nos discussions, mais je dois dire que la dernière explication du délégué Australien me convainc et je pense effectivement qu'il est sage dans le cadre actuel de s'arrêter à *après 2010*. Je soutiens donc la proposition australienne. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« *Merci à la Suisse.*

Are there any other members of the Committee who would like to comment? Jordan or Egypt?”

Jordan:

“Well, Mr. Chair, the Old City of Jerusalem was specified in the former Decision of this Committee. If you like we can put a full stop after 2010 and then add the budget for Jerusalem should support the entire Old City of Jerusalem and its walls. The idea is to not restrict it to the Mughrabi Ascent.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you repeat that please?”

Jordan:

“We agree with Australia in putting a full stop after 2010 and then to put a new sentence saying that: *the budget allocated for Jerusalem would support the properties within the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls.* Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to our rapporteur in order to reread paragraph 5 following Jordan’s proposal.”

Rapporteur:

“I think we would then have a set of two paragraphs, which is paragraph 5:

5. Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at USD 100,000 starting from 2010.

And then a new insertion between paragraph 5 and paragraph 6 which would read:

5bis. Decides that the budget allocated for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls should support the complete property.”

The Chairperson:

“Delegation of Jordan?”

Jordan:

“Approved Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“I am turning to the Australian Delegation.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I think the problem with this, as set out in the paper, relates to 7.2., the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, as they may be applied to the design of the Mughrabi Ascent and that’s the previous decision of the Committee. The concern we have is that through this particular Decision and additional paragraph, we are extending the budgetary decision to do something that the Committee has not previously decided. This is an issue that will be discussed under the status of conservation report and we believe this is the appropriate place to do so.

I assure Mr. Chair that Australia is not being difficult. We are just trying not to create a precedent where a decision is being taken before there actually has been a discussion about the issue in the agenda. I am requesting the deletion of this line.”

The Chairperson:

“In that case, I would suggest adjourning the adoption of paragraph 5 first and second parts after the discussions of items regarding the State of Conservation of the in Danger List of Jerusalem Old City and its walls. I would like to have agreement from the members on this proposal. There are no objections. Thank you very much. Our President is back and is taking his seat.”

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

Document WHC-10/34.COM/7A; 7A.Add and 7A.Add2 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.7A
Decisions: **34 COM 7A.1 to 7A.32**

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to thank my friend who replaced me. Now let’s start with Item 7 A, which corresponds to the State of Conservation of properties listed on the World Heritage in Danger List. The documents are WHC-10/34.COM/7A, WHC-1034.COM/7A, 7B ADD. 2 related to the State of conservation of the properties inscribed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger. 34.COM/INF7A, Outstanding Universal Values for World Heritage inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and properties discussed for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The report on Natural properties will be presented by Mr. Guy Debonnet and the report on Latin America and the Caribbean will be presented by Mr. Marc Patry. First we have a presentation on Africa, then Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean.

The report on cultural properties will be presented by each regional office, following the same order as expressed earlier. This year it has been decided that the presentation will start on 7A and B with cultural properties in the following order: Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean.

After the examination of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, we will then begin consideration of natural properties in the same order as the region as was the case for the cultural properties. The relevant documents for this item are WHC-10/34.COM7A, WHC-10/34.COM7A addendum WHC-10/34.COM7A addendum 2 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF7A. These documents will present reports on the State of Conservation of all the 31 properties inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List.

Out of these, 16 are cultural properties and 15 are natural properties. Perhaps I could also draw your attention to the fact that some State of Conservation reports were received from the State Parties a long time after the statutory deadline of the first of February. Thereby, the preparation of the document was hampered and some reports were not provided in one of the two working languages of the Convention. I here call on all the State Parties to comply with the statutory deadline for the submission of reports to facilitate and submit them in the working languages of the *Convention*.

Perhaps we can start with the report on cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS is going to explain the methodology to be followed.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Chair. What is coming into focus clearly this year is defining Outstanding Universal Values through the statements of our Outstanding Universal Values which are now being developed for all properties through the periodic reporting process which will be submitted to the Committee for approval. The existence of these statements enables threats or vulnerability of these properties to be considered for their impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value which is clearly defined. These statements should contribute to the way State of Conservation reports are able to state precisely how and why threats have the capacity to impact on a property in terms of impact on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value.

Agreeing with the defined state of conservation of all properties in Danger means there is a clear goal to reach when the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value are in an acceptable State of Conservation. For properties which are not on the Conservation List, there is still a need to relate all threats and vulnerabilities to the Outstanding Universal Value and its attributes.

The need to undertake an assessment of the impacts on attributes brings up the need to ensure that processes that are used are appropriate and are consistent. The main tool that is used for identifying impact is the environmental impact assessment. For sometimes there have been concerns that the tools associated with environmental impact assessments that the Committee has called for at a number of properties over the years, do not relate well to the needs of World Heritage Properties, particularly Cultural Properties.

Some of the environmental impact assessment processes in various parts of the world tend to consider the impacts or threats on individual aspects of the site, instead of considering the whole site, which is precisely what is needed for World Heritage Properties. In response to this need, ICOMOS has developed Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage Properties. This Guidance has been distributed to all Committee members during the lunch break.

This Guidance does not set out local guidance on environmental assessments, but rather suggests how this needs to be amplified to encompass the specific needs of World Heritage Properties. In particular, to show how Outstanding Universal Values and the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value must underpin the impact assessment. The Guidance aims to reinforce the overall thought process and ensure that environmental impact assessments are clearly relevant to the needs of World heritage sites and should be

of practical use to State Parties. The Guidance has been labelled “draft” as it is seen very much as a work in progress. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“There is a demand from the representative of the Forum of Indigenous People which will intervene briefly before the presenter on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the African region.”

Forum of Indigenous people:

“Thank you very much chairperson; my name is Victoria Tauli-Corpuz and I am a member of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. First let me thank you for giving me again this opportunity to make a brief intervention. Our main mandate as a UN Body is to provide expert advice and recommendations on Indigenous Issues for the Economic and Social Council as well as programmes, funds and agencies of the United Nations. In addition, the Forum is mandated to promote the integration and coordination of activities related to Indigenous People within the UN System.

It is within this mandate that I was requested by the Forum to attend this session of the World Heritage Committee. As you may know the World Heritage *Convention* is a very important *Convention* for Indigenous People and the Permanent Forum. In many of the sessions of the Forum, the Indigenous representative submits statements related to World Heritage sites. Some of these are positive statements, some others raise concerns related to the identification and management of sites found in their traditional territories. In the interest of time I will not enumerate these concerns, I would just like to inform you that the Forum will submit them in writing to the Committee for your information and consideration. Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I will now ask Mr.Eloundou of the World Heritage Centre to make a presentation on the properties inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List and located in the African region.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je vais présenter le rapport de conservation des ruines de **Kilwa Kisiwani et Songo Mnara en République Unie de Tanzanie**. Ce rapport qui vous a été soumis se trouve en page 45 de la version anglaise et en page 43 de la version française du document 7A. Le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 1981 sur la base du critère (iii). En 2004 il a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en raison de la détérioration et la désagrégation des matériaux qui provoquaient l'effondrement de la structure archéologique et historique pour lequel le bien avait été inscrit.

Vous vous souvenez que lors de la 32^e session, le Comité avait établi un calendrier de mise en œuvre des mesures correctives avec des changements souhaités au bout de deux ans et d'autres au bout de trois ans. L'État partie vient juste d'élaborer en juin 2009 un

Plan stratégique triennal avec l'appui du Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain. Le document de Plan triennal n'a pas encore été transmis au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour examen par ICOMOS.

En termes de mise en œuvre de mesures correctives, l'État partie n'a donc toujours pas finalisé la délimitation du périmètre du bien et des zones tampons. Le Plan d'occupation des sols qui permettrait de protéger l'occupation du Bien n'a pas non plus été établi. En termes de poursuite des travaux de conservation, l'État partie informe que des travaux se poursuivent sur des structures de grande valeur telles que le Fort de Gereza, la Mosquée de Malindi et le cimetière de Kilwa Kisiwani et cela avec le soutien du World Monuments Fund et du Programme du Fonds commun des Nations Unies.

Il faut également relever que le mur de protection des tombes royales de Songo Mnara qui s'est écroulé en juin 2009 du fait de l'érosion maritime a été reconstruit grâce au Fonds du patrimoine mondial. Enfin, l'État partie indique dans son rapport son intention de construire un nouveau bâtiment qui abriterait un musée sur le site ainsi que des bureaux pour le personnel. Le rapport n'est pas clair sur les raisons de ce nouveau bâtiment en lieu et place de la réhabilitation historique d'un bâtiment existant. ICOMOS souhaite faire un commentaire ».

ICOMOS:

“One of the key areas of the desired state of conservation is the establishment of land use plans in order to define management zones, as a means of addressing land use conflicts on Kilwa between the habitation sites and the monuments. This is essential in order to establish confidence into where to put infrastructure and tourism facilities, and it helps to get some sort of framework to the management of the property.

While we accept the need to cater for visitors, ICOMOS considers that this time there is also a need to avoid diverting funds to new buildings for Museums when there is the pressing need to address the fundamental priorities as set out in the corrective measures and the desired State of Conservation. Also because of the fragile nature of the ruins, the property is really not ready for an increase of visitors at this present time.”

The Secretariat:

« Le projet de **Décision 34 COM.7A.16** se trouve en page 47 de la version française et en page 45 de la version anglaise. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for this presentation. I now open the floor to Members of the Committee for their comments. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous nous réjouissons que pour ce bien il y ait des progrès en vue même s'il reste beaucoup de travail à fournir et nous sommes confiants que grâce au Plan triennal prévu, il y aura des progrès bénéfiques pour le bien. En ce qui concerne les structures qui sont prévues pour les visiteurs, nous sommes d'accord de donner la priorité aux mesures de conservation prévues plutôt que de créer de nouvelles structures visiteurs.

Nous sommes aussi d'avis que pour ce site en particulier, il faut associer la population locale à d'éventuels bénéfices de ces visites. Nous souhaiterions donc souligner l'importance de cette association de la population locale et nous croyons que cela sera bénéfique aussi pour la conservation de ce site. Nous avons fait deux petits amendements : le premier pour éviter une redondance dans la Décision et un autre pour introduire l'importance de cette participation locale. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now the floor is to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I also would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the member State for the progress it has made towards an active state of conservation for this site. My comment is going to be confined to one particular area.

I think we need to begin to separate the term ‘museums’ from the structure which may house a museum. A museum is not specifically for visitors. I do not think we have picked up that implication from the State Party. A museum may be also addressing the same situation that Switzerland has outlined, which is the need for the involvement of all the community in the active participation and interpretation of the site. Unless we are apprised of the contents of this proposed museum, I suggest that we do not refer to it in such pained terms but rather address ourselves to the issues in terms of new construction on the site, and separate the need for active interpretation through various methodologies which may include a museum and may very well be the considerate focus after a time.

I do accept that the priority must be on conservation, but please Sir, between you and the members of the Committee let us reduce this notion that the museum is an imposition rather than a mechanism by which we can, in fact, recognise the participation of community as part of the interpretative process. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now, the floor is to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, mon intervention se situe à deux niveaux. Le premier niveau est relatif au processus d'inscription même du bien. Dans le propos de l'exposé sur le site tanzanien, il y a deux éléments qui sont reprochés. On parle de manque de zone tampon, même si cette dernière n'est pas exigée cela ne fait que renforcer la protection. On parle aussi de la non-précision des limites. Personnellement, je pense que l'on dit souvent que “gérer c'est prévoir”. Et bien c'est en amont que l'on doit regarder à la loupe si ces éléments sont fournis avant d'inscrire le site et de ne pas attendre après quelques années et de dire que le site est en péril, car la délimitation n'est pas claire. C'est mon premier propos.

Le second concerne le progrès réalisé par l'État partie dans le système de conservation du site. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

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

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Sir. We would like to join our voices with all that has already been said by the delegates of Switzerland, Barbados and Mali. We would like to congratulate the State Party in terms of the progress made for conservation. We find that the State Party has been making efforts to overcome the huge difficulties faced. We see that there is political will and there are efforts being made to solve the major problems face by this site.

However, I feel that this document shows this determination of the State Party to correct short comings. I also agree with what was said by the delegates of Switzerland and Barbados as for the fact that there is need to involve the local population in the process of conservation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Do any other members of the Committee wish to speak? It seems not. If the rapporteur does not intend to make any comments and since everyone is speaking in terms of the strength of the report, I would now like to take us to the approval of Decision 34 COM 7A.16, if I see no objection to the adoption from members of the Committee.”

Rapporteur:

“I have received a written amendment form the State Party of Switzerland which concerns paragraphs 4 and 6. According to my current knowledge all other paragraphs remain unchanged. I would suggest reading to you the formulation that has been suggested by Switzerland.

The current paragraph 4 has an insertion in the middle and I read the full paragraph:

4. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the actions being taken to implement some of the corrective measures, and urges the State Party to continue its work on all the corrective measures identified previously,—and now the insertion—according to the established priorities—and I continue—including the establishment of a proper land-use plan to protect the property's integrity and resolve future land conflicts, the delineation of boundaries, the conservation of the architectural structures, the mitigation of sea wave erosion and the control of vegetation.

So there was a four word insertion in the middle of this paragraph. In addition Switzerland proposes deleting current paragraph 6 and replacing it with the following formulation:

6. Underlines the importance to foresee the participation of the local population in the activities developed for visitors.

Thank you Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do all Members of the Committee agree to the proposal from Switzerland? Yes, it seems that this is approved. Thank you all.

ARAB STATES

I now ask the Secretariat to present the report on the State of the Conservation of properties located in the Arab States' region. Regarding the discussion on the ancient City of Jerusalem and its Wall, it will be postponed until later while consultations are taking place on the Draft Decision.

We will be looking at Draft Decision **34.COM7A.17 on Abu Mena in Egypt**, Draft Decision **7A.18 on Ashur in Iraq** and there is the **Samarra Archaeological City in Iraq** Decision **7A.19**, the **Historic Town of Zabid in Yemen**, Draft Decision 7A.21. The floor is to Madame Dauge.”

The Secretariat :

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je vais commencer par le site de **Abu Mena en Égypte** que vous trouverez page 43 du Document 7A addendum en français et page 42 en anglais. Le site archéologique d'Abou Mena en Égypte est sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis 2001 en raison d'un certain nombre de problèmes, les principaux étant l'élévation de la nappe phréatique, l'absence de mesures de conservation et l'absence d'un plan et d'une structure de gestion.

Une première mission de suivi réactif en 2005 avait défini des mesures correctives, dont beaucoup ont été mises en oeuvre par l'État Partie. Une deuxième mission en décembre 2009, demandée par le Comité du patrimoine mondial, a permis d'avoir un état des lieux plus récent et de constater les progrès accomplis. Le rapport transmis par l'État partie annonce l'achèvement des travaux de drainage destinés à prévenir la montée des eaux. La question de l'eau, et en particulier de l'irrigation de l'agriculture, sera un travail important des années à venir avec un travail de consultation essentiel des communautés et des agriculteurs qui vivent autour du site.

Les mesures liées à l'archéologie, à la conservation et à la gestion sont moins avancées même si certains travaux d'urgence ont été menés et des études entamées. Les projets envisagés par les autorités prévoient des restaurations et même des reconstructions totales pour lesquelles il conviendra d'être vigilant. Je laisse la parole à l'ICOMOS qui, je crois, souhaite dire quelques mots ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS notes progress reported by the State Party in implementing the corrective measures which was also further assessed by the monitoring mission. It recognises that significant results have been achieved in addressing problems with the water table level and the Management Plan.

ICOMOS also notes the proposals made by the State Party with regard to future conservation and management. ICOMOS is concerned about the potential scenario that would entail extensive interventions and reconstruction and would like to underscore the importance of submitting these proposals for evaluation and review prior to their implementation.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci, le projet de Décision vous est soumis page 46 dans l'addendum 7A.add en français et page 45 en anglais. Ce projet demande à l'État partie, notamment de définir un état de conservation souhaité pour le retrait du bien de la Liste en péril ; de revoir le

calendrier de mise en œuvre des mesures correctives, qui avaient été préalablement annoncées pour 2010 et qui donc devra être étendu ; de compléter le Plan de conservation ainsi que le Plan de gestion. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor to the members of the Committee for their comments. Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, Chair. Bahrain would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Egyptian authorities for the important studies that have been undertaken, as well as the impressive first draft of the Integrated Management and Conservation Plan. We are also pleased to learn that the authorities have managed to control the rise of groundwater and have thereby abolished a significant threat to their property.

We strongly feel that this site is moving in the right direction and we would like to see it removed from the List of the World Heritage in Danger soon after the boundaries of the buffer zone have been established and agreed upon. However, we would like to hear the State Party in regard to the conservation measures and their opinion in that regard. We have also submitted amendment to the Draft Decision. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you any other interventions? The floor is to Jordan.”

Jordan:

“Very shortly: we support the comments from the representative of Bahrain.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“As with my colleague from Jordan, Barbados would like to join in with the comments made by our colleague from Bahrain and I believe he spoke for all of us. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je remercie le Bahreïn, la Barbade et la Jordanie pour leurs interventions favorables à l'égard de l'Égypte et je voudrais simplement signaler et mettre en exergue deux petits points pour les membres distingués du Comité.

Le premier point concerne les travaux engagés par le ministère de la Culture via l'organe du Conseil suprême des antiquités autour des projets de conservation, de restauration et de drainage autour du site d'Abou Mena qui sont bien engagés. Il est tout à fait vrai que l'Égypte n'est pas prête cette année pour la date de 2010 que nous avions auparavant donnée à l'ICOMOS et au Centre du patrimoine mondial. Je pense que le Conseil suprême des antiquités va être prêt vers la fin 2011, ou début 2012, et cela sera signalé dans le rapport de l'année prochaine.

Le deuxième point concerne le *Site Management Plan*, c'est en cours et il faut remercier la communauté d'Abou Mena qui aide à l'accomplissement de ce Plan ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to give the floor to the representative of Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Gentlemen, we support completely what Bahrain said about Abu Mena. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to give the floor to the representative of the United Arab Emirates.”

United Arab Emirates:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman, I would like to support Bahrain's comment and also that of our colleagues on what Egypt achieved so far.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Anyone else would like to comment? The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. I have received one amendment from the State Party of Bahrain which concerns paragraphs 3 and 4. All other paragraphs remain as they are, so I will only read to you paragraphs 3 and 4. As a reminder you will find Draft Decision 10/34.Com/7A.17 on page 45 of the English version and 46 of the French Version of the document 7A.ad. Paragraph 3, the Bahrain proposal reads:

3. Welcomes—instead of takes note—the information provided by the State Party on the progress made in achieving some of the corrective measures and requests the State Party to continue its work on all the corrective measures adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006).

And accordingly in paragraph 4, we have a change at the end:

4. Notes the results of the December 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission endorses its recommendations and requests the State Party to...

And then everything remains identical. Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Can we approve the Decision with the amendment from Bahrain? Are there any objections? I see none. Then the Decision is approved, thank you very much.

The floor is now to Madame Dauge regarding Decision 7A.18.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, le rapport sur l'état de conservation du site **d'Ashur en Irak** se trouve dans le document de travail 7A, page 49 en français et 47 en anglais. Comme vous le savez, le site a été inscrit en 2003 et immédiatement mis sur la Liste en péril, notamment en raison d'un projet de barrage qui risquait d'inonder en partie le bien. Ce projet de barrage est à l'heure actuelle suspendu, mais l'État partie nous a fait savoir qu'il n'était pas annulé.

Dans le rapport transmis par l'État partie cette année, on trouve toujours des problèmes d'infiltration d'eau dans la partie orientale du bien. Néanmoins, le rapport indique que l'état de conservation général du Bien est satisfaisant, mais que des travaux de réparation et de maintenance nécessaires n'ont pu être menés en raison de problèmes financiers.

Le Comité du patrimoine mondial avait demandé à ce que l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial entreprennent une mission en Irak. Cela n'a pas été possible cette année pour des raisons de logistique et de sécurité, mais nous espérons que cette mission sera possible dans le cours de cette année-ci.

Le projet de Décision se trouve page 51 du document en français et 49 du document en anglais et il demande à l'État partie de faire son possible pour mettre en œuvre les mesures d'urgence identifiées parmi lesquelles d'ailleurs l'établissement des limites du bien et de sa zone tampon et redemande cette mission. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to open the floor for comments. Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Again we are pleased to read about the enormous effort the Iraqi authorities have undertaken to protect the property from the rising water of the Tigris River. The results

achieved, despite the difficult situation in Iraq, are promising and remove a serious threat to the Eastern part of the property. We therefore think that these efforts should be commended rather than noted and we have submitted an amendment to this matter. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Jordan has the floor.”

Jordan:

“With your permission, is it possible for the State Party to clarify the situation of the site, please?”

The Chairperson:

“I suggest that we ask the question directly to the State Party. Now the floor is to the representative of Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Thank you so much for the recognition for all the effort and calls for the protection of our archaeological site. All the raised points will be taken into account (6, 7, 8, 9, and 10). I just want to clarify the current situation which has changed positively this year.

Point 3A, Relocation or cancellation for the dam: After a request submitted by the State Body for Antiquities and Heritage (SBAH) in Iraq, a major official Board responsible for the antiquities, the Ministry of Water Resources, postponed working on the dam and we are working now for its relocation.

Point 4B, Seepage: This year the Ministry of Culture dedicated Iraqi Dinar 200 millions for building a stone gate to prevent rising Tigris water affecting the site. The work has begun and we hope to finish it next year.

Point 4C: Dinar 100 millions have been allocated for the conservation work of the Tabira Gate and the actual work has begun. The conservation plan will also include preservation and conservation of the Royal Cemetery near the Ancient Palace, comprising of five stone graveyards discovered by the Germans.

Point 4D: the SBAH, in partnership with the World Monuments Fund, has supported an international expert dealing with mud-brick structures. He has been preparing his study concerning conservation of mud-brick structures in Iraq. He is an expert who has spent almost ten years in ancient Cities studying mud-brick structures. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte offre tout son soutien et son support logistique, financier et autre, non seulement au site d'Assour, mais à tous les lieux archéologiques endommagés dernièrement et sollicite la communauté internationale pour qu'elle apporte tout son soutien à tous ces sites qui méritent vraiment d'être sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next speaker is Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Sir. Brazil would like to join the delegates who preceded it to congratulate the government of Iraq for the efforts it has been making to protect this property. We would like to congratulate Egypt, which proposed to offer technical and financial support to Iraq. We would like to remind State Parties of the specific situation that the country of Iraq faces and in the Draft Decision it is stated that the international community should participate in protecting this property because it is in a difficult situation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Would any other delegates like to take the floor at this time? If not, then I am going to let the rapporteur read the Decision with the appropriate amendments.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. To remind you, the Draft Decision can be found on page 40 of the English and page 51 of the French version in Document 7A. I have received one amendment by Bahrain, which concerns only paragraph 3 of the current Draft Decision. All other paragraphs remain as they are. I am reading the revised paragraph 3:

3. Commends the State Party for its efforts to protect the eastern part of the property from the rising waters of the Tigris River and recommends that the works be undertaken as soon as possible

The first part of the paragraph changes from *notes the effort* to *commends the State Party for the efforts*; thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Are the Delegations satisfied with the Decision including the amendment? Yes, It is approved. Madame Dauge will now present the **Draft Decision on Samarra, Iraq.**”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. À Samarra on retrouve beaucoup de similarités dans les problèmes rencontrés sur le site d'Assour. La mission qui avait été demandée au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'ICOMOS n'a pu avoir lieu comme à Assour, mais nous espérons pouvoir la faire en 2010. Le rapport de l'État partie annonce qu'un plan de maintenance et de gestion du site est en cours de préparation et il réitère sa demande d'assistance technique en termes d'expertises de formation et d'élaboration de projet de conservation.

Le projet de Décision se trouve page 53 du Document 7A en français et 51 en anglais, il demande la mise en œuvre des mesures urgentes de conservation et la mission prévue l'an dernier. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Would any representatives of the Delegations like to comment? The representative of Iraq, you have the floor."

Iraq:

"Here again I would like to clear the current situation. For point 3A: Establishment of local Management Unit on the site; there is a Management Unit in many locations. There is one in the Al Malwiya Mosque and in two palaces in addition to the staff and our investigating Centre in Samarra.

As for points B and C: the governor of the province this year provided the SBAH with a budget allocated to the Department of antiquities in Samarra and soon a team from Baghdad will be on site to start conservation on the Al Malwiya Mosque, in addition to Dinar 800 millions allocated to building a museum on the site.

Points 4, 5, 6 and 8 will be taken in account. Point 7: Since we sent our team to establish conservation work on site, we have realised that the conditions allow for further visits from a mission to assess the state of conservation of the property. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Jordan."

Jordan:

"We actually do not have any comments. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Anyone else would like to take the floor? No, so the floor is to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. I have not received any amendments on this Draft Decision, so the Decision stands as it is included in the document."

The Chairperson:

“In that case, can we consider the Draft Decision approved? Yes, then it is Approved. Ms. Dauge has now the floor regarding the **Historical Town of Zabid, Yemen.**”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, comme vous le savez Zabid est sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril depuis l’an 2000 et a causé un certain nombre de préoccupations à votre Comité. Néanmoins, comme nous l’avons annoncé déjà depuis 2007, des progrès considérables ont eu lieu. Les autorités yéménites ont lancé avec le soutien de la coopération allemande un immense programme de revitalisation et de réhabilitation urbaines. Ces efforts au bout de trois ans de ce projet, se font maintenant sentir. De nombreux projets ont été menés tant dans le domaine de la réhabilitation de l’habitat, la restauration des souks, de trois des mosquées de la ville, le soutien à la communauté et une revitalisation socio-économique.

Le Bureau de l’organisation des villes anciennes du Yémen a été renforcé à Zabid. Néanmoins, l’État partie indique que le processus juridique de protection est encore à améliorer. L’ICOMOS souhaite prendre la parole à ce stade ».

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS considers that good progress has been made in addressing the physical degradation and reversing the socio-economic decline. There is still an urgency to address the second aspect of corrective measures, which is to put in place adequate legal and institutional frameworks, such as: The Heritage Protection Bill, the Urban Development Plan, and a Conservation Plan.

The Committee initially requested these to be put in place by 2008. This clear framework is needed, so that all stakeholders are aware of the parameters for the development of the town. There is also a need to define more clearly reporting and monitoring targets. As the Committee did, we suggest, that what is most needed is evidence to show that what seemed like almost irreversible decline, at the time when the City was put on the in Danger List, has in fact been reversed and there is a healthy upward trend. Thank you.”

The Secretariat:

« Vous trouverez le projet de Décision page 57 du document 7A.ad en français et 56 du document 7A.ad en anglais. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would any representatives of the Delegations like to make a comment? Sweden, please, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Sweden is pleased to see that some progress has been made to stop the decay and the negative development of the property. But there is still much to do, as we have heard. The social and economic activities aiming at stimulating these business and housing improvement programmes have appeared to have been positive for Zebid’s development and its ability to manage the cultural heritage.

We are sorry to hear that the mission did not take place, but hope that the requested mission will verify the progress made. We would like to make a general remark regarding measures for social-economic development and World Heritage properties.

Zebid is a case in point here. For many World Heritage properties, both social and economic interventions are often prerequisites for their conservation and sustainable development. People must be given opportunities to support themselves and live in towns like Zebid. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to take the floor? No, the floor is then to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I have received no written amendments for Draft Decision 34.COM.7A.21 which is on page 56 of the English version and 57 of the French version of document 7A.ad. So this Draft Decision stands as it is in front of you. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we consider this Draft Decision approved? Yes, then it is approved. Mr. Giovanni Boccardi from the World Heritage Centre will now present the reports on the State of Conservation of the properties located in the Asia-Pacific region.”

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. Boccardi:

“Thank you very much; the first site that I am going to present is the **Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam in Afghanistan**. You’ll find it on the Document 7A.ad page 57 in the English version. For this property no report was submitted by the State Party, nor any statement of Outstanding Universal Value. However, information on the State of Conservation was obtained by the UNESCO Kabul Office and through this, the World Heritage Centre held a meeting in Munich with Afghan officials last March concerning Bamiyan, another site which we will report on shortly.

The comparison has slightly changed for the better compared with last year. As regards the first two corrective measures identified by the Committee: Building capacity of the Afghan staff from the Ministry of Culture and defining the precise boundaries of the property. UNESCO was able to dispatch a mission by technicians of an Afghan company named ALCO in May of this year with funding from the government of Switzerland. This enabled a thorough survey of the archaeological remains around the Minaret, as well as 3D documentation.

Prior to this, a one-week training course was held for the Afghan staff on the measurement equipment and an expert undertook the mission together with ALCO technicians, thus receiving in situ training. Regarding security, this is currently ensured by guards provided by the government. This was stated by the Afghan officials during the March meeting. However, no progress has been made on the development of the comprehensive management system that was the fourth corrective measure set by the Committee.

The other development is the agreement with the Afghan authorities and the donors (Italy and Switzerland) on a Plan of Action for activities to be implemented on site. This focuses on the documentation and conservation of the Minaret and the strengthening of the retaining walls along the two rivers adjacent to the Minaret—you can see them on the slide. Activities are described in more detail in our report.

We hope to be able to carry out this programme and at the same time continue the capacity building activities, also in the context of ongoing project for Bamiyan with funding from the Japanese government. UNESCO is also providing assistance to Afghanistan in relation to the Periodic Reporting Process and in this framework we intend to help the State Party to prepare a draft statement for Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Mr. Chairperson, I would like briefly to ask ICOMOS to make a statement.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS welcomes the progress made in serving the site which is essentially an activity which would be crucial for the implementation of a conservation strategy, which would evidently contribute to a better understanding and delineation of the site. We also note and welcome the importance of continuing capacity building endeavours which will in time contribute to the implementation of a sustained conservation and management course of action.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any Delegations who would like to take the floor? Egypt, you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte appuie avec satisfaction les efforts déjà faits et les progrès même s'ils sont modestes. Cependant j'ai une question à poser au Secrétariat, au représentant d'ICOMOS ou au représentant de l'Afghanistan, s'il est dans la salle, en ce qui concerne le Plan de gestion du site et s'il y en a un prenant en compte la zone tampon avec le Minaret, ou se concentre-t-on, pour l'instant, seulement sur la restauration du bien. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mr. Boccardi would you like to answer?”

Mr. Boccardi:

“There is no management plan for this property, which also does not have a buffer zone. It was inscribed by the Committee on the bases of sketched maps with indicative boundaries, hence the need to survey the area and to draw precise boundaries. In this context also, perhaps, the inclusion of a buffer zone is needed, on which the Management Plan could be developed, when the Afghan government will be in a position to implement it, which is not the case currently.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any other Delegations would like to take the floor? No. Rapporteur you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I have not received any written amendments on this Draft Decision. So, it remains as it is printed on your document 7A.ad on page 59 of the English and 61 of the French version.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we consider the Draft Decision approved? Yes, so it is approved. Mr. Boccardi you have the floor.”

Mr. Boccardi:

“Thank you very much. The next site is the **Cultural Landscape and Archaeological remains of the Bamiyan Valley, also in Afghanistan**, which is page 60 of the document 7A.ad in the English version. Again, no report was sent by the State Party nor a Statement of Outstanding Universal Values as was requested by the Committee.

Despite this, significant progress has been made in Bamiyan thanks to efforts from the government, and support from a variety of donors and institutions including Japan, Germany, New Zealand and the UN Mine Action Centre in Afghanistan. Information on this property comes, as previously mentioned, from discussions held during a meeting of the Expert Group on Bamiyan that was held in Munich, in March 2010, for which I would like to acknowledge the support of ICOMOS Germany.

With regard to site security, the first component of the desired State of Conservation, a great achievement of the past 12 months has been the complete mine clearance of the eight sites forming a series of properties—there was a slide on my presentation showing people clearing the site of mines but it must have been cut. Mine clearance is of course crucial not only for the obvious benefits that it provides in terms of safety, but because it will finally enable urgent conservation work at all the different sites that constitute this serial property.

UNESCO is also providing financial support to ensure that the site is guarded, and is planning to organise training initiatives in cooperation with the Italian Special Corps of the *Carabinieri* in charge of the protection of cultural heritage. Another important step forward, and here I am moving to the second corrective measure, is the near completion of the Eastern Buddha niche, the one you see on the slide on the top left, by the German team with

support from Japan under the UNESCO Funds in Trust Project and with funding from the German government. Work should now start on the Western niche, the larger one, which has not been touched up to now.

Archaeological work has also been carried out on some archaeological areas with the property containing mural paintings, by the Japanese team from Tobunken, the National Research Institute of Tokyo. Now that the entire property is accessible, it is urgent to conduct condition assessments and emergency conservation work.

As far as the Management and Master Plans are concerned, progress is somewhat slower. UNESCO has conducted some training for Afghan officials on site management and will continue to do so. The actual adoption and implementation of the Master Plan however is still pending, which means the Plan is not operational. On the picture is a zoning plan, not a management plan in the traditional sense.

One interesting development concerning Bamiyan is the beginning of a discussion on the long-term for the Buddha niches and the statues, including conservation and interpretation. The discussion that took place in Munich also included the possible setting up of a site museum and of a proper museum in Bamiyan for the entire province. For the niches, several ideas were put forward ranging from anastylosis to less intrusive proposals to re-establish the images of the Buddha and interpret them for visitors. These proposals are welcomed, as they meet the expectations of the community after so many years of very important technical work, which has perhaps not been so visible for them. In any case, we believe that any proposal would need to be carefully reviewed, including by the Committee, in due time.

The Decision is on page 64 in the English version and 67 in the French one, for your consideration. Again, I believe that ICOMOS would like to make a comment.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. Just a short comment: ICOMOS notes with satisfaction that the conditions exist now for the implementation of priority conservation measures. It also notes this range of proposals that my colleague mentioned and is being developed for the preservation and conservation of the Buddha niches. ICOMOS notes the interest expressed by the State Party in hosting an advisory mission that could examine these various proposals and could also explore the long-term directions for the conservation, presentation and management of heritage in Bamiyan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to Mr. Boccardi and to ICOMOS. The floor is now open to members of the Committee. As there are no requests for the floor, it is now to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. We have received no amendments on Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.23, so the Decision is as it is printed on page 64 in English and 66 in French of your document 7A.ad.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we consider this Draft Decision approved? Yes, it is then approved. The floor is again to Mr. Boccardi.”

Mr. Boccardi:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. The next report is on **Bam and its Cultural Landscape in the Islamic Republic of Iran**. Regarding this property the State Party provided a report, as well as an updated Nomination File. The File is now in order after a few years, as I would like to recall to the Committee, that the site was inscribed following the emergency procedure after the earthquake, and at that time, the Committee approved a much larger site than the one that was presented and inscribed in the Nomination File, on the basis of a Map submitted somewhat at the last minute. We were then in a situation where we had a map which did not match the description of the site in the Nomination File. This has been corrected by the State Party which has submitted an updated Nomination File.

Progress against the corrective measures identified by the Committee are described in the document, they include the consolidation of the citadel (here on this picture), restoration work, conservation of archaeological findings and etc. The perimeter of the property is now being studied thanks to archaeological investigations and it has been reflected in new boundaries drawn and seen by the committee in 2007, and approved with a minor modification.

The Management Plan has been finalised and officially adopted at the central level. This is a sort of landmark achievement in Iran, as this is the first Management Plan to have been developed through a broad participatory approach with some support from UNESCO. The Centre understands that the adoption of the Plan made at the central level must still be communicated to the local authorities that are meant to see to its implementation on the ground. We have been told that this will happen soon. It is not yet the case.

As for security, the last of the corrective measures required by the Committee, as mentioned last year: Guards have been provided by the State Party and have been trained.

Our conclusion is that the overall picture of the State of Conservation of this property is rather positive, which explains the Draft Decision we are proposing. We observe a positive trend, but it is necessary to verify on the ground the actual progress made, with regard to the implementation of the Management Plan, and if the findings of this mission confirm the positive developments emerging from this report, then perhaps the Committee might consider removing the site from the List in Danger next year. ICOMOS has a further statement.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS notes with satisfaction the sustained implementation of the measures for the property and the progress that has been made towards achieving the desired State of Conservation. This of course welcomes the opportunity to carry out a potential monitoring mission to assess whether conditions have been met for removal from the in Danger List. It would let us know, however, that it would be important to secure the necessary resources for the sustain implementation of the recently defined Management Plan. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is open. Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“This report shows clearly that Iran has taken the comments in the previous report very seriously and has undertaken an enormous amount of work to improve the situation after the earthquake. We would have liked to have seen the same commitment from other State Parties with sites on the World Heritage in Danger List.

We therefore congratulate Iran for the courage they have shown and the effort made. We all hope that the monitoring mission that will take place in late 2010 can verify the current State of Conservation as well as if the desired State of Conservation has been achieved, so that we hopefully can remove this site from the World Heritage List in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. I would also like to join my voice with those that have just spoken and I would like to congratulate the government of Iran on the effort made. I would say that this site was seriously damaged by the 2003 earthquake and that the subsequent situation was very serious. Indeed, it was a major a tragedy that Iran suffered, many people died, many sites were affected by the earthquake and it led to a massive mobilisation from the international community and support for the country.

I would like to congratulate the government of Iran. Despite all the difficulties they faced, they have made all these efforts to implement a Management Plan and also succeeded in stabilising the lower and upper parts of the citadel. A lot of work has also been done in terms of dealing with the effect of the earthquake. The Delegation of Brazil indeed would like to congratulate this State Party for all this effort made in this respect.”

The Chairperson:

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

Bahrain:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson, We would like to echo the previous speakers regarding the effort that has been taken by the State Party to restore and conserve the site. We would like to show this site as a good example regarding managing risks, an issue that was discussed this morning. However, we would like to hear the State Party’s opinion, if they have any information to that regard. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Let’s ask the representative of Iran? Would you like to take the floor?”

Iran:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Since this is the first time that I am taking the floor, let me first thank you on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Iran for your kind hospitality during our stay in Brasilia and also to congratulate you on The Chairpersonmanship of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to thank the distinguished members of the Committee regarding their comments on our work in Bam.

There is no further information to give you. The only thing that I can say is that the government is spending as much effort as possible to implement the Decision made by the World Heritage Committee, in order to reach the criteria set to remove the site from the World Heritage in Danger List. We hope that once the monitoring mission has visited the site, we will be able to remove the site from the List at the Bahrain meeting; thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would anyone else like to take the floor? The representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. I did not have the opportunity to speak before and I am pleased to hear the determination of the State Party in this regard. Barbados would wish to join in with the other Delegations to extend its congratulations to the State Party. I want to note in particular that to us, this site and indeed the previous sites where effort was made by Iran, is a demonstration on how the World Heritage list in Danger provides the opportunity to utilise all the resources and will necessary by the international community, as by the State Party and all other Parties, to successfully move and change the integrity and authenticity of the site to a state that is desired by all of us. Congratulations again to the State Party, and I look forward to seeing its removal from the List in Danger in 2011. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. If there are no additional comments, then the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I have received no written amendment on the Draft Decision. It stays as it is and you can find it on page 55 of the English and 57 of the French version in Document 7A. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Can we approve the Draft Decision? Yes, it is then approved. The floor is to Mr. Boccardi.”

Mr. Boccardi:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The next site is the **Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore, Pakistan**; the report can be found in the 7A.ad document. In this case, a State of Conservation Report from the State Party was submitted in mid-April. However, they did not provide a Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. If we assess the progress made by the State Party with respect to the desired State of Conservation defined by the World Heritage Committee, we note significant progress.

The Master Plans, which are sorts of Action Plans not Management Plans, in the standard understanding, have been implemented and are well funded by the Punjab State to which the management of the property has been decentralised by the Federal Government of Pakistan. The water tanks which were damaged by careless interventions years ago, which is one of the reasons for the in Danger listing of this property, have now been consolidated and all the area around them has been fenced and is protected. The walls around the Fort of Lahore are being restored and the moats and the area surrounding them are being rehabilitated and rearranged including a visitor's Park. Moreover, conservation work has been carried out for many buildings within the Fort, including of course the Palace of the Mirrors, with support from various donors including Norway.

As for the boundaries, which was one of the requirements set out by the Committee, the State Party claims to have redefined them and a map was submitted as a part of the report. But the State Party has not yet officially requested a minor modification according to the established procedures of the *Convention*.

Finally, regarding the encroachment near the Shalamar Gardens in particular, some of the land has been acquired and efforts are under way to create a buffer zone around the walls of the Garden to control building activities. This is apparently proving more difficult than foreseen due to the presence of inhabitants and houses, which have been constructed near these walls. It is hard for the local authorities to enforce this provision.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that for this property, as for the previous one, a positive trend is developing. We feel that as soon as the boundary issues have been clarified by the State Party, through the submission of a proposal for minor modifications, and especially based on the progress made on addressing the issue of the encroachment, the Committee in one of its future sessions could consider removing the property from its in Danger List. This, however, will require some work and for this reason we are not recommending a mission immediately.

With regard to the issue of encroachment, I would like to add a few remarks. This will necessarily require a careful assessment of the different interests at stake. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that any solution will have to balance the need of the local community and the imperative of the construction. Houses have been constructed for many years along the walls of the Garden, and perhaps there could be a way to ensure they do not harm the Monument without necessarily relocating the people living there.

The Draft Decision is on page 67 of the English version and 69 of the French document. I believe that ICOMOS does not have any additional comments to make on this case.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is open. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous aimerions féliciter l'État Partie de ces grands progrès que nous venons d'entendre et nous souhaiterions apporter une clarification au sujet de la Décision. Dans le sens que nous souhaiterions insister sur le fait qu'il est nécessaire de faire une modification mineure des limites et que cela soit séparé d'une éventuelle extension plus substantielle dont on avait parlé les autres années. Nous avons donc clarifié, à notre avis, cette question dans la Décision. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor."

Brazil:

"Thank you. We would like to above all underscore the corrective measures identified with respect to the site: the implementation of a Master Plan to this regard, is an important measure that has been taken by the State Party, which is the protection and preservation of the outer Walls of the Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens. That, in our view, is an all-important action undertaken by the State Parties. Now, we are looking at a redefinition of the boundaries of the core and buffer zones of the Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens.

The State Party is also aware of the problems of urban pressure causing encroachments, which of course affect the site. Finally, I would like to say that we recognise that the State Party has allocated resources in line with the Monument objectives determined in the Master Plan. Chair, maybe the State Party would like to comment?"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak, maybe the State Party as requested by Brazil? The floor is to the representative of Pakistan."

Pakistan:

"Thank you. Just a brief comment on the efforts that have been undertaken by the government of Pakistan with regard to Shalamar Gardens and the Lahore Fort, as well as the other heritage sites. Despite financial constraints, we have been spending huge amounts on the preservation and restoration of World Heritage site monuments. With regard to the Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens which were included in the List of World Heritage in Danger due to the partial demolition of the hydraulic system of Shalamar Gardens in June 1999, they have been saved from further losses by taking various measures.

The Master Plan 2006-2007 of Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens prepared by UNESCO and the Government of Punjab within the framework of projects funded by Norway and the Getty Foundation, USA, proved instrumental in getting masterpieces of art and architecture of the Mughal era for its removal from the List of World Heritage site in Danger. The Department of Archaeology and Museums has submitted the requested report on the State of Conservation on the Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens to the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to take the floor? No, the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I have received one amendment from the State Party of Switzerland, which concerns paragraph 5b, and I will read out to you the amendment in the original language, French. It is considered as a replacement of the current paragraph 5b:

b) de redéfinir, de manière précise, les limites du bien ainsi que de sa zone tampon et de considérer l'extension du bien visant à inclure la Mosquée royale (Badshahi Masjid) et la Tombe de Rangjit Singh.

Once more:

b) de redéfinir, de manière précise, les limites du bien ainsi que de sa zone tampon et de considérer l'extension du bien visant à inclure la Mosquée royale (Badshahi Masjid) et la Tombe de Rangjit Singh.

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much to the Rapporteur. I now ask the floor. Do you agree to approve this Draft Decision including the presented amendment? Yes, then it is approved. Mr. Boccardi, please.”

Mr. Boccardi:

“Thank you very much. The next and last site, as far as the Asia-Pacific region is concerned, is the **Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, in the Philippines**, which is reported in Document 7A page 56 in English.

This is a very complex property made of different sites and presenting a certain number of challenges. I have to stress that for this property the desired State of Conservation has not been established by the World Heritage Committee, although it requested one. However, the Committee has indicated corrective measures.

The State Party report provides extensive information on the progress accomplished against each of these corrective measures and includes a proposal for a desired State of Conservation for removal of this property from the List in Danger. This was reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in close consultation with the State Party and is reflected in its final version in the Draft Decision for your consideration.

It is difficult in a few minutes to reflect the great variety of actions implemented by the State Party, some of which are reflected in this longer State of Conservation report. They

range from measures to strengthen the management and regulatory system of the site; securing funding for implementation of these conservation measures; to rehabilitation of irrigation systems; as well as initiatives focusing on creating additional means of livelihood for the community based on traditional practices and raising awareness.

It should be known that many of these initiatives are developed by the authorities through a very broad participatory approach. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider once again that this report shows a very strong level of commitment by the State Party and reflect significant progress towards achieving a satisfactory State of Conservation that might lead to the removal of the property from the in Danger List after so many years.

While noting progress on many specific aspects, however, what is not perfectly clear from this report is whether overall the site has recovered its integrity, which has been affected in the past by various factors, and is managed effectively with the support of the community, so as to finally consider it out of danger. In other words, we note a positive trend, but we are not sure where we actually stand on the path of recovering Outstanding Universal Value.

As suggested for the case of Bam, therefore, we consider it relevant to request a reacting monitoring mission to assess whether conditions have been met for removal of the site from the World Heritage List in Danger. This reacting monitoring mission, if approved by the Committee, would also offer the opportunity to review the desired State of Conservation and progress made against it, as well as providing recommendations to the State Party for the future conservation and management of this property. ICOMOS has a statement.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS recognises the sustained efforts that have been made by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures. It also recognises the efforts made to achieve the desired State of Conservation. It particularly notes the measures implemented to strengthen the management system and considers that this will sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

ICOMOS considers that the efforts made to secure the long viability of the rice farming communities are also noteworthy. It recognises the challenges faced by the State Party for the enforcement of the legislative and regulatory frameworks and it underscores the importance of fully addressing this measure to support a protection of the property in the long-term.

In light with the considerable progress that has been made today, ICOMOS, as a World Heritage Centre, considers that the monitoring mission will be crucial to identifying whether conditions have been met for the removal of the property from the Heritage in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is open. Brazil, the floor is yours.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. This is a site that is of major importance and requires special attention and care. I would like to recognise the quality of the monitoring missions that were conducted and I agree with comments made, in that the next mission will be a crucial one, as to helping the State Party to overcome these problems, to make sure the integrity of the site is ensured. I would like to ask if it is possible to hear from the State Party to have them comment on this issue of the integrity of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I turn to the State Party; would you wish to give some precision on this matter? I turn to the representative of Mexico, actually.”

Mexico:

“Thank you. We would like to express our agreement with what was said by the representative of Brazil. We think it is an extremely important site as to World Heritage. It is a productive landscape site and an extremely complex site, as said by Mr. Boccardi himself. We believe that the damage can be reversed and we feel that this could be a test case that would show that the Committee as a whole can undertake a significant task when dealing with sites that have Outstanding Universal Value.

It seems that here the involvement of the local community is essential to guarantee in the long-term the value for which the site was inscribed. Furthermore we think it would be good to hear from the State Party. Perhaps they could tell us what progress has been made in recent times. It would also be good to have an evaluation mission so that we would know that in the future the site could be removed from the in Danger List. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I turn to the representative of the Philippines. Would you like to take the floor?”

The Philippines:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for their very comprehensive report, as well as Brazil and Mexico for their comments. On the integrity of the site, we would like to believe that we are on our way to achieving and getting back the integrity of the site, but we do welcome the monitoring mission that has been proposed.

Regarding the comment of Mexico, I would like to assure the Committee that the full involvement of the community is at the core of the conservation effort, as we believe that any effort that we undertake will not succeed without its participation and full involvement; thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. No one is scheduled to take the floor. I turn to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have not received any written amendments on this Draft Decision. You will find Decision 7A.26 in the document 7A page 61 of the English and 64 of the French version.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now ask the Committee if we can consider this Decision as approved. It is then approved. Thank you. I am going to take a break for a few minutes and will be replaced by the Vice Chair. Thank you very much.”

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The Vice chair (referred as The Chairperson hereafter):

“Let’s move on with the agenda and start with the Europe and North America regions. I would like to invite Ms. Mechtild Rössler from the World Heritage Centre on the State of Conservation of the properties located in this region.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We are moving to the region of Europe and the first report is on the **Historical Monuments of Mtskheta in Georgia**. This is in your document 7A.add, starting on page 69 in the English version.

You will recall that this site was included in the World Heritage List in Danger due to a number of threats, including loss of authenticity. The joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM’s reactive monitoring mission to the property was undertaken this year, in March, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at the last session. In April the director of the Centre met with representatives of the Georgian president and we discussed a number of issues regarding the State of Conservation of the World heritage Properties in Georgia.

On 6 May, the State Party informed the World Heritage Committee of the partial collapse of the Bebris Tsikhe Fortress situated on the Buffer zone of the property, due to continued rainfall and the resulting landslide of 29 April. On 22 June the State Party submitted a revised version of an international assistance request for the improvement of a management of the historic monuments. This document is for review with the Advisory Bodies.

The State Party also submitted two proposals for conservation and rehabilitation of the Jvari Church for review. The joint mission report was sent to the State Party for comments. They have not been received so far, but we had meetings with the Ambassador of Georgia and representatives from Georgia at UNESCO. On 7 July we got the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Values, as well as clarification on boundaries submitted. It was requested and as you see in paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision, it is planned for next year for review by the World Heritage Committee. I believe that ICOMOS has some comments to make. Thank you very much.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS notes that the mission report covers not only the inscribed property but also monuments in the buffer zone and options for the boundary within the framework of the statement of the Outstanding Universal Value, as there is currently not a clear understanding of the extent of the attributes of the property in relation to the boundaries. The recent partial destruction of the Bebris Tsikhe Fortress in the buffer zone highlights, as you have heard, the overall vulnerability, as this listed monument is part of 11 protected monuments in the buffer zone. The mission considered that there might be a possibility to include some of these monuments listed within the property in the future. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to open the floor for comments or questions regarding this site. Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you, Chair. Estonia expresses its serious concerns about the state of preservation of the property and welcomes the detailed presentation of the corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation as outlined in the Draft Decision before us. Following consultation with the State Party concerned, Estonia is ready to share its experience in establishing institutional coordination mechanisms for heritage protection and to assist in appropriate training in conservation and management for the staff in charge of the preservation of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Estonia. Switzerland, you asked for the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci. Nous sommes très conscients des grandes difficultés auxquelles doivent faire face le bien et l'État Partie et nous avons des remarques de caractère général sur les mesures correctives qui sont présentées dans le projet de Décision sur le point 7. Si l'on étudie ces mesures, on trouve quand même une sorte de catalogue très exhaustif avec beaucoup de contenu.

Certes, toutes ces mesures sont très pertinentes et vont certainement aider à la bonne conservation du bien, mais on se demande quand même si l'on n'aurait pas dû se concentrer plus sur les points vraiment essentiels et réduire un peu ce grand catalogue de mesures correctives. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à vous, est-ce que vous avez des propositions précises, je veux dire par là un texte à proposer ? »

Switzerland:

« Justement, nous avons rencontré quelques problèmes techniques et ne sommes pas prêts avec notre amendement encore. C'est pour cela que j'ai effectué ce commentaire d'ordre général ».

The Chairperson:

« Vous avez besoin de combien de temps pour proposer un amendement à ce projet de Décision ? »

Switzerland:

« Il nous faudrait une heure je pense ».

The Chairperson:

« Je me tourne vers les membres du Comité pour des commentaires ou questions supplémentaires, je n'en vois pas. Je donne la parole à Madame Rössler pour répondre à la remarque de l'Estonie ».

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. Just to clarify that the desired State of Conservation derived from the mission that discussed with the State Party and authorities concerned, and I am fully aware that this is a very long statement for adoption but keep in mind that this was discussed as a requirement. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse vous avez la parole ».

Switzerland:

« Juste pour préciser que si cela a été discuté avec l'État partie concerné et si tout le monde est d'accord, de notre part nous pouvons suivre la recommandation telle quelle. Nous trouvons que ces mesures correctives devraient être plus pertinentes, mais dans ce cas précis on peut la laisser comme ça. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Si personne ne souhaite effectuer des commentaires ou poser de questions, je suggère que nous passions à l'examen du projet de Décision 34 COM.7A.27 et je donne la parole à notre rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. You will find the Decision on page 72 in the English and 74 in the French version of the document 7A.add, and I have not received any written amendments. I understood that the Swiss Delegation will refrain from proposing an amendment in this case. The Draft Decision remains as it is in front of you. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Georgia has the floor.”

Georgia:

“We would like to say a few words regarding this case, if this is possible.”

The Chairperson:

« Oui, si vous avez des informations à ajouter sur le site et son état de conservation, je vous donne la parole ».

Georgia:

“Thank you very much, and to the rapporteur and the Delegation of Estonia which offers us great assistance in helping us in conservation tasks including management of the property. I would like to add some improvements that were or are being implemented. One of the very essential projects is the conservation of the Amatsikhe archaeological site. It is co-financed by the United States Ambassador Fund and envisages implementing measures for the preservation of the archaeological remains as well as organisation of basic visitor infrastructure for the sites.

Another important activity for the State Party is the project for improvement of cultural heritage, and legal and institutional framework at the national level. A conservation training project is being prepared in scope with the European Union twinning programme. The project will provide essential legal instruments for efficient management of cultural heritage with emphasis on World Heritage site management. It also envisages harmonisation of the law with the UNESCO recommendations and guidelines.

As was requested at the previous World Heritage Committee, the State Party took specific steps towards forming institutional coordination among different decision making bodies. A ministerial commission called World Heritage was established in 2009 to oversee the problems and issues related to the Georgian World Heritage sites and historic monuments of Mtskheta. The Body ensures coordination to give priority and consideration to the problem of the World Heritage sites within relevant decision making processes.

In closing, I would like to stress that we are open to continuing close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and its Advisory Bodies and strongly hope that the implementation of corrective measures and efforts made by the State Party will be duly acknowledged by the Committee with a view to the withdrawal of Mtskheta from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to come back to the examination of Draft Decision 34.COM.7A.27.”

Rapporteur:

“As said earlier, the Draft Decision remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections? I see none. Then Draft Decision 34.COM.7A.27 is adopted.

Now we are moving to the next site in this region, which concerns the **Medieval Monuments in Kosovo**. Mrs. Rössler, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much. You have the following document in front of you, 34 COM. 7A, on page 63 which includes the Decision from last year session, the 33rd from the World Heritage Committee. 7A annex 1 is the document of the 33rd session annex 2 which is the document 33 COM.7A.ad and for the English version 33 COM 7A.ad of the 33rd session. The Secretariat would like to remind the Committee that the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee decided to adjourn the debate on this matter until this session, and that previous documents have been distributed with the other documents at this session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would the representative of ICOMOS add something? No, so I would like to open the floor to the members of the Committee regarding this site. I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse estime que le rôle du Comité du patrimoine mondial consiste à soutenir les efforts entrepris pour la conservation des biens et leurs valeurs exceptionnelles. Les informations sur les mesures entreprises ou envisagées en faveur des monuments médiévaux du Kosovo, notamment dans le cadre du Conseil de l'Europe, nous permettent d'être confiants.

De ce point de vue là, il nous paraît qu'il n'appartient pas au Comité de prendre une décision qui, de toute manière, a une connotation politique qui sort de son mandat. En ce sens, Monsieur le Président, la Suisse propose d'ajourner ce débat de ce point de l'ordre du jour jusqu'à notre prochaine session selon l'article 31 du Règlement intérieur du Comité. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

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

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, as said rightly by my colleague from Switzerland, we work for conservation, preservation and to look after World Heritage. But I do not understand this comment, as these medieval monuments in Kosovo are really in Danger. This site was inscribed by Serbia, and reports on the conservation of this site are done by Serbia, and now we keep on adjourning the Decision because we do not want to put Serbia in brackets.

Finally, I understand that this is not an easy situation. For the moment there only exists the Resolution of the United Nations 1244, which is the only legally binding basis for the United Nations including UNESCO and the World heritage Centre’s position on this matter. This is where UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre must continue to stay neutral. I propose that the Decision about the conservation of the medieval monuments of Kosovo has to be studied during this session. Thank you”.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. On my list now is Mali, then France, Mexico, Brazil, Sweden and China, Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaiterais que l’on apporte des éclaircissements par rapport à une ambiguïté, notamment le paragraphe 8 de la discussion. Selon ce paragraphe, le site est en péril et en même temps on dit de continuer à appliquer le Mécanisme du suivi renforcé. Je suis donc un peu confus par rapport à ce paragraphe 8. Par ailleurs, je souhaiterais connaître la position de l’État partie, la Serbie, s’il est là ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, mais pouvez-vous préciser la question que vous souhaitez poser à l’État partie ? »

Mali:

« De la part de l’État partie, j’aimerais par exemple savoir les efforts qui ont été faits pour quitter cette situation de péril. On a demandé dans la Décision 7A.27 deux éléments : le site est encore en péril et on demande à appliquer les mécanismes de suivi renforcé, quels sont les efforts de conservation mis en place par l’État partie vis-à-vis de la situation ? »

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, nous prenons note et je propose que l’on continue avec les interventions de la part des membres du Comité puis je donnerai la parole à la fin à l’État concerné. La France a la parole ».

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous souhaitons en effet, comme l’a dit le représentant de la Suisse, que le Comité du patrimoine mondial évite la politisation de la question de la protection des monuments médiévaux du Kosovo. Nous estimons que cette

question doit être traitée aux Nations Unies à l'aune des derniers développements. Nous soutenons donc l'ajournement du débat présenté par la Suisse au prochain Comité du patrimoine mondial.

À ce titre, je voudrais poser une question au conseiller juridique. En effet, je pense que lorsqu'une demande d'ajournement est faite nous devons avant tout, Monsieur le Président, nous prononcer sur cette demande d'ajournement et ne pas poursuivre le débat. Je souhaiterais donc que le conseiller juridique nous apporte des éclaircissements sur ce point de procédure. Il me semble, à la lecture du règlement du Comité, que nous devons avant tout nous prononcer sur cette demande d'ajournement ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. Les positions sont une demande d'ajournement et une autre demande de continuer la discussion. Posons donc la question au conseiller juridique pour qu'il nous éclaire sur ce point ».

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The applicable rule is rule 31 of the rule of procedures of the Committee. It reads as follows:

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.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to have more clarification from the legal advisor. What would be the next step/procedure to follow?”

Legal Advisor:

“You have to vote whether the debate should be adjourned or not.”

The Chairperson:

“I am turning to the Committee members. I think that we should go to the voting and the rapporteur will formulate the text of the voting.”

Rapporteur:

“We vote on: *whether the members of the Committee are in favour of adjourning the debate on this item until the next session of the World Heritage Committee.* Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“I think we are now reaching the end of the afternoon session, there is an evening session planned for 7pm when we will continue our proceedings by voting.

I would like to have the opinion of the legal advisor on my suggestion.”

Legal Advisor:

“I think that if a member State has requested a vote and the vote is on the adjournment, then you should proceed to the vote now.”

The Chairperson:

“We have to proceed to the vote, so I will ask the rapporteur to repeat the text. Before I give the floor to the rapporteur and proceed to the vote, the legal advisor will inform us on the voting procedure.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you. Voting shall not normally be by a show of a hand, and decision should be taken by the majority of the States present and voting. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the rapporteur to read the text you will be voting on.”

Rapporteur:

“We request the World Heritage Committee to indicate if they are in are in favour of deciding to adjourn the debate of this agenda this item until the next ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee.”

I repeat:

“We request the World Heritage Committee to indicate if they are in are in favour of deciding to adjourn the debate of this agenda this item until the next ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“France and Mexico have asked for the floor. Is it regarding the voting process? I would like to ask the legal advisor if I may give the floor to France and Mexico or if I proceed to the vote.”

Legal Advisor:

“It depends whether it is a point of order, but if the voting is proceeding you have to ask the Delegations with a show of hand if they are against or in favour: I do not know if this is what the Delegations had in mind. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any points of order regarding the vote? Mexico has a point of order.”

Mexico

“Thank you very much Sir. Based on what we have just heard from our legal advisor, we want to be quite clear as to what the Committee is doing, particularly with respect to who is putting forward this motion. Is it Switzerland or France, and are we going to call on all those in favour or against? If we are doing that, was it done or are we going to do it?”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the legal advisor for reply.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you. With respect to the question from the distinguished delegate from Mexico, the proposal was made by Switzerland. The country that spoke in favour of the proposal was France.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali, you have a point of order?”

Mali :

« Oui, c'est pour apporter un éclaircissement, est-ce que l'on peut soumettre un site qui est en péril à un suivi renforcé ? Que les choses soient claires, je n'ai pas demandé un vote ».

The Chairperson:

« Vous n'avez pas demandé un vote, certes, mais nous devons suspendre cette discussion et les débats, car nous sommes dans un processus de votation ».

Mali *(interrompant le Président):*

« Moi je n'ai pas demandé un vote ».

The Chairperson:

« La France a demandé la parole ».

France:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. C'était sur la procédure, pour avoir des éléments complémentaires de la part de la conseillère juridique. Je suis en train, comme beaucoup j'imagine, de regarder le Règlement intérieur de notre Comité. Les articles qui ont trait à la procédure de vote. Je vois qu'il y a deux possibilités, mais je voudrais que ce soit confirmé par la conseillère. Il y a la possibilité d'un mode à main levée selon la procédure de l'article 40, mais également la possibilité d'un vote au bulletin secret selon la procédure de l'article 41, selon des cas précis développés dans cet article. Je voulais m'assurer, avec la conseillère, qu'il y avait ces deux possibilités en vertu de l'article 40 et 41 ».

The Chairperson:

« Je donne la parole à la conseillère juridique pour répéter la procédure de vote et en même temps répondre à la France ».

Legal advisor:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Effectivement, il y a deux procédures pour voter. Celle par un *show of hands* et le vote secret. Cependant, pour un vote secret il faut avoir deux ou plus de deux États membres qui le demandent ou sinon que le Président prenne la décision ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Je vois la Serbie qui a demandé la parole, malheureusement je ne peux pas vous la donner puisque nous sommes dans un processus de vote ^[la Serbie prend la parole]. *I cannot give you the floor Madame. China, are you asking for a point of order?* »

China:

“I would like to ask the legal advisor to clarify: the vote by two thirds of the majority or by simple majority? I mean the counting of the vote.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. The floor is to the legal advisor.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you. In response to the question put by the distinguished guest from China, the voting is by simple majority of members present and voting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. After this clarification, we now have a choice for a show of hands or secret voting. For the moment there is no request of the member States for secret voting, so we are going to proceed by voting with a show of hands. Mexico, do you have a point of order? The floor is yours.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Sir. Now, with a view to simply clarifying things so there is no doubt. We would like to ask the legal advisor to clarify for us what would be the position with respect to abstentions. I know you are talking about members present and voting; what about a State who abstains? Is that considered as having voted? And if so what consequences does this have on the majority. Let me give you an example: Let’s say we have two votes in favour, one against and three abstentions, even though there are more votes in favour than against there is not a majority of votes of members present. That’s the kind of example that I am concerned about.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique. La parole est au conseiller juridique ».

Legal advisor:

“Thank you. The response to the question put by the distinguished delegate of Mexico is in article 39 of our Rules of procedure and I will read it in English:

the expression "States members present and voting" shall mean States members casting an affirmative or negative vote—that is to say you vote yes or no. States members abstaining from voting shall be regarded as not voting.

Anybody who abstains from that vote will not be counted in the process. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, legal advisor. China, the floor is yours again.”

China:

“Sorry to ask for the floor. If you read our Decision passed last year it says: *The World heritage Committee decided to adjourn the debate on this agenda item until the next ordinary session.* I think for my understanding that this session should deal with this matter ostensibly. I wish not to adjourn this matter but if you do adjourn this matter to the next ordinary session, we are in a position of violating the last session’s Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“We do have two opposite positions, and we should proceed after that clarification from the legal advisor regarding the voting procedure. I give the floor again to the rapporteur for re-reading the text for voting.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much, we are voting on:

whether the members of the Committee are in favour of adjourning the debate on this agenda item until its next ordinary session.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you legal advisor; we are now going to proceed with the vote. Could the members of the Committee in favour of this decision please raise their hands?

Would you raise the sign of your country please? Legal advisor, please proceed to counting. Could you keep your signs up please? Thank you, you can put your signs down.

Now I am going to ask who is against this decision. Please put your signs up.

I am now going to ask for the members who wish to abstain to raise their signs, please.

The text will read by the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“The results of voting *whether the members of the Committee are in favour of adjourning the debate on this agenda item until its next ordinary session of the World heritage Committee.*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. In favour 11, against the decision 6, abstention 3 and 1 non-voting.

The decision is to adjourn the discussion of this item to the next session. Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Very briefly. It was a very democratic procedure, but in any case I would ask that we give the floor to Serbia, as we have finished with the voting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to the representative of Serbia.”

Serbia:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Distinguished colleagues, members of the World Heritage Committee, this is a great honour to finally have the right to address you. It was requested twice by two Delegations. In the meantime Mr. Chairman you refused it. Now it is my honour to address you.

I am not going to repeat what we have said many times during this session and also the 2009 session in Seville, but what we would like to see is the following: this body, the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO, and the UN are fully respecting the only legally binding document, which is the Security Council resolution 1244. I ask your legal advisor if you do not share my opinion that it is written in every single United Nations document.

Adjourning once again is putting your own responsibility in question. This very decision has been for three years to be adopted. What we expect is only to work with you to protect Serbian Medieval Orthodox heritage in Kosovo. This Committee has no mandate to discuss status. We tried, we did our best as the Delegation of Serbia, not to politicise this issue, not to divide this Committee by voting.

You remember very well that a two thirds majority was reached last year in Seville. We did not want it to go to a vote, to expose any country members of this Committee to this difficult situation. What we would like is to prove that Serbia is fully cooperating with this Committee in order to prevent further destruction to four medieval monasteries from the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries. These monasteries were introduced by the State Party of Serbia to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Why are you putting this now in question? We are presenting you reports about our conservation work. These reports are accepted by your competent Bodies.

Please, I do believe that we all share the same position. We are not here at the UN Security Council or at the General Assembly. If you do not want to continue under certain pressure to ignore the future, and to be responsible for what is destroyed, please dear colleagues, be players, members of this Committee and distinguished representatives of your member States.

Je vous remercie énormément de me donner la parole, mais cela va à l'encontre de ce que beaucoup de gens ici croient, de nouveau de ne pas être responsable... »

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]:*

« Merci de conclure et de ne pas répéter votre texte en français. Merci à la Serbie, je vous rappelle que nous avons suivi les règles définies par le conseiller juridique, nous sommes dans un processus tout à fait démocratique, et c'est la raison pour laquelle je vous ai donné la parole. Je vous remercie.

Je souhaiterais que nous clôturons cette séance. Le Secrétariat n'a rien à ajouter donc nous nous retrouvons à 19 h 30 pour la séance de nuit, merci beaucoup ».

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 27 July, 2010

Tuesday, 27 July 2010

FIFTH MEETING

Evening session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

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

CULTURAL HERITAGE

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN

The Chairperson:

“The Secretariat has confirmed that we have a programme, so we can start. Please take your seats. We are moving to the region of Latin America and the Caribbean and I invite Ms. Nuria Sanz from the World Heritage Centre to present the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. You have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The State of Conservation of **Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile)**. As members of the Committee recall, this property contains the largest deposit of Saltpetre in the world. It was inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger when it was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2005 because of the extremely fragile nature of the industrial buildings and the deterioration of the construction material, which was suffering from corrosion and metal decay.

A reactive monitoring mission was carried out in 2010, as requested by the Committee at its 33rd session. One of the main issues raised by the mission was the need for more detailed applied research for the conservation of timber and wooden structures to better understand the decaying process and establishing an accurate desired State of Conservation for the property which is still pending.

The State Party continues to implement a priority intervention programme in order to address the structural stability of the building, one of the main tasks identified for its removal from the World heritage List in Danger. When implementing corrective measures, the State Party met with an unexpected problem following the finalisation of the first detailed assessment of the more affected buildings, as the technical and financial estimations for interventions were not sufficient. Despite the difficulties, 15 intervention projects for the most affected structures were submitted. The State Party has undertaken efforts to ensure funding to address the project, to avoid collapse in the upper floor of the Santa Laura leaching plant and the Santa Laura surgery.

A tremendous effort has been made in terms of recovering mobile heritage and archaeological interventions, and as well as a compilation for historical information which in fact has reinforced the justification of the criteria by which the site has been inscribed. The perimeter of the property has been completed to further aid security and the State Party continues working to explore all the possibilities to ensure regulatory measures within the framework of the national law for the buffer zone.

The State Party recently informed that discussion has continued as a shared task by the Council of the Monument and the Museum management in order to establish contact with authorities responsible for territorial planning, as well as with private owners. Delineation for route A16 has been proposed, but this will have impact on Santa Laura with diminished impact on Humberstone. New alternatives should be submitted and the impact of the limited property should be extra Mines. The State Party has just submitted the retrospective declaration of the Outstanding Universal Values, as requested, which implicates that the related paragraph 6 of the Decision should be amended accordingly. The Draft Decision can be viewed on page 78 of the English and 81 of the French versions of document 7A.ad. The State Party is in the room and ICOMOS would like to make some comments.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS takes note of the progress that has been made today for implementing the corrective measures that were identified for the property at the time of the inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger. However, ICOMOS remains strongly concerned about the State of Conservation and the limited progress that has been made in identifying interventions that will ensure the conservation of attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Values of the property. While maintaining its conditions of integrity and authenticity, it might be worth recalling that it was the fragile nature of the buildings and their vulnerable state that warranted its inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger.

ICOMOS welcomes the development of OUV, Outstanding Universal Values, as it underpins all decision making for the property. Efforts should continue to secure conditions to have an effective participatory and operational management system in place that address not only conservation concerns but also public use of the property and regulatory measures for the Buffer zone.

ICOMOS welcomes the possibility of convening an expert meeting, as indicated by the State Party, in coordination with ICOMOS International Committee for the conservation of industrial heritage. We welcome this meeting, as it would address conditions and identified guidelines for intervention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you. We should like to make some short comments with regard to Humberstone and Santa Laura. A number of measures have been taken, that is clear, in order to try to correct the enormous damage that this property has suffered from. We know that this site is absolutely extraordinary. It is like a moonscape and when this was placed on the in Danger List, the stakes on the property were huge. The State Party has made an extraordinary effort in order to try and preserve those structures that were almost falling apart. Also, to try to end the deterioration process, which was well under way. This has been done.

We also have been impressed that Chile is taking the necessary measures in order to ensure that there is better control of visits to this World Heritage site. This is why in light of what Ms. Sanz said, it would be a good idea to call upon the State Party Chile to bring us up to date as to the measures they have been adopting so far. Along this line Mexico has submitted a draft resolution incorporating what I just said now.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Chile. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, I would like to support the extremely pertinent comment made by the distinguished delegate of Mexico. I believe that the work that the State Party has done in caring for this site is extremely important, and it is essential to take into account the extreme vulnerability of the industrial buildings, the fact that there was lack of conservation of these buildings for 40 years including weathering. The State Party is preparing a report on the State of Conservation which is extremely important and that is being examined by the World Heritage Centre.

I would also like to highlight the corrective measures that have been undertaken by the State Party, especially in consolidating and rehabilitating the structural work, notably in the most dramatic public area and the recovery of buildings in the industrial area. It is clear that the State Party has made a lot of effort in order to rehabilitate and protect the site, so we can see that the State Party is heading towards the proper direction. Besides to listening to the State Party about the site, we also would like to congratulate him.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China has the floor.”

China:

“We are glad to see that tremendous progress has been made for the conservation of this site. A certain number of industrial heritage sites in the world share the same problems, especially problems brought by materials that are not traditional but are susceptible to the environment or the weather. Thereby, we would like to see further conservation activities on this site and also would like to share the experience in the conservation of this site so that we can disseminate it to all countries, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Any questions or comments? No, Ms. Sanz neither. So let's move to the Draft Decision. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The Draft Decision can be found on page 78 of the English and 81 of the French version of document 7A.ad, and I have received a draft amendment suggested by Mexico which concerns three different paragraphs, so I will read them to you first. The Delegation of Mexico suggests inserting a new paragraph between the existing paragraphs 4 and 5 which will read then 4bis. I will read slowly in the original submission, English:

Notes with satisfaction the government owned land concession, that the Chilean State has given to the Saltpetre Museum Corporation, covering a part of the buffer zone and ensuring the conservation of significant Saltpetre remains.

Then, the former paragraph 5 which accordingly will turn paragraph 6 remains unchanged in its chapeau and a and b. But the Mexican Delegation proposes a slight change to the small paragraph c which will then read:

c) Finalise the process for establishing adequate regulatory measures in the buffer zone,

The final amendment of the Mexican Delegation concerns the paragraph that follows, d. The current text of d would be replaced by a new text, and again I read slowly:

d) Consider strengthening the mitigation measures in order to avoid any potential impacts of the new trace for the bypass of Route A-16 on the Santa Laura area,

All the remaining paragraphs will remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you repeat which of the paragraphs are to be amended by number?”

Rapporteur:

“From the beginning of the Decision: paragraphs 1 to 4 remain unchanged, before 4 and 5 Mexico suggests introducing a new paragraph. Would you like me to read it again?”

The Chairperson:

“Yes, please.”

Rapporteur:

“Notes with satisfaction the government owned land concession, that the Chilean State has given to the Saltpetre Museum Corporation, covering a part of the buffer zone and ensuring the conservation of significant Saltpetre remains.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any objections regarding this amendment? Brazil requests the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you. From our part there are no objections made to the proposal from Mexico. Nevertheless, we would like to propose a new wording for paragraph 6 which would read...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting Brazil]*:

“Excuse me, we are on paragraph 4bis for the moment, would you have any objections?”

Brazil:

“You are right, I will wait for the examination of paragraph 5 and then I will ask again for the floor.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. So are there any objections regarding paragraphs 1 to 4, including 4 bis, for Decision 34 COM 7A.29? I have none, so paragraphs 1 to 4 including 4 bis are adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5: I will read it paragraph per paragraph so we can include all amendments. The chapeau paragraph reads:

The Chairperson *[interrupting the rapporteur]*:

“I am sorry to interrupt but I would like to ask the Brazilian Delegation if they have a text ready for paragraph 6 and if so to give it to the rapporteur.”

Brazil:

“Regarding paragraph 6, we have a proposal of alternative drafting and it would read as follows in English”.

The Chairperson:

“In that case could you give it to the rapporteur while she is talking about paragraph 5?”

Brazil:

“You would like me to forward the amendment in writing? I shall do so.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Paragraph 5, the chapeau, a and b remain unchanged, c has an amendment from Mexico and would read in its new version:

c) Finalize the process for establishing adequate regulatory measures in the buffer zone.”

The Chairperson:

“Any objections regarding paragraph 5a, b which remain unchanged and an amended c? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you, Chair. Not necessarily an objection. I am just reading and seeking a clarification, as the proposed change appears to remove the requirement for the State Party to define the Buffer Zone and rather than just say *ensure protection in the buffer zone* what is not clear to me is this: have there been some changes, so that the buffer zone is clearly defined and therefore there is no requirement for this, or is it a suggestion that the Party no longer needs to define the buffer zone? If it was the second one, we would have a concern that we were removing the requirement to define the buffer zone.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to ask the Delegation of Mexico if they have any further information on the point raised by the Australian Delegation and will ask the Secretariat for comment.”

Mexico:

“First of all, after my intervention, I would like to know if it is possible to give the floor to the State Party so that they can provide more information, but I would like to answer the concern expressed by the distinguished representative of Australia. We understand that the buffer zone has already been defined by the State Party and this is why we suggested clarifying this point through this amendment, although it might be appropriate to listen to the voice of the State Party. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. **Before** I give the floor to the State Party, I would like to ask the Secretariat if we have the right to ask the State Party to intervene during the adoption procedure.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you, Chair. In fact, it is stated in the current issued text of the State of Conservation that the buffer zone is clearly defined, but the State party, the *Consejo de Monumentos Nacionales*, in close relationship with the Museum, has established a new relationship with private owners as well as with the Ministry of Territorial Planning in order to enlarge the buffer zone. That’s why we include it in the text. The finalisation, which means according to the discussions: *defined the buffer zone of the Hulla*. It is my understanding that in fact there is a very positive answer from the stakeholders and that the State Party is going to gain more place for the buffer zone which is important to the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Values of the site as stated in the report.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. now I turn to the legal advisor.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you. I think there would be no objection from the State Party to answer a point of information if that point of information on this issue is requested.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The representative of the concerned State Party is in the room. You have the floor, Sir.”

Chile:

“Thank you. I would like to add that the buffer zone has been defined and during the past three weeks the government of Chile has given a further concession to the museum of 1.4 hectares, so as to have an extended buffer zone. It is a policy of our government to make sure we guarantee the sustainability of the site. At the same time, 15 projects have been presented and this is going to make it possible to apply them. As mentioned in the previous meeting, we have modified the bypass route, so as to really make progress at this site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Is the Australian Delegation satisfied or do you still object to paragraph c? Please take the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. From what I understood from the explanation, it seems like the buffer zone has been defined, in which case the amendments would be acceptable. I would almost like to ask for the Secretariat’s advice: if it is clear that the buffer zone is defined then in this case the amendment proposed for Mexico would be satisfactory to us.”

The Secretariat:

“I think it is perfectly acceptable, since we would need in the case that the buffer zone were to be revised, accurate mapping and there is a four-month procedure for doing that. So, it is perfectly possible to accept the amendment in accordance with the agreement established with ICOMOS and the World heritage Centre.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Rapporteur, could you please repeat paragraph c?”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph c as proposed by Mexico reads:

c) Finalise the process for establishing adequate regulatory measures in the buffer zone”.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. If there are no objections regarding paragraph 5 including a, b, c, then this paragraph is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph d has a replacement text suggested by Mexico which replaces the initial text. It reads:

d) Consider strengthening the mitigation measures in order to avoid any potential impacts of the new trace for the bypass of Route A-16 on the Santa Laura area.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. If there are no objections regarding paragraph 5 including d, I see none, then d in this paragraph is adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“e) remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 5 including e? I see none. Then e in this paragraph is adopted. Paragraph 5 in its entirety has been adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6: I have received an amendment by Brazil which deletes a small part of the paragraph and it would now read:

6. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a proposal for the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

The part that has been deleted is the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Values.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 6 as amended by Brazil? I see none, so paragraph 6 adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“The following paragraphs, 7, 8 and 9, remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 7, 8, and 9? I see none, so paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 are adopted and the Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.29 in its entirety from paragraph 1 to 9 also adopted.

The floor is now to the Secretariat for the next item in this region. Thank you.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. The State of Conservation of **Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in Peru:** The fragile State of Conservation of the earthen structure and decorated surfaces, the impact of the El Nino phenomenon and the insufficient capacity to implement conservation measures were issues that were taken into account when the Committee decided to refer the property to the World Heritage in Danger List at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1986.

It has been 24 years since the Chan Chan archaeological area has been inscribed on the World Heritage List without any solution of continuity. The State Party has implemented a programme of corrective measures in order to address the threats being faced and also to deal with the conservation issues affecting the physical fabric of the property. These include maintenance of drains and control of the water table, stabilisation of perimeter walls and main palaces and general maintenance activities to control vegetation growth and improved the presentation of the site.

Draft regulations of the application of the law 28200QC1 have still not been finalised. These measures are critical in addressing the illegal removal of cultural goods and illegal occupation of the property. These regulations have been pending for at least eight years and are considered essential actions to be carried out in the context of corrective measures set out in 2007. The buffer zone has been revised and integrated with planning tools at the municipal level. Land use planning in relation with the buffer zone is also being reviewed for implementation to control urban sprawl. But since regulations have not been approved or put into force, land use of the surrounding area cannot be controlled, and subsequently the official delineation of the buffer zone has not yet been submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre.

The Draft Decision can be viewed on page 67 of the English and 60 of the French versions of document 7A. The State Party is in the room and ICOMOS would like to add some comments.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS has noticed progress that has been made since the last reactive monitoring mission in 2007. We recognise that sustained action has been taken on the property towards the right direction in implementing the corrective measures. ICOMOS has also reviewed the Statement of Outstanding Universal Values that was submitted by the State Party and considers this has an essential tool to further guide decision making.

While noting the improvement that has been made in the State of Conservation, we remain concerned about the vulnerability to various factors, including what was mentioned by my colleague before, and the one remaining item where limited progress has been made: the enforcement of regulatory and legislative measures to provide appropriate long-term protection.

ICOMOS considers that a reactive monitoring mission is warranted at this stage to assess the progress that has been made on the property after having been on the World Heritage List in Danger for over 20 years. It is time to revised corrective measures and define the desired State of Conservation of the property and to evaluate whether conditions have been met for removal of the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is open for comments or questions. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, Chair. I would like to thank the Secretariat for the quality of the document that was sent to us and for the report presented by the secretariat with a wealth of information on the inscription of the site on the in Danger List. We should also understand the particularly difficult conditions that the site finds itself in and the quality of the land around it. Also to be mentioned are the difficult weather conditions affected by El Nino.

This means that this site faces difficulties. We would like to stress the part of the report that deals with the identified corrective measures. This seems to us very encouraging on the part of the member State and we would also like to praise and underline the importance of the programme for implementing these corrective measures.

We believe that the State Party is making an effort in the sense of correcting the problems. I would also like to highlight that there has not been extra budgetary contribution according to the report, and if that had happened it would have encouraged the State Party. The importance of the ICOMOS and ICCROM mission that visited the site in 2007 is also noteworthy. Mr Chairman, I would like, if possible, to ask the State Party involved to comment on the report. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. The floor is now to the State Party concerned for comments. Also, just a confirmation before Peru starts speaking—I had trouble with the interpretation—did Brazil ask for Peru to take the floor? Ok, thank you. Please, Madame.”

Peru:

“Thank you Mr. President. I think it was said before in the report that implementation of the Management Plan has continued in a positive way in Chan Chan. Funding is being allocated to the Management Unit. The World Heritage centre recognises and appreciates the progress made towards mitigating the impact of different factors for the conservation of the physical fabric of the site.

We do have to recognise that legislative and regulatory frameworks have taken a long time. But in this regard, I would like to announce the recent creation of the Ministry of Culture, which is an important step towards direct managing and solving of issues like the one mentioned before, and in due time I am sure that we will be able to invite a joint monitoring mission to the site of Chan Chan.

Having said this, my Delegation finds excessive the terms expressed when saying “*strong concern*” in the draft. Yet, thank you to ICOMOS for the report and we hope for your understanding. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madame. We have an amendment coming from a member of the Committee which is in line with what you just said. I am now giving the floor to the Secretariat for more explanation.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre expressed strong concerns since it is not possible to take into account and to try to apply and to finalise some important issues according to the corrective measures, without having the proper legislative system. That is why it is important to go ahead with the application for all the policies to try to answer the past 20 years of concerns and to rebuild the situation at the place.

That is why we consider that without having an important and solid legislative framework, it is not possible for the State Party to finalise and positively address all the tasks pending according to the corrective measures established during the last mission. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for this information Secretariat. I do not think there are any further requests for the floor. Let’s start then with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.30, and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Draft Decision 7A.30 can be found on page 67 in the English and 69 of the French version of Document 7A. I have received one amendment by the Delegation of Mexico which concerns paragraph 4 of the existing Decision. The amendment suggests replacing the beginning of the paragraph. It now reads:

4. *Expresses its concern*—instead of *strong concern*, the proposal is to leave the word *strong*—*that the development* and so on. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.30 with the amendment proposed by Mexico? I see none, so Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.30 is adopted in its entirety, including paragraphs 1 to 8.

Let’s move on to the last site for this region, and I give the floor to the Secretariat, Ms. Sanz.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. The State of conservation of **Coro and its port, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**. The concern regarding this property lies in the fact that there has been no submission of any Conservation Report in the last two years. The property was previously inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2005 due to a series of degradations of materials and earthen structures as a result of torrential rainfall and the lack of an adequate Conservation and Management Plan to fight decay.

On 20 July, 2010, the State Party sent an information letter to communicate the decision of the Government of Venezuela to establish a new system and management structure for the property. As members of the Committee may remember, the Management Plan awaited approval for several years and then was finally considered unsuitable according to the new constitutional text of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Organic Law of the public administration.

The new legal framework of Venezuela threatens the participatory character of all public measures taken, which indicates the central role of the communal Council in the planning process. In April, a Management Plan was submitted for the approval of the Ministry of Economy and Finance and the Ministry of Planning and Development and then to the Vice-President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for final approval before entering into force.

The new management structure referred to as Management Commitment will take the place of the former Management Unit of the property. When approved, this Management Plan will enter into force for, according to the State Party, ten years of sustainable and appropriate funding support. The revised Draft Decision has been distributed to the members of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party is in the room and ICOMOS wishes to make some comments. Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS takes note of the information provided by the State Party in the letter sent in July 2010 and welcomes this information about the actions to be implemented regarding the management arrangements for the property. While we welcome the steps taken, we would like to underscore the point made by the reactive monitoring mission in 2008, which is the importance of defining a clear conservation policy to ensure the definition of intervention criteria, methodologies of intervention and monitoring mechanisms that are required for effective and adequate implementation.

We would like to reiterate the importance of developing the Statement of Outstanding Universal Values and welcome the opportunity to carry out a reactive monitoring mission to the property to evaluate the progress in implementing the corrective measures and to assist the State Party to finalise the Statement of Outstanding Universal Values.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open for comments from the State Party. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We have two brief observations. First of all, we heard from the State Party that they have finished preparing a Plan that has been adopted by the community and this is a quite complex process and we would like the State Party to add to this information.

The second observation: we would like to know why the Secretariat has changed the Draft Decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the Secretariat to reply.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chairperson. As I have said in my previous intervention, we have taken into account all the details submitted by the State Party on 20 July and have added and corrected information accordingly. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. If there are no further comments from the floor, I will ask the rapporteur to start with the reading of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.31 that has been distributed to you.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much chairperson. The revised Draft Decision 7A.31 is in front of you in this blue paper. Excuse me, but it seems Mexico is asking for the floor.”

The Chairperson:

“Mexico, you may, Sir.”

Mexico:

“Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to repeat that it is important that the State Party provides more information. I am requesting you, Sir, to give the floor to the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Mexico. Brazil, you asked for the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. Mr. Chair, I was going in the same direction as Mexico: I ask the State Party for clarification. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I will ask then the representative of the State Party to give more information, as requested by Mexico and Brazil. Is there a representative of the State Party in the room? It seems that the representative of the Member State is not in the room. Mexico and Brazil, would you agree to go further with the examination of the Draft Decision? Yes, thank you. Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned, the revised Draft Decision by the Secretariat has been distributed in both languages and should be in front of you in the form of a blue paper indicated as 34 COM.7A.31.Rev. I will read through the Decision completely:

The World Heritage Committee,

- 1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7A.Add,*
- 2. Recalling Decision 33 COM 7A.30, adopted at its 33^d session (Seville, 2009),*
- 3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit the required state of conservation report for the second consecutive year in spite of the requests made by the World Heritage Committee;*
- 4. Takes note of the letter sent to the World Heritage Centre on 20 July 2010 informing of the decision to set up a new management structure, in full coherence with the National Constitution and the current Organic Law of Public Administration;*
- 5. Urges the State Party to establish the appropriate communication channels to answer in time the information requested by the World Heritage Committee to ensure the proper protection and monitoring of the site in the future.*
- 6. Requests the Stet Party to inform the State Party of the official approval of the new management tool by the Ministry of Popular Power for the Economy and Finances, the Ministry of Popular Power for Planning and development and the Vice President of the*

Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and subsequently submit the new management plan and the related actions to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;

7. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures to achieve the Desired State of Conservation, and to collaborate with the State Party in finalizing the property's Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;

8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011;

9. Decides to retain Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.31REV paragraphs 1 to 9?”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Just two points regarding that Decision. Australia believes that the wording of paragraph 5 is inappropriate in the time. It does sort of mean that the Committee is lecturing the State Party and we believe the concept of responding in time is already captured by paragraph 3, which expresses regrets that things have not happened. Australia would suggest we actually delete paragraph 5.

In addition, in paragraph 6, I am not sure it is appropriate for the Committee to spell out who are the appropriate authorities within the State Party. We believe that rather than listing out *The Ministry for Popular Power* and etc., it should be replaced by the *relevant authorities* and delete the references to the particular ones, as this is a matter for the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. Barbados would like to support the perspective offered by Australia in terms of the tone of these two paragraphs and I think if we could make those adjustments, as it would be a more appropriate text than the one we have at the moment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding deleting paragraph 5? I see none, so we can adopt paragraph 1 to 4. Any objections? I see none, so paragraph 1 to 4 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.31.REV adopted.

Now we are going to delete paragraph 5 and I will ask the rapporteur to read out former paragraph 6, now new 5.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6 indeed becomes paragraph 5 and I read the new text that incorporates the Australian amendment:

5. Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Committee of the official approval of the new management tool by the relevant authorities, and subsequently submit the new management plan and the related measures to the World Heritage Centre and the ICOMOS.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 5? I see none, so paragraph 5 is adopted. Paragraph 7 becomes 6, paragraph 8 becomes 7 and 9 becomes 8. Any objections regarding these paragraphs? I see none, so paragraphs 6 to 8 are adopted and **Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.31.Rev** has been adopted in its entirety from paragraphs 1 to 8. Thank you.

Let's move to another topic regarding natural properties. Brazil, you have the floor, as you are asking for it.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that, since this was raised when we talked about Latin American and Caribbean countries, the Brazilian Delegation would like to express its gratefulness to the centre and those in charge of the Latin America/ Caribbean region. We have felt Mr. Chairman that there has been a great improvement in the reports for the past two years in terms of the amount of information, the proposals, and referrals. Thereby, I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Bandarin and to the staff who have helped us greatly, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Brazil. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you, Chair. **We** too would like to fully endorse what Brazil has said. We believe that the improvements that we are seeing in Latin America and the Caribbean speak for themselves and we cannot but express our gratitude for all the efforts that have been undertaken and express our congratulations. After all, we are on Brazilian land, so it is only fitting that we should endorse that statement. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. We are moving to the natural properties inscribed on the List of the World in Danger and I would like to invite Mr. Guy Debonnet from the World Heritage Centre to present the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in Africa.”

NATURAL HERITAGE

AFRICA

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. The first property is the **Manovo Gounda St Floris National Park (Central African Republic)**. The Committee would recall that the reactive monitoring mission visited the property in 2008 and concluded that a long period of insecurity had negatively impacted on the values and integrity of the property and that without urgent action, the degradation risks becoming irreversible and may lead to the loss of Universal Outstanding Values. The mission proposed to develop a new emergency Action Plan concentrating on protecting the essential values of the property in a reduced area.

As mentioned in the working document, it has not yet been possible to carry out the workshop that was proposed by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to develop Action Plan before this session. It is hoped that this meeting can now be organised by the end of September. However, on the occasion of a recent mission of a team of the UNESCO Yaoundé Office to the Central African Republic in June, meetings were held with the Minister for Environment, the Wildlife Direction of the Ministry and the EU funded ECOFACT projects.

The mission team was informed that a new EU project, ECOFAUNE, would develop a management plan for the entire North Eastern African Republic, a region of 80,000 km². The project, with an expected budget of 4 million Euros, will focus mainly on the hunting areas at the southern boundary of the property but would also monitor activities to secure the southern part of the property. However, no efforts are foreseen for the Northern part as this area now seems permanently colonised by cattle.

A second regional EU-funded project is also under preparation, which will seek to address the transboundary problem in the Northern Chad and Northern Central African Republic area, but it is not yet clear which activities are foreseen. The Minister also ensured the UNESCO Delegation that the ECOFAUNE project will support conservation of the property and suggested further consultations between the project, UNESCO and IUCN. The proposed workshop could be a good opportunity to do this.

The working document also provides some information on a meeting that was organized by the World Heritage Centre in April 2010 with the Ambassador of the Central African Republic to discuss the organisation of the High level meeting requested by the Committee at its 33rd session with the authorities of Central African Republic, Chad and Sudan. The Ambassador promised to follow up on this issue with his counterparts from Sudan and Chad, and with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. So far, no further feedback has been received from the Central African Republic.

In view of the continuous threats to the Outstanding Universal Values, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the reinforced monitoring mechanism should continue to be applied to this property. IUCN has also a comment.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. IUCN also notes the new information on the EU ECOFAUNE project as described by the Centre. While any conservation support for this site is welcomed, the scope of this project seems too broad to meet the emergency plan that was recommended. There is a need to urgently focus conservation efforts in a small area within the park that can be protected now in order to ensure that the minimum amount of wildlife is kept in place within the property.

IUCN considers it is desirable to influence this project to reinforce recovery strategy focus on a small, manageable area. With our director general here present, we also would like to note our commitment to participate in the high-level meeting when it is arranged. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now open to questions or comments on this site. Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. We are really facing a serious situation. According to the report, it seems that the State Party is trying to improve the situation. However, I have read in the report that the main threats led to losing around 80 percent of wildlife. We are very concerned about the Outstanding Universal Value in this case. I would raise this issue with the Advisory Bodies and to the State Party if they are present in this room, so they may give us their opinion about this situation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank **you**. Are there any representatives of the Central African Republic in the room? No, so I will give the floor to the Secretariat to reply.”

The Secretariat:

“This is really an issue that was examined during the last mission to the property and we certainly recognise the very critical situation which the distinguished delegate from Bahrain outlined. The observation from the last mission was that there is certainly potential for restoration and therefore potential for the Outstanding Universal Values of this property to recover. In those circumstances we did not feel that the Outstanding Universal Values have been lost, but it is clearly a very critical and urgent matter, which is why the tone of the Decision remains as it is. I hope that answers the question of the delegate.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any further comments? I see none, so I suggest that we examine Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.1. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. You will find the Draft Decision on page 5 of the English and French versions of document 7A.ad, and I have not received any draft amendments so the Decision stays as it stands.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.1 paragraphs 1 to 12? I see none. So Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.1 is adopted.

Let’s move to the next property from Côte d’Ivoire. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. The next site is **Comoé National Park (Cote d’Ivoire)**. Unfortunately we did not receive a State of Conservation Report on this property, which makes it difficult to assess it. The working document provides an assessment based on reports received by IUCN from its network of experts. The report states that due to security concerns and the continued presence of militias, the presence of the National Park Authorities remain limited and there is little effective control or patrolling.

Results from survey work by the Wild Chimpanzee Foundation in June 2009 also indicate a high incidence of poaching, deforestation and agricultural encroachment across the whole property. No new information has been received from the State Party on the three mining exploration licences, which according to the 2008 report provided by the State Party, have been granted and cover part of the property.

In early July the protected area authority was awarded a US\$30,000 grant from the World Heritage Centre Rapid Response Facility. Funding will be used to assess the state of poaching and to try to address the threats through the reinforcement of the authority of the State Party in the Park. This will be achieved through the use of guards removing illegally established poaching camps and bringing the poachers to justice. It is hoped that it will be possible to reduce the incursion of poachers and start halting the spread of agriculture and livestock in the property, and the funding is also a vital bridging grant before funding becomes available from the Global Environmental Facility, as the project has been approved and is on its way for implementation later this year.

The Draft Decision can be found on page 9 of the working document and IUCN has no comment on this site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open for comments. Bahrain, you have it.”

Bahrain:

“We read the report very carefully and we felt very comfortable talking about the survey in 2009, which indicated that the population is still in good status. This is very encouraging news in that regard. However, we would like to hear from the State Party if they are present in the room on two specific issues: the control of the Park and its status, as there is a dispute regarding this issue in the present and previous reports. Second: has the World Bank Protected Area Project taken place to improve the management problem? Thank you very much Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any further requests? Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you very much Sir. Nigeria would like to associate itself with the comments made by Bahrain. Given the seriousness of the situation and the lack of information from the State Party, we would like to invite the State Party of Cote d'Ivoire, if they are present in the room, to provide additional information, especially on the issue of mining licences, which is critical to the integrity of the site. So, Mr. Chairman, we would like the State Party to make contributions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Is the representative of Cote d'Ivoire in the room? Yes, the floor is yours Sir.”

Côte d'Ivoire:

« Merci, je suis le Directeur général de l'Office national des parcs et réserves de Côte d'Ivoire. En ce qui concerne les mesures correctives, le problème est certainement lié à un manque de financement, mais ce qui est plus important c'est la volonté gouvernementale. Dieu merci depuis le mois de mai, le premier ministre a décidé de mettre en place un programme d'urgence sur six mois afin de faciliter le Projet FEM administré par la Banque Mondiale concernant le problème de permis d'exploration des mines.

Je suis membre de la Commission des impacts environnementaux au niveau de la Côte d'Ivoire et dans ce cadre, au niveau de la Comoé, aucune licence d'exploration n'a été délivrée dans le parc de la Comoé. Peut-être que c'est dans les environs, mais cela n'a rien à voir avec le parc de la Comoé.

Autres informations : avec l'IUCN, en appui avec la Banque Mondiale, nous avons formé des commandos qui vont être en place début août avec le programme du gouvernement. Je crois que c'était le seul problème, la gestion des ex-rebelles, mais une solution a été trouvée par le gouvernement. Je pense donc que d'ici 2011, le bien pourra être retiré de la Liste des biens en péril ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Côte d'Ivoire. Est-ce que le représentant du Secrétariat ou d'IUCN souhaiterait apporter des précisions ou faire un commentaire ? »

The Secretariat:

“We note that the information for the mining concessions comes from the 2008 report, so if that information is not correct, we would like to request the State Party to provide with the correct information. Secondly, we are aware of these anti-poaching activities, as the grant from the response facility will also support these activities, so we hope that this can bring some improvement in the situation by next year. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN would you like the floor? No, Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie l'IUCN pour son brillant exposé et au passage son représentant a parlé d'un problème extrêmement intéressant, le braconnage, qui est un handicap majeur. N'oubliez pas que nous avons à faire à un pays qui vient de sortir d'une rébellion, il y règne l'insécurité. Je souhaiterais savoir de l'État partie quelles sont les mesures prises contre le braconnage et également savoir si la conservation du site s'est améliorée, merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Représentant de la Côte d'Ivoire, vous avez la parole ».

Côte d'Ivoire:

« Merci. En ce qui concerne le braconnage, nous avons formé au niveau gouvernemental 50 commandos distribués en équipes. On en compte cinq autour du parc de la Comoé, et pour des raisons stratégiques nous sommes d'abord partis du sud, et ils ont avancé sur trois secteurs cette année. En plus, pour faciliter nos actions, le gouvernement, début août, a mis 200 millions de Francs CFA à notre disposition pour que nous mettions en œuvre un programme d'urgence qui consisterait à faire des patrouilles mixtes (rebelles, ex-rebelles avec les forces gouvernementales). Je pense que c'est déjà un grand progrès depuis le début de la crise en Côte d'Ivoire ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, s'il n'y a pas d'autres demandes, je proposerais que nous passions à la Décision. Je passe la parole au rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Draft Decision can be found on page 9 of the English and page 9 of the French version in Document 7A.add. I have received no amendments so we consider the Draft Decision that is included in the Document.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.2, including paragraphs 1 to 11? I see none, so Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.2, including paragraphs 1 to 11, is adopted.

Thank you very much. I would like to adjourn our session until tomorrow morning, all members agreed. Thank you, good night, see you tomorrow morning.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the evening session of 27 July, 2010

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

SIXTH MEETING

Morning session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
M. Mohamed El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

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

The Chairperson:

“Good morning everyone. I hope you had a restful evening and I think we can congratulate ourselves, as we are making great progress. Now I hand over the floor to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I would like to remind the Committee of something we already informed the Bureau of, which is today’s work of the working groups. Today is a special day, because there are many, many events and side events, so I would like to draw your attention on the way we are going to organise the work of the working groups.

There are three of them; the one on the Operational Guidelines already met this morning from 8:30am until 9:30am in the Bureau room. The second, on the Future of the *Convention* will meet today from 2:00pm until 3:00pm. We have to move this group to the Plenary, as we have another event taking the usual room.

Today, the Future of the *Convention* working Group—please for those who attend—remember that it starts at 2pm in this room. The third Working Group on the Budget will meet from 1pm until 2pm in room E, which is a meeting room on the ground floor, just in front of the Bureau meeting room. This meeting room has no facility for interpretation and, as we have announced previously, this working group will not benefit from it.

Today, we also have side events, let me remind you for one on the activities of UNESCO for Haiti, there will be members of the Haitian institution attending this meeting. They will present the results of the ICC (International Coordination Committee) that was held in Paris recently, and also the results of a mission that took place just a week ago in Haiti. It will be held from 1:15pm until 3pm in the Bureau meeting room downstairs, which is the reason why the other group cannot meet there. We have another side event on *The World Heritage of Portuguese origin* from 1:30pm until 2:30pm in room F, which is located in front of the Bureau meeting room.

I would also like to inform the Committee on a couple of things that we have discussed at the Bureau. We have been requested to anticipate the discussion on item 7A regarding the site of Manas in India, as the Indian representative has to leave, so he asked us kindly, if we could brought this item forward on the agenda. With your permission, this will be moved to the top of the list and we will start with this item when we resume proceedings.

Secondly, there is a proposal to give the floor, for a short presentation, to Ms. Watson-Wright, who is our ADG for the International Oceanographic Commission. She is here with us, sitting on the podium on your left and she would like to give a short presentation on the way UNESCO's sector cooperates for World Heritage conservation. Thank you chair."

The Chairperson:

"The floor is to Ms. Watson-Wright."

Ms. Watson-Wright:

"Thank you very much Francesco and Mr. Chair. Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very pleased to be here with you and to speak to you. World Heritage, the very word evokes the global nature of the mission to protect the highest quality and most iconic natural and cultural sites for future generations.

A glance at the world map shows how strikingly blue our planet is: More than 70 percent of the globe is ocean; over 95 percent of wildlife on earth lives in the Ocean. The Pacific Ocean alone covers about half the surface of the world. Yet, today, the World Heritage *Convention* protects only 49 outstanding places in the Oceans over a total of 890 World Heritage sites. This World Heritage Committee session will decide the heritage status of two of the largest, most pristine ocean places on our planet: Phoenix Island in Kiribati and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument site in Hawaii.

Nomination of these sites is a significant step towards increasing the area of ocean designated as World Heritage. UNESCO's intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) is one of the leading organisations in researching and protecting the Ocean, primarily through fostering international cooperation among Ocean institutions worldwide. This year, IOC, like Brasilia, is celebrating its 50th anniversary.

The core mission of IOC concentrates on both marine scientific research and data collection designed to better understand the ocean, and development of management guidance for governments worldwide that can facilitate your task in protecting ocean resources. IOC is a key resource in providing guidance for States through the design of Marine Special Planning, a new tool that allows both conservation of core ocean values and sustainable development, to meet people's social and economic needs. Marine Special Planning has been applied successfully in many countries around the world and was last week adopted by the USA, as its new model for integrating an eco-system based ocean management.

Over the past months, IOC and the World Heritage Marine Programme have strengthened their cooperation and identified a number of specific initiatives that will help bring IOC's expertise to you, to the State Parties and Marine heritage site managers around the world. Through our International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange Centre, in Belgium, IOC will help the World Heritage Marine Programme with scientific advice toward identifying new marine areas of potential Outstanding Universal Values, particularly in under or not represented areas such as Africa, the Indian Ocean and the Middle-East region.

IOC will also provide our expertise and marine special planning and eco-system based management for a new resource guide aimed at improving management in marine World Heritage sites. An initiative which is going to be started this fall, in 2010, and which will be coordinated by the World Heritage Marine Programme.

Additionally, IOC will contribute to the first Marine World Heritage Site Managers' Meeting, which is currently being planned by the Marine World Heritage Programme. The meeting will provide a platform for Marine World Heritage site managers to share information and management success stories. It will also provide site managers with the opportunity to discuss knowledge gaps with a number of leading marine scientist and practitioners. IOC is taking an active role in this effort, not only by providing financial support to the meeting, but also by providing knowledge and expertise that will help to ensure Marine World Heritage site managers will have access to the best available marine science and expertise.

Mr. Chair, I thank you again for giving me the opportunity to speak this morning and I wish you all a very successful meeting here in beautiful Brasilia. *Obrigada.*"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. As mentioned in the opening allocution of Mr. Francesco Bandarin, we are now going to review the site of Manas in India, which will be presented by Mr. Guy Debonnet."

NATURAL HERITAGE

ASIA PACIFIC

The Secretariat:

"Thank you Mr. Chair; the next site is the **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in India**. The report by the State Party was only received on 31 May, after the finalisation of the working document. Furthermore, the State Party submitted a new updated version of this report on 21 July. These late submissions of report make it difficult for the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to assess in detail the information provided.

The report mentions substantial progress in the implementation of the corrective measures, and it also provides some data on wildlife population; unfortunately, not the data on population trends which was requested by the Committee. I want to recall that the Committee at previous sessions decided that a clear trend demonstrating the recovery of wildlife populations was important for this site to be removed form the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN, in the margin of this session, had a meeting with the Indian Delegation to clarify which data is needed to demonstrate the recovery. Based on the report and on the discussions with the Indian Delegation, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN proposed a revised Draft Decision requesting a monitoring mission to the property, to assess the implementation of the corrective measures and review, with the State Party, the available monitoring data in order to assess if the wildlife population has recovered sufficiently, to allow for the site to be removed from the World Heritage List in Danger at its 35th session.

The revised Draft Decision was distributed yesterday on a blue paper. IUCN wants to make a comment."

IUCN:

"IUCN notes that it is important to recall the Committee's clear position that an upper trend in the populations of key wildlife species needs to be demonstrated to be the basis of the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Although

there has not been sufficient time to fully evaluate the information provided by the State Party, especially in the report submitted on 21 July, IUCN notes that it does indicate some further evidence of the early stages of recovery. Additional information is needed on a range of key species and IUCN is ready to provide additional information and support to the State Party in this regard.

IUCN recommends with the Centre that the Committee considers fielding a reactive monitoring mission to the property in order to assess the result of wildlife surveys that are planned for 2010-2011 and which include an important tiger survey. The mission will be able to recommend whether the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger could be envisaged at the 35th session of the Committee. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open. Representative of Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much. We have seen for the past three years very promising and encouraging results regarding this property. I do agree with the Advisory Bodies with their consultation to the State Party that some elements related to the key wildlife animal list need to be confirmed. However, we have received some of the latest results of the survey which are very promising in that direction.

Bahrain would also like to express our pleasure in seeing a good cooperation between the Park Authorities and NGOs in conducting the survey for the monitoring database. We have learnt that encouraging results have been found, which we received yesterday from the State Party present in this room. We hope that at the Bahrain meeting, this site will be removed from the List in Danger and we would like to hear the response from the State Party, especially regarding key species in the Park. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you. Australia welcomes the progress that has been reported by the State Party and in particular the progress in implementing corrective measures and also the promising signs of recovery of the wildlife population in the Park. Australia would therefore like that the Decision could reflect an encouraging tone to the State Party by welcoming the progress, so we have submitted a very minor revision to the Draft Decision to do so.

And, also, we want to make it clear that this Committee wants to encourage Parties to move towards removal from the *in Danger* List. We have suggested that in addition to the suggestion in the current text having the Advisory Bodies advice on consideration of removal of the property, we also included some language stating that when the World Heritage considers it, we consider it with a view to remove the property from the List. We believe this to be consistent with the proposed Draft Decision.

Australia proposes this merely because we believe the Committee should be encouraging State Parties whenever is possible to move forwards in a positive way.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to India.”

India:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Since India is taking the floor for the first time, the Indian Delegation would like to thank UNESCO for hosting this session and the government of Brazil and the people of Brasilia for an excellent hospitality.

Mr. Chairman, as you are kindly aware, the prolonged insurgency and ethnic agitation in the Manas region and in the State has caused severe devastation to the Park's infrastructures and depleted the forest cover and wildlife population. But these are past issues. Now, with peace quickly spreading in the region, the Park's infrastructure has been reconstructed and controlled, and there is an upward trend in wildlife populations, which is reflected in the census conducted in 2008. The census also provides benchmarks and wildlife data for future reference and for further assessment of the increasing trend.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add here that 42 camps have been set up in the Park with full infrastructural facilities and the problem for the Park management has been resolved by the creation of the National Tiger Foundation. I have been given notes on the increasing trend of the wildlife population which I would like to share with the World heritage Committee.

As far as the census of tigers is concerned, we have done a comprehensive census of the tiger population during the current year. I would like to inform that a comprehensive management plan has been put in place and the government has decided to add an area of 300km² to the existing area of 500km² enlarging it to 800km². We have recently finalised the Outstanding Universal Values of the property with a workshop conducted by the Wildlife Institute of India in Dehradun, which is the largest such institute in the region.

Mr. Chairman I would like to conclude by saying that this property, Manas National Park, has five different conservation values: a National Park, a World Heritage site, a Tiger National Reserve, an Elephant Reserve and a Man and Biosphere Reserve. The State Party will strongly argue for deletion of the Property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this additional information. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil (English translation):

“Thank you Chair, the delegate of Brazil would like to acknowledge the effort made by the State Party with respect to the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary, particularly when it comes to the creation of an institution devoted to ensuring future development of the sanctuary and that it remains part of our World Heritage.”

The Chairperson:

“China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Chair. I was asking for the floor to give the opportunity to the State Party of India for their explanation regarding what they have done recently for the improvement of the site, but as this opportunity was given to them, I have no further requirements. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is there any other Delegation which would like to take the floor? The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. You have a revised Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.12REV, which has been distributed this morning. Compared to the initial Draft Decision that was included in your document 7A.ad, paragraphs 3, 5 and 6 have been deleted and replaced by a new text.

I have further received an amendment by Australia to the revised Draft Decision. It concerns paragraphs 3 and 7. I will read these paragraphs to you as they are amended to the version found on the blue paper. In paragraph 3 the amendment only concerns the verb at the very beginning of the paragraph and Australia amends:

3. Welcomes the State Party's report which mentions important progress in the implementation of the corrective measures and also provides some data on wildlife populations but not on population trends as requested by the Committee and regrets that the very late submission of the state of conservation report did not allow a proper assessment of the data by IUCN;

So the only thing that has changed is the verb at the beginning: *Notes* was changed to *Welcomes*. In paragraph 7, which remains unchanged from the original Draft Decision, the amendment of Australia suggests adding at the end of the paragraph:

Following World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011,—and then—with a view to considering the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

I repeat again: *Following World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, with a view to considering the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.*

Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any observations regarding the amendment submitted by Australia? There are none, so we can consider the Draft Decision approved.

Let’s now go back to the scheduled agenda regarding the National Park of Virunga in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and I would like to give the floor to Mr. Guy Debonnet on this site... I beg your pardon we are going to listen on the Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d’Ivoire and Guinea). Mr. Debonnet, please.”

NATURAL HERITAGE

AFRICA

The Secretariat:

“Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve in Côte d’Ivoire and Guinea: A report was received from the State Party of Guinea on 22 January and from the State Party of Côte d’Ivoire in April. The reports showed only limited progress in the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee, partly due to the continued insecurity in the Côte d’Ivoire part of the property and to the difficult political situation in Guinea. This has also led to some delay in the mining project on the Guinean side.

So far, no assurance has been received from the State Party of Côte d’Ivoire that all mining concessions within the property have been revoked, as was requested by previous sessions of the Committee. No additional information has been received on this property since the preparation of the working document, so all the information is in it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would any delegates like to take the floor? Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous sommes totalement d’accord avec le projet de Décision, nous aimerions pour une meilleure lecture des Décisions, faire une remarque générale de ne pas utiliser des acronymes seulement dans les Décisions, car cela ne facilite pas la lecture. Donc, nous demandons au Secrétariat et aux Organisations consultatives de mettre les mots en entier et non seulement les abréviations. Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Secretariat, would you like to reply?”

The Secretariat:

“Agreed. We will make the changes together with the rapporteur.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is now to the representative of Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie le Secrétariat du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour la tâche accomplie et je remercie le présentateur de l'IUCN pour sa brillante présentation. Dans son propos, celui-ci a dit que nous avons à faire à une insécurité et une situation politique extrêmement fragile en Guinée. Évidemment, ce contexte politique constitue un handicap dans la mise en œuvre des mesures de conservation. Mais j'aurais souhaité quand même entendre les représentants des deux États parties, s'ils sont là, à ce sujet ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. We believe that there are still some problems in the property. However, there are some improvements which were shown and we can see that the situation is on a positive trend. There is improvement in terms of security. The number of gorillas has increased, which led to the restart of tourism in 2009. This is a very important issue as is the element regarding sharing tours and benefits for the local communities, which according to the report were given around 30 percent of it. This again shows the support of the community regarding sharing tourism activity.

The initiative to replace charcoal is working. Bahrain feels that this type of activity and improvement needs to be acknowledged: That is why we have submitted an amendment to be included in the Draft Decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to comment? The floor is to the rapporteur. Actually, just one moment, as I understand that one of the State Parties would like to take the floor. The floor is to the representative of Côte d'Ivoire.”

Côte d'Ivoire:

« Merci. En réponse aux préoccupations qui ont été soulevées, il faut noter que concernant la volonté gouvernementale de protéger ce patrimoine transfrontalier, le Mont Nimba, les 12 et 13 juillet derniers, les ministres en charge de l'Environnement, des Eaux et forêts et du Développement durable de la Guinée et de la Côte d'Ivoire ont signé une déclaration conjointe. La première était relative à la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui a été transmise au Comité, la deuxième concernait l'harmonisation de la gestion du site, notamment de la forêt de Déré en face de la zone centrale, de la biosphère où il y a en face une zone classée : la forêt de Diabeu. Il y a un progrès, une volonté gouvernementale qu'il faut noter, c'est récent, c'est pour cela que ceci n'est pas noté dans le rapport.

En ce qui concerne l'insécurité, je pense qu'il est prudent que nous restions dans le contexte. Nous sommes un pays en post crise et nous sommes actuellement gérés par

l'Accord de Ouagadougou qui essaie de faciliter les opérations. En s'appuyant sur cet accord l'OIPR qui est en charge de la gestion du Mont Nimba arrive à mener quelques activités. Notamment en 2010, l'OIPR avec la Fondation des Chimpanzés ont effectué un suivi écologique sur le Mont Nimba.

Je pense donc qu'il faut prendre note de ces efforts effectués par les États parties, c'est ce que je souhaiterais apporter comme détail surtout au niveau de la collaboration des deux gouvernements ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this explanation. Bahrain Delegation, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Chair. I just would like to correct a miscommunication. The statement was for Virunga and not for Mount Dimba, sorry.”

The Chairperson:

“Ok, thank you. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I have not received any written amendments to the Draft Decision, but I will continue in French.

Je souhaiterais assurer à la Délégation de la Suisse que nous allons remplacer l'abréviation SMFG par Société des Mines de Fer de la Guinée et EIES par Étude d'Impact Environnemental et Social. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Can we consider the Draft Decision? No objections? Then the Draft Decision is Approved.

The next case is the Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of Congo.”

The Secretariat:

“Excuse me Mr. Chair. Before proceeding with Virunga, we will discuss the general Decision on the Democratic Republic of Congo, which is in report 32 in your 7A.ad document. It is a general report on all the sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo which the Committee has asked for.”

The Chairperson:

“Could I just interrupt you for a minute? I have to give the presidency to the Vice Chair, as I have an engagement.”

The Vice Chair (hereafter referred as The Chairperson):

« On va continuer les travaux de notre Comité, je donne la parole à Monsieur Guy Debonnet pour continuer les travaux et présentations ».

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. As mentioned, we will now review the Report on the Conservation of the **World Heritage properties located in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)**, on the general situation of the properties in DRC, which is presented in document 32 at the end of your document 7A.ad.

The Committee will recall that at its 31st session in Christchurch, it decided to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism to all five DRC properties. The Committee further requested the director general of UNESCO and The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to convene a meeting with the DRC authorities to discuss progress in addressing the deteriorating state of conservation of these properties. In general, the security situation in the eastern DRC has improved since the previous session, following several military operations to dislodge rebel groups. However, pockets of rebels remain active in the regions.

Unfortunately, there are more and more consistent reports on increasing illegal resource exploitation in all of the five sites by elements of the regular Congolese army. The military is involved in: poaching, illegal mining operations, deforestation and charcoal production. These activities have led in several places to violent clashes between the army and Park guards with casualties. In a recent clash at Virunga National Park, two soldiers were killed and one Park guard seriously wounded in a shoot out following the killing of an elephant by the military. The World Heritage Centre also received letters from the International Rangers' Federation and the Secretary of Workers Association in Australia explaining concerns over the situation in DRC, in particular the humanitarian situation of the Park staff and their families, as well as the fate of the wildlife in the sites.

As mentioned in the working document, so far little progress has been made on a number of other threats to the site which involve other ministries, such as illegal activities by soldiers and the different mining and oil exploration concessions which have been granted or are under preparation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore remain convinced that the high-level meeting requested by the Committee at its 31st session remains necessary to create political momentum to address this and other issues.

So far, UNESCO has not yet received a proposal on the days to hold this meeting. However, the director general of UNESCO, on 25 April this year, received the Minister for Environment of DRC. During this meeting, the Minister announced that he will send a representative of the DRC to this session of the Committee to inform the Committee on the status of the meeting. The State Party is in the room and could maybe provide an update on the situation of this meeting.

I also want to point out that in the Draft Decision, the title of the UN Mission in DRC was changed following a new mandate for this Mission: The title is now: United Nations Organization, Stabilization Mission in the DRC, in abbreviation MONUSCO. It will be appropriate to make this change on the Decision. IUCN would like to comment on this report.”

IUCN:

“IUCN welcomes news of the requested high-level meeting to take place in the DRC and would like to confirm IUCN’s own commitment to supporting this event, as requested by the Committee at its 31st Session. We hope that this important meeting will create the urgently needed momentum to address the issues that require stronger national commitment, including tackling illegal exploitation of natural resources within these sites. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would suggest that we proceed with the next item and first site of the Democratic Republic of Congo, but before that there is Draft Decision 34 COM 7A 32. The floor is then to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“It is on page 83 of the English version of 7A.ad document and 87 in the French version.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I have received no amendments to Draft Decision 32 COM.7A 32 but I believe the Secretariat has a slight change of the wording.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you, Chair. It is not to propose a change to the Draft Decision, but just to make a general comment on this item. We obviously, as a Committee, have been watching this closely over the past years, and its scenario of enormous human tragedy, as well as heritage tragedy. We, and I have no doubt other Delegations, have struggled with the issue of what difference in this sort of context World Heritage can make and whether it is appropriate for us to be spending our resources in that area.

I would like to reflect on that and I think in light of the positive news conveyed by the Secretariat and IUCN that it does point to the utility of our continuing efforts on the path of the *Convention* to look at this. I also reflect, in that context, on the external audit report of the Centre, where it was recorded that without the efforts of both IUCN on the ground and the project on Biodiversity in regions of armed conflict that it is quite possible that there would be very little, if any, heritage remaining in this area.

So, I think whilst the threats that remain and are very considerable, it is an area where it does show the utility of the *Convention* continuing to try and pluck away on the ground at protecting the Heritage that does remain in the area. I thereby congratulate IUCN and the Centre for their work on that and, indeed, the State Party for the prospective high level meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia; any other comments? No, so, are there any objections to this Draft Decision? Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“According to a clarification we received by the Secretariat, the name of the organisation MONUC has been changed to MONUSCO, so in paragraph 6 we will accordingly change the name *MONUC* to *MONUSCO*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Any objection regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.7A 32? I see none, so the Draft Decision 32 COM 7A.32, including paragraphs 1 to 7 is adopted. Thank you.

The floor is back to Mr. Guy Debonnet.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We move to the next property, the **Virunga National Park (DRC)**. In January, a new eruption of the Nyamulagira Volcano occurred in the Park and the lava stream destroyed several hectares of forest on its southern flanks. This picture was taken in February when flying over the new volcanic cone shortly after the eruption ended. It is important to remind the Committee that active volcanism is one of the reasons for inscribing this property under criterion (viii).

The security situation in Virunga has improved significantly since the 31st session and Park guards are operating across most of the property. Despite this, several Park guards have been killed in the Park in Park protection operations since the last session. Pockets of FDLR militia from Rwanda and Mai Mai militia are still operating in certain areas of the Park and continue to engage in poaching and charcoal production. I also received a message from the Director of the Park on Monday this week that on Sunday evening another guard was killed by an attack of Mai Mai militiamen on a patrol post in the Park.

The illegal occupation of the Park also remains an important conservation challenge. The picture shows deforestation and installation of agriculture on the western shores of Lake Edward. This occupation is gradually moving south and affecting also, now, the main part area. Park authorities are planning a campaign in August-September to stop this agriculture with support from the UNESCO Programme in DRC.

As mentioned before, most of the illegal resource exploitation is now happening under the control of soldiers of the regular army. Army soldiers, including some local commanders, are involved in poaching and many poaching incidents involving elephants, hippopotami, buffaloes and lions have been documented. Army officials are also controlling illegal fishing activities, providing illegal fishing licenses to fishermen. These pictures were taken this spring and show how army soldiers are involved in the poaching of hippopotamus and fishing activities. They are also involved in charcoal production activities.

These problems are the result of the numerous army possessions in the property and have led to an increasing number of incidents between the soldiers and Park guards. ICCN informed the Centre recently that discussions are on the way with the military commanders of

the region to address this problem, to join patrols and to also diminish the army presence in the Park.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are also very concerned about the issue of oil exploration. These slides show a page of the web brochure of a company, Dominion Petroleum, mentioning that exploration concessions are being granted in a World Heritage site, and outline the challenge of having exploration concessions within a World Heritage Property. According to the website of this company, the President of the Democratic Republic of Congo ratified on 24 June a new production sharing contract for an exploration concession which includes the DRC part of Lake Edward, which is part of the property. The World Heritage centre and IUCN reiterate that oil exploration is not compatible with the World Heritage status of the Park and will threaten its Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are encouraged by improvement of the security situation and welcome the efforts of the Park authorities to restart law enforcement in the Park. However, conservation challenges remain daunting. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the reinforced monitoring mechanism should continue to be applied and the importance to organise the high-level meeting as soon as possible. As mentioned before, the State Party is in the room and might have some information on it. IUCN also would like to comment on this property.”

IUCN:

“IUCN deeply regrets the tragic loss of life and the violence that is affecting those trying to protect the National Park. One of the key concerns is the ratification at the presidential level of a production sharing agreement which includes part of the Virunga National Park and could lead to oil exploration within the property. IUCN notes that at present Congolese law, in fact, prohibits oil exploration in National Parks and that the oil production sharing agreement is in potential conflict with the legal protection regime of the property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for this presentation. I now open the floor to Members of the Committee for their comments. Mali, you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je pense que le cas des sites de la RDC doit être traité de manière globale et non séparément. Nous avons là cinq sites inscrits au patrimoine mondial en Péril et je pense qu’il y a urgence d’organiser d’abord la réunion de haut niveau. Si elle ne figure pas dans le projet de Décision, je souhaiterais qu’elle y soit pour déterminer une période pour la tenue de cette réunion de haut niveau.

Je remercie aussi l’IUCN pour les gros efforts qui sont consentis pour améliorer l’état de conservation du site et au cours de la réunion de haut niveau je souhaiterais que soit débattu le problème de concession autour du bien, car le fait de donner des autorisations autour du bien est incompatible avec le bien lui-même. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci Mali. Je souhaiterais donner la parole au représentant de l'État Partie pour plus d'information. Y a-t-il un représentant de l'État Partie concerné dans la salle, vous avez la parole, avant ça le Nigeria demande la parole ».

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Nigeria would like to express our condolences to RDC over the deaths of staff members who are assisting in the Park and their contribution to the protection of this property. We would like to share the position taken by Mali about the need for the Committee to address holistically the issue of the properties in Congo. It appears that all World Heritage sites in Congo face similar problems. So, I think it would be wise, especially with the legal conflict for the Management of National Parks and the protection of these properties, to ask the State Party to make comment and see how these two important issues are related. This would address completely the issues that these National Parks face. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to remind you that we have a Draft Decision concerning each sites of the State Party. I would then give the floor to the Secretariat for clarification of the issues raised by Mali and Nigeria.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The Committee might remember that in Christchurch this issue was discussed as was the issue of the need for a comprehensive approach to the problems in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Since the Christchurch Decision, the Secretariat has prepared a separate report on the general state of conservation of the five sites, with a general decision which is the one you have adopted and includes reference to the high-level meeting as mentioned. But we still need, on a statutory basis, separate decisions for each World Heritage site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for this clarification and I would like to give the floor to the State Party concerned.”

Democratic Republic of Congo:

« Merci Monsieur le Président pour la parole ; la République Démocratique du Congo (RDC) tient à remercier le Comité du patrimoine mondial et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'attention soutenue que vous n'avez cessé de témoigner pour les biens de la République Démocratique du Congo.

Nous tenons très sincèrement à vous remercier pour le fait que notre pays bénéficie du mécanisme du suivi renforcé dans tous ses biens. Nous pouvons aujourd'hui témoigner que les résultats sur le terrain sont très satisfaisants par rapport aux efforts que le gouvernement est en train de fournir.

Nous pouvons dire de manière globale, comme souhaité par certains membres du Comité, que la situation en RDC du point de vue sécuritaire s'est suffisamment améliorée après l'implication personnelle du chef de l'État et le recours aux armées de l'Ouganda et du Rwanda pour pouvoir éradiquer les menaces de rébellions originaires de ces pays. Aujourd'hui nous pouvons affirmer que dans toute la partie est de la RDC la situation de sécurité s'est assez améliorée pour pouvoir soutenir l'action dans les différentes aires protégées que ce soit au Parc de Virunga, au Parc de Garamba, à la Réserve de faune à Okapis, ou au Parc de Kahuzi-Biega et au Parc de Salonga.

D'une manière générale nous pouvons affirmer qu'il y a eu des instructions du gouvernement données à l'armée pour travailler en partenariat avec les gardes des parcs. Donc, quels que soient les abus des membres de l'armée qui sont des soldats indisciplinés, il y a maintenant en place un mécanisme pour que l'armée nationale travaille en partenariat avec les gardes des parcs. Cela permet de garantir les actions de sécurisation et de pouvoir faire front à tout le braconnage grâce à des patrouilles mixtes.

Nous pouvons aussi affirmer que par ce mécanisme renforcé, aujourd'hui, nous sommes en train de renforcer les capacités de nos gardes du parc qui sont en train d'être formés, par des membres des forces armées françaises ou belges en retraite, ou même de pays africains tels que le Kenya ou l'Afrique du Sud. Ces gardes bénéficient donc de ces formations et continuent d'utiliser tous les appuis qu'ils peuvent utiliser pour éradiquer le braconnage. Ces cinq parcs ont été mis sur la Liste des biens en péril réellement en raison d'un braconnage qui était très accentué. Et aujourd'hui nous pouvons confirmer qu'avec des patrouilles mixtes, tant avec l'armée nationale que les forces de la MONUSCO, nous avons réduit suffisamment ces menaces ».

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker].*

« Pourriez-vous conclure s'il vous plaît, car il y a un temps qui vous est imparti. Merci ».

Democratic Republic of Congo:

« Quant à la réunion de haut niveau, nous tenons à confirmer les engagements que le ministre de l'Environnement avait pris auprès de la directrice générale de l'UNESCO : un délégué est ici présent et le message que la RDC envoie est que la réunion de haut niveau pourrait ou devrait se tenir au mois d'octobre, la date pourra être confirmée par voie diplomatique avec madame la directrice générale de l'UNESCO.

Pour ce qui est des concessions d'exploitation pétrolière, nous pouvons aussi vous affirmer que concernant les tractations dont vous avez parlé, que l'on trouve sur Internet, nous prenons l'engagement de pouvoir faire au Comité une note d'information dans les plus brefs délais afin de donner tous les détails à ce sujet. Donc, d'une manière générale et sur l'ensemble de ces biens nous pouvons affirmer qu'il y a des mécanismes assez importants pour essayer d'atténuer l'insécurité et d'apporter aujourd'hui une image nouvelle du bien en RDC. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au représentant de la RDC. Je souhaiterais demander aux membres du Comité s'ils ont d'autres commentaires. Ce n'est pas le cas donc je donne la parole au rapporteur pour passer à l'examen du projet de Décision ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair; I have received two amendments to Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.4 which is on page 14 of the English version and 15 of the French version of document 7A. The Delegation of Bahrain proposes a new paragraph 4bis between existing paragraph 4 and existing paragraph 5, which reads:

Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party which led to an increased population of gorillas in the Park and the resuming of tourism.

I will repeat paragraph 4bis once more:

Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party which led to an increased population of gorillas in the Park and the resuming of tourism.

I have further received an amendment from the Swiss Delegation which concerns paragraph 6 and paragraph 10. In both cases, it is the replacement of a small section of text of each paragraph. In paragraph 6, the very end of the text which formerly read: *To formerly exclude the territory of the property* has been replaced by: *Not to authorize any project of prospection or petrol exploitation*. The full paragraph 6 with this amendment then read:

6. Reiterates its concern with regard to the envisaged oil prospecting project overlapping the property. Recalls its position regarding the incompatibility of oil exploration and exploitation in respect of World heritage status and urges the State Party not to authorize any project of prospection or petrol exploitation.

The second change of the Swiss Delegation relates to paragraph 10 where in the middle of the paragraph the phrase *the evacuation of illegal occupants* has been replaced by *on appropriate measures taken to facilitate the relocation of occupants to appropriate zones*. The full amendment with the Swiss amendments reads now:

10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on proposed oil exploration and exploitation projects overlapping the property, on the reduction of military positions inside the property, on appropriate measures taken to facilitate the relocation of occupants to appropriate zones, and on the status of flagship species in the property as well as progress accomplished in the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

Mr. Chairperson, I have just received an additional amendment by Mali, but it does not indicate which paragraph it modifies so we will need some clarification from Mali on this amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I see Barbados would like the floor but I would rather first give the floor to the representative of Mali to clarify the amendment.”

Mali:

« C'est un nouveau paragraphe, oui ».

The Chairperson:

« Un nouveau paragraphe, mais où souhaitez-vous le voir inséré ? À la fin du projet de Décision ? Ce serait le paragraphe 13, 12 ? »

Mali:

« Après le paragraphe 11 ».

The Chairperson:

“I would like to suggest that the representative of Mali insert it just after paragraph 9 as 9bis. Would you accept that? Yes, thank you very much. Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you chair. I do not have any objections to the recent changes to that Decision. I am just recollecting that in 2008, the Committee spoke about standardising certain practices with regard to mining in World Heritage sites. I do not see that statement in paragraph 6, so notwithstanding the amendment proposed by Switzerland, I would have suggested that we needed to reinstate that reference to mining in particular. Perhaps the Centre or IUCN can confirm, but it would in fact replace *Regarding incompatibility of Oil exploration and exploitation in respect to World Heritage status*, it refers to particular standards. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados is submitting an amendment to paragraph 6, and could you say exactly what you wish for?”

Barbados:

“Mr. Chair, I do not have the material in front of me, but I am asking the Centre or IUCN, if I am correct in recalling the terminology used. It may not be the right one, then there is no need to correct it and this issue could go away.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the Centre and IUCN.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. Just to clarify for the delegate of Barbados, what we are talking about is oil. The standard paragraph that we used is clearly related to mining and extractive industries but different and the standard paragraph normally recollects the commitment of the International Council on Metals and Mining which is specific to mining activity. They are not the same umbrella organisations that made a commitment when we talk about oil exploitation, so it is not easy to construct a standard paragraph.”

Barbados:

“Thank you for the explanation, and I do not require any changes in paragraph 6.”

The Chairperson:

“I am sorry could you repeat Barbados?”

Barbados:

“I am satisfied with the explanation and there is no need for change.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Can we proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.4, in the following manner, which is asking the members of the Committee if they have any objections? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est juste pour expliquer les amendements que l'on a faits au paragraphe 6 si l'on peut y revenir après ».

The Chairperson:

“On y reviendra après.”

So, are there any objections to the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4, including 4bis, which is going to be re-read by the Rapporteur?”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 4bis, as proposed by Bahrain reads:

Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party, which lead to an increased population of gorillas in the park and the resuming of tourism”.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Paragraph 5, no changes?”

Rapporteur:

“No Mr. Chair. Paragraph 5 remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraphs 1 to 5, are there any objections regarding their adoption? I see none, so adopted. Now the floor is to the rapporteur for paragraph 6.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6 with incorporation of the Swiss amendments reads:

6. Reiterates its concern with regard to the envisaged oil prospecting projects overlapping the property, recalls its position regarding the incompatibility of oil exploration and exploitation in respect of World Heritage status, and also urges the State Party not to authorize any project of prospection or oil exploitation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 6? I see none, paragraph 6 adopted. Now, let’s move to paragraphs 7 to 9, which remain as they are?”

Rapporteur:

“It is correct Mr. Chairperson. They remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraphs 7, 8, 9? I see none, paragraphs 7 to 9 adopted. Now, let’s move to paragraph 9bis as proposed by Mali.”

Rapporteur:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président, le nouveau paragraphe 9 bis :

Propose que la réunion de haut niveau soit tenue le plus tôt possible avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives.

Je répète paragraphe 9 bis :

Propose que la réunion de haut niveau soit tenue le plus tôt possible avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, is this what you asked for Mali? Are there any objections regarding paragraph 9bis? I see none, paragraph 9bis adopted. Let’s study paragraphs 10, 11, 12. There is an amendment proposed by Switzerland on paragraph 10.”

Rapporteur:

“That’s right Mr. Chair, paragraph 10 has an amendment of Switzerland in the middle of the paragraph. I now re-read the full paragraph:

10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on proposed oil exploration and exploitation projects overlapping the property, on the reduction of military positions inside the property, on appropriate measures taken to facilitate the relocation of occupants to appropriate zones, and on the status of flagship species in the property as well as progress accomplished in the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 10 as amended by Switzerland and paragraphs 11 and 12? I see none, paragraphs 10 to 12 adopted. The **Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.4** with its 12 paragraphs is adopted.

Now we are moving to the next site of the Democratic Republic of Congo, concerning Kahuzi-Biega National Park and the floor is to Mr. Debonnet.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The next property is **Kahuzi-Biega National Park in the Democratic Republic of Congo**. From 28 November until 6 December, the World Heritage Centre’s IUCN reactive mission was conducted to this property, as requested by the Committee. The mission confirmed that since the previous mission, the presence of armed groups in and around the property and the resulting insecurity has continued to be the biggest obstacle to conservation and restoration of the integrity of the property. However, military operations to dislodge the armed groups from the area and the Park have been conducted since the last session. If successful, this will provide the Park authorities with a major opportunity to occupy the area and act against the activities of illegal mining.

The mission noted also that threats identified by previous missions such as poaching, mining and illegal occupation of part of the property are still present. The picture on the slide shows the degradation of the ecological corridor between the highland and the lowland sectors. In spite of all the positive political and legal decisions that have been taken regarding this issue, and the personal involvement of the Minister for the Environment, it has not been possible to enforce the law and remove the illegal occupants of this area.

Further more, the mission observed the extent of the occupation of the Park land by villagers in the lowland sector. The picture shows clearing in this area and the satellite image shows in red the area degraded by agricultural activities.

The mission concludes that, values for which the property has been inscribed have been seriously affected by the impact of the conflict and that, at present, the integrity of the property is questionable. In view of this, it is proposed to continue to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism, for the desired state of conservation with a view of removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Nine indicators have been proposed in the report, however, currently, baseline data is missing to quantify these indicators. IUCN wishes to comment on this report.”

IUCN:

“IUCN is concerned about the extent of occupation in the lower sector of the property and about the degradation caused in this area by agricultural activities. In June of this year IUCN supported the management authority in developing several possible scenarios to address encroachment. IUCN notes that there is no easy solution to address this issue and that significant time will be needed to address encroachment within the property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor to members of the Committee for further comments or questions. I see none, so the floor is to the rapporteur concerning the Draft Decision.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. You will find Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.5 on page 19 of the English and page 20 of the French version of Document 7A. I have not received any amendments to this Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.5 including paragraphs 1 to 12? I see none, so Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.5, paragraphs from 1 to 12 is adopted. Now the floor is to Mr. Debonnet for the presentation of **Garamba National Park (DRC).**”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much. From 20 to 30 March 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre-IUCN mission visited this property, as requested by this Committee. As was the case with the previous property, since the last mission, the management of the property has been greatly hampered by the presence of rebels and the subsequent state of insecurity. However, the mission notes that the security has improved recently.

As a result of the military operations against the rebels, there is now an important army presence in the region. As in other properties, this is presenting new challenges to the Park management. Soldiers have been involved in widespread poaching and as a result the signs of poaching of wildlife seem to have increased in spite of the departure of rebels from the area. The left hand picture shows confiscated elephant meat and ivory from an army soldier.

The mission also raised concerns about the increasing artisanal gold mining in the hunting area surrounding the property. The right hand picture shows how this is destroying the gallery forest along the rivers and streams. The hunting areas are not part of the property, but given that the wildlife lives there during part of the year, they are important for the site integrity.

The mission concluded that the Universal Outstanding Values for which Garamba has been inscribed on the World Heritage List have been greatly degraded, but with the probable exception of the northern white rhino, it could be restored, if adequate management measures for the Park are set up and maintained.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the current improvement of the security situation and the mobilisation of important technical and financial means for the period 2010-2015 present an opportunity to make advances towards restoration of the OUV of this property. If the updated corrective measures are implemented, conditions which could permit removal of the property of the List of World heritage in Danger might be attained in 2015. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are very concerned about the report on the increasing involvement of the army's poaching.

Given the fragility of the situation, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it necessary to continue the application of the reinforced monitoring mechanism. The mission also proposes eight indicators for the desired state of conservation. But, again, new baseline data will be needed to quantify these indicators. However, an inventory which was planned for May 2010, which could have resulted in this baseline data, could not be implemented because of lack of funding. IUCN has no further comments on this property."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I open the floor for comments or questions. Nigeria, you have the floor."

Nigeria:

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. Nigeria appreciates the need to take these sites one by one and therefore would like to make some comment on this particular property. We would like to join IUCN in congratulating the State Party for the efforts it has exerted since 2006 to maintain the state of conservation of the site. Although this site is not a serial nomination it also has some transboundary characteristics. It requires the collaboration of Sudan, for example, to maintain the protected contagious zone of the property.

Given the amount of work that the State Party has done, I think it should be appropriate to hear from the State Party the amount of cooperation it has received from Sudan in ensuring this site is well maintained, within the spirit of the Convention, based on the collaboration of the two of them. Given the suggestion by IUCN that, if appropriate measures are taken and maintained, the site could be removed from the in Danger List as soon as possible, probably in the next two to three years, so it would be nice if the State Party could tell us the level of collaboration and cooperation they enjoy with Sudan to ensure this is done as soon as possible. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I would like to give the floor to IUCN for comment on this."

IUCN:

"I think the distinguished delegate of Nigeria requested the State Party for information, but I can confirm that there is some local cooperation between the managers of Garamba National Park and the site of Lantoto, which is the property on the Park on the side of Sudan. Of course this is an area in South Sudan, so it is controlled by the local Sudanese government. The Committee has requested in the past also to facilitate this context at the highest level but this presents more challenges as the Lantoto National Park is on the Sudanese side."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Secretariat. Would the representative of the concerned State Party like to add something?”

Democratic Republic of Congo:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. En ce qui concerne le Parc de Garamba qui est en pleine restauration et qui garde encore suffisamment ses espèces, nous avons signé, au niveau des deux directions générales, les accords entre la RDC et le Sud Soudan pour la protection de ce Parc et nous travaillons avec ces deux organisations pour sa sécurisation. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Bahreïn a la parole ».

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain is very concerned about the status of the white rhino within the property and wants to raise the question again of the extinction of this population. We discussed the matter last year also, but we shared the recommendation of the Advisory Bodies to wait for one more year to finalise this issue. However, we would like to hear from the Advisory Bodies about other flagship species which may retain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, if the rhino were to be lost. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN would you like to reply, please?”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you for the question. Indeed, for several years there have been efforts to relocate the northern white rhino, unfortunately so far unsuccessfully, and the proposal of the mission which went to the property was to renew the effort for one year, otherwise we would consider it no longer appropriate to use the rare Park resources to continue this investigation, which has been going on for several years now.

Of course, as was discussed before, first of all the Garamba National Park is not inscribed only under the biodiversity criteria but also under criterion (vii). Its Outstanding Universal Value is not only based on biodiversity, and secondly, it is not only based on the northern white rhino, but also on other rare and endemic species such as local endemic variety of the giraffe and an important elephant population which is quite unique in the sense that it is a mixture between forest and savannah elephants.

So, if it is confirmed that the northern white rhino is lost, other options could be envisaged such as the reintroduction of southern white rhino, but then it would have to be discussed with the appropriate specialist group of IUCN, the African Rhino Specialist Group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; if there are no any further requests for intervention, I now move to the Draft Decision and give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.6 is on page 14 of the English and page 15 of the French Document 7A.ad. I have not received any written amendments to the Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections to adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.6 including paragraphs 1 to 11? I see none, so Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.6 is adopted in its entirety. Thank you.

Now we are moving to the next site, **Salonga National Park (DRC)**, and the floor is to Mr. Debonnet.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. For Salonga National Park, a report was received on 8 February but unfortunately only contained limited information on progress achieved in the implementation of corrective measures. In the report, in your document, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN expressed concerns with regard to the accumulative delay in connection to the implementation of the corrective measures for this property. In particular, the anti poaching strategy and the joint anti poaching operation which has been requested between ICCN and the Congolese army to clear poachers and armed groups from this property. These operations had been planned since 2008. Last week, the World Heritage Centre received information that a joint operation is now underway with the military and that so far 25 arms and 6,000 rounds of ammunition have been confiscated.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN, also, did not receive a copy of the strategy to minimise and mitigate the impact of the villagers in the Park, which is reported to have been developed, as well as the agreement on the discussions with the local communities on the use of natural resources, and the result of the consultation with local communities, and the preliminary studies conducted on the establishment of a corridor between the two parts of the property.

In view of the situation, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend to continue the application of the reinforced monitoring mechanism. IUCN has no further comments on this report. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is opened to members of the Committee. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est une remarque d'ordre général qui est valable aussi pour tous les autres dossiers des points 7A et 7B. Cette remarque, et observation, concerne la date de livraison des rapports de la part des États parties au Centre. Une nouvelle date, le premier décembre, a été introduite dans le paragraphe 6 et nous pensons qu'il faut harmoniser quand même ces dates. Pour cette raison, nous avons soumis un amendement et repoussé le paragraphe 6 après le paragraphe 8 pour harmoniser tout délai au premier février ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Je donne la parole au Secrétariat ».

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The reasons we propose this earlier date are two fold. First, we know that these studies are available, they were mentioned in the State Party report, but they have not been submitted. Secondly, we thought that in view of the upcoming high level meeting, it would be important to have these elements in preparation of the meeting. That is why we requested these reports to be submitted by 1 December. This is not the normal State Party State of Conservation Report which is requested in paragraph 8, but documents which are already available, because they are mentioned in the State Party report. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland is again asking for the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. On accepte de retirer l'amendement dans ce cas précisément, cependant nous aimerions quand même que dans d'autres cas, l'on puisse harmoniser les dates ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. D'autres demandes de parole de la part des États membres du Comité ? Je n'en vois pas, donc la parole est au rapporteur pour examen de la Décision ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. The Draft Decision is on page 24 of the English and on page 25 of the French version of Document 7A. The only amendment I received was from Switzerland and it has just been withdrawn, so there are no amendments to this Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.7 including paragraphs 1 to 10? I see none, so Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.7 from paragraphs 1 to 10 is adopted in its entirety. Thank you.

We are proceeding to the next site: **Okapi Wildlife Reserve (DRC)**, and the floor is to Mr. Debonnet.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. We are now dealing with the last site of the Democratic Republic of Congo. At the previous session, the Committee decided to no longer apply the reinforced mechanism to this property, in view of the progress achieved in the implementation of corrective measures, such as combating wildlife poaching.

On 8 February 2010, the State Party submitted a concise report on conservation. Since the previous session, there have been numerous reports on the renewed, increasing commercialisation of poaching involving soldiers from the DRC army. The World Heritage Centre was recently informed by the Park’s managing authority, ICCN, that following meeting held with the military commander, this poaching has again diminished, but has not entirely subsided.

The World heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about the renewed poaching pressure and the evident implication of members of the army in both poaching and trafficking of bush meat and ivory. Failure to address this issue could endanger the ongoing recovery of the property’s Outstanding Universal Values, which was finally progressing after years of continued degradation. The increase in poaching is also related to an increase in the bush meat rate following the rehabilitation of the road crossing the property and connecting the reserve to nearby urban centres.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the need to put in place appropriate control mechanisms on the road to control this bush meat trade. The World heritage Centre and IUCN express the hope that the current upsurge in poaching can be addressed quickly by the State Party, and that the restoration of the Outstanding Universal Values can still be ensured, so that the indicators set by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session can be reached within the planned time frame. Of course, although wildlife recovery has been demonstrated, this property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN has no further comments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to the Secretariat. Do members of the Committee have any requests for intervention? I see none, so we proceed to the review of the Draft Decision. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 29 of the English version and page 31 of the French version of document 7A and I have not received any written amendments.”

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.8 including paragraphs 1 to 9? I see none. Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.8 is adopted in its entirety.

We now continue with the next site, which is the **Simien National Park in Ethiopia.**"

The Secretariat:

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. As requested by the Committee from 12-14 October 2009, a joint UNESCO-IUCN reactive monitoring mission was organised for this property. The mission concluded that one of the four corrective measures has been fully completed. More work is needed to fully complete the three remaining corrective measures in order to adequately address the threats to the Outstanding Universal Values.

The World heritage Centre and IUCN stress that two of the main threats to the values and integrity, namely the extensive grazing pressure in the property, and the important part of the property which is encroached by agriculture, have not yet been fully addressed. On the slide you can see pictures taken during the mission showing the current overgrazing of the property and its impact on the landscape and the native vegetation through erosion. As mentioned in previous sessions, scientific studies have also demonstrated the impacts of the overgrazing of the two flagship wildlife, species the Walia ibex and the Ethiopian wolf.

The World Heritage centre acknowledges the work undertaken by the State Party to develop strategies to address these threats, but is also concerned that so far no adequate funding has been secured to implement them. The world Heritage Centre and IUCN, therefore, reiterate the need for the State Party to urgently organise a donor conference. As mentioned in the working document, funding was provided to the State Party from the World Heritage Fund in December 2009 and the conference was originally planned for February 2010, but was postponed. We are still waiting for a new date for this conference.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the property should remain on the list of World Heritage In Danger to allow for the State Party to implement the three remaining corrective measures. If a donor conference can be organised in 2010 and if it is successful, and the boundary setting can be included in the programme for the next parliamentary session, the property might be removed from the World Heritage List in Danger at the 36th session. Also, the desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property was proposed by the mission and included in the mission report. IUCN has also a comment on this property."

The Chairperson:

"Yes, please."

IUCN:

"Thank you, Chair. IUCN notes that the State Party has expressed its concern that the extension of the property may require preparation of a new World Heritage nomination dossier. IUCN would like to emphasize that, while under the Operational Guidelines, it is indeed the case that the proposed extension would require a new nomination, that the

documentation would not need to be nearly as detailed as for a new property, because it is likely that the values within the existing property will remain the same.

IUCN would like to further note that the State Party could benefit from provisions of international assistance from the World Heritage Fund to obtain the necessary support to prepare this documentation. Lastly, IUCN notes that the preparation of this new nomination is not a requirement within the corrective measures, as set for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you, Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any comments from members of the Committee? Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much, Sir. I would like to start by thanking the individuals who prepared this particular report for the quality of the work and the level of details that it contains. We are well aware of the fact that the situation is quite complex, and of the difficulties faced in managing this site. But we would also like to acknowledge efforts made by Ethiopia in terms of dealing with some of these difficulties.

We would also like to point out the fact, as stated in the report in terms of the state of conservation, which gives us an update, if you will, of the corrective measures being taken. Although, it would appear that some of these corrective measures have not yet been implemented. What is important to note is that the State Party has made considerable progress in this, since the report was tabled at the 33rd session.

I would also like to point out, without going in too much detail, or at least to highlight the fact that Ethiopia has been making great efforts to regularise the situation, despite all the difficulties they are facing with respect to conserving the site. The State Party continues to work hard together with the Advisory Bodies, to make sure these difficulties are overcome.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Brésil. La parole est à la Suisse ».

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous nous joignons aux félicitations exprimées par le délégué du Brésil. On félicite l'État partie de l'Éthiopie pour leurs efforts à la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives suivant les recommandations qui ont amélioré l'état de conservation de ce bien. À cette fin, nous souhaitons encourager l'État partie en effectuant un changement dans les paragraphes 9 et 11, en disant qu'au lieu d'être instructif de la part du Comité, de mieux encourager en utilisant le terme “*recommandation*” au lieu de “*on demande*”. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci à la Suisse*. Bahrain you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Bahrain also appreciates the great effort made, since Vilnius, to conserve this important site. The extension seems to have captured more habitats of Walia Ibex and Ethiopian wolf. However, the State Party, as we heard in the report, may need to re-nominate the site and we are hoping that, if this situation occurs in the future, there will be no complication regarding the re-nomination. We also would like to understand better because we have two situations here: removal from the site of the in Danger List or a new nomination to be submitted. When this latter occurs, will the site still be listed as in Danger or will it be removed? We need to understand what will happen after. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; I would like to give the floor to Nigeria and then to IUCN and the State Party. Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you. We would like to share in the appreciation of the great effort made by Ethiopia, the State Party, in trying to maintain the status of this property and to encourage them to continue in the same direction, even though we share the conclusion that it is premature to start discussion on removing the site from the in Danger List. However, I would like to quickly suggest that the State Party, along with the IUCN commission, takes an inventory of the endangered species and continue the efforts that it is undertaking to ensure that this site is eventually removed from the in Danger List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. I would like to reiterate the point that was made. What is put in place is the extension of the Park in the field and that is the key part of meeting the corrective measures. There is no conditionality to go through the major boundary modification process. In relation to the removal of the site of the List in Danger, the focus is on the three corrective measures outlined in the report.

We certainly echo the hope that a re-nomination would also be processed smoothly, because this is something which has so clearly been part of the engagement of the Committee in terms of measures that are necessary for this site. This is also why we think it is appropriate that if this extension comes forward, international assistance could be provided and we could provide a great deal of guidance, if this was required by the State Party to ensure the re-nomination. It would be a re-nomination and not a minor boundary modification which could be expedited as easily as possible.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Just to confirm, you mean that if the extension were to be approved by the Committee, the site would remain on the in Danger List?”

The Secretariat:

“No, the focuses of the corrective measures that have not been met are the legal setting that is required and also the two strategies related to livelihoods and grazing where the strategy is in place. But the issue is the necessary funding and the implementation that is required. So, we do not see a coupling between the need to prepare the nomination and the removal from the in Danger List. The focus is on these other three corrective measures. I hope this clarifies.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali, asked for the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, moi je pense qu'au vu des nombreux efforts fournis par l'État partie dans le cas de la conservation du site, l'État partie aurait souhaité proposer un autre statut, celui de suivi renforcé. Car l'IUCN parle encore de mesures correctives et nous partageons cet avis avec vous, mais il faudrait aussi reconnaître les efforts effectués par l'État partie et l'encourager, l'aider à sortir de ce péril, donc nous proposons le suivi renforcé. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, est-ce que l'État partie concerné souhaiterait apporter un peu plus d'informations ? Vous avez la parole ».

Ethiopia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The most difficult part of the points mentioned in the document concerns those which involve human life, grazing and rehabilitation. It is difficult because it requires huge amounts of money. So, we need some time to do this, but not a very long time because it would encourage the government to put up some money if the date were to be fixed and shorter than expected for the completion. If it is closed to 31 May it would encourage the government to work harder and put some money together with the assistance of international donors. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you. We would like to endorse the comments made by my colleague from Mali with respect to this site. I was quite pleased to hear the explanations provided by the State Party concerning this site. Obviously, the State Party needs to benefit from the understanding of the Committee: It has dealt with enormous difficulties, and I think that the Committee should be sensitive to these various difficulties; the latter can be found in all range of countries, whether they are political or social.

The Committee needs to show a certain amount of flexibility and a certain level of understanding to take all of this into consideration and not to adopt rigid decisions, particularly in this case, Sir. So, the Brazilian Delegation would like to endorse the comments

made by the Delegation of Mali and supports the efforts made by Ethiopia. We would like to call for a certain amount of flexibility in order to take into account the characteristics of this site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Secretariat, would you like to comment on the issues raised by Brazil and Mali? You have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think there is a need to clarify, if I may refer, as something of a misconception, that the reinforced mechanism is something prior to the in Danger listing. I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the Decision that was taken in Seville last year, where it was very clearly mentioned by the Committee, and I quote: “The reinforced mechanism should be applied, predominantly to sites which are already on the in Danger List”. The basic purpose of the reinforced monitoring mechanism is to enable The Chairperson or the director general to launch a mission without the Committee having to decide that a monitoring mission needs to be undertaken.

The second purpose is to enable the Committee to receive a report on the State of Conservation of the property in between two sessions. So, reinforced monitoring mechanisms should not be seen as a lower category of monitoring by the Committee before the site is listed as being in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any more interventions? IUCN would like to comment, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just to amplify the point just explained and the one on timeline. First, as the Director of the Centre reported, we should be clear on the purpose of the reinforced monitoring mechanism and in fact in the debate that was staged during the last Committee and its conclusion, it was seen as a way of reinforcing monitoring for sites that are on the in Danger List and are in the most critical of conditions. I think the debate with this site is actually the opposite. We have a site which, we hope, is at the other end of the process, and we want to put in place corrective measures. I would suggest that at the donors’ conference which is referred to in the Decision, we find a way to support the site but not conceived in the format of the reinforced mechanism.

As far as timescale is concerned, we also benefited from a discussion in the margin of this meeting with the representative of the State Party. There are three corrective measures, as I outlined in an earlier statement. The gazettement relies on the legal process within the country and that is presumably something which is in the hand of the party and could happen in a quick timeline before the next session of the Committee. The two strategies which are still seeking funding are looking for a significant amount of resources. So, it could be hoped, with the absolute most optimistic situation, that there could be a result within a year, but realistically, it is most likely to be a two or more year time scale.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to move to Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.9. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.9 is on page 20 in the English version and page 21 of your document 7A.ad. I have received draft amendments from Estonia and Switzerland which both point at the same direction, but are applied in different paragraphs and reduce the time frame for consideration for removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger to the next 35th session of the Committee. I would read to you the paragraphs that have been amended.

Paragraphs 1 to 5 of the Decision remain unchanged. In Paragraph 6 Estonia proposes an insertion as follows:

6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to organize as soon as possible the donor conference for which funding has been provided from the World Heritage Fund in order to identify potential donors,—and now the insertion—as a first step for possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the 35th session in 2011, and calls upon the international community to financially support the implementation of the grazing management and alternative livelihoods strategies.

In the following, paragraphs 7 and 8 and their sub paragraphs remain unchanged. In paragraph 9, Switzerland proposes to change the first word *Request* by *Recommend to the State Party*. So, the beginning of paragraph 9 reads:

9. Recommends to the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2009 mission—and the remaining text remains unchanged.

Paragraph 10 remains unchanged. In paragraph 11, the Delegation of Switzerland proposes an addition at the end of the paragraph, so that the end of the paragraph reads:

World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 in view of removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future.

Paragraph 12 remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 5 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.9? I see none, so paragraphs 1 to 5 are adopted. Now moving to paragraph 6, I would like to ask the rapporteur to read the text as amended by Estonia.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. It reads:

6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to organize as soon as possible the donor conference for which funding has been provided from the World Heritage Fund in order to identify potential donors, as a first step for possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the 35th session in 2011, and calls upon the international

community to financially support the implementation of the grazing management and alternative livelihoods strategies.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 6? I see Switzerland. You asked for the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci. On aimerait demander à la Délégation de l’Estonie si elle pourrait vivre avec une formulation plus ouverte comme nous l’avons formulé *le proche futur* au lieu de redire *le retraitement de la liste à la 35^e session*. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Estonia, you can comment. You have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Yes, it is possible.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Estonia. I give the floor to the rapporteur for re-reading of paragraph 6.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6:

6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to organize as soon as possible the donor conference for which funding has been provided from the World Heritage Fund in order to identify potential donors, as a first step for possible removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future, and calls upon the international community to financially support the implementation of the grazing management and alternative livelihoods strategies.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 6? I see none, paragraph 6 is adopted.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 remain unchanged. Any objections regarding paragraph 7 and 8? I see none, so paragraphs 7 and 8 are adopted.

Now, we move to paragraph 9 with an amendment from Switzerland; the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Only the first word of the paragraph has been replaced and it now reads:

9. Recommends to the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2009 mission on management planning, tourism planning and management, road and power supply alignments and climate change adaptation”.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 9? I see none, paragraph 9 is adopted.

Paragraph 10 remains as it is, any objections? Paragraph 10 is adopted.

Now we move to paragraph 11, and the rapporteur will read the amendment from Switzerland.”

Rapporteur:

“The Swiss Delegation has proposed an addition at the end of the paragraph which reads:

for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 in view of removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 11? I see none, so Paragraph 11 is adopted.

Paragraph 12 remains unchanged. Any objections regarding paragraph 12? I see none, so paragraph 12 is adopted.

The **Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.9 is adopted** in its entirety. Thank you very much.

Let’s now move to the next site, which is **Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserve in Niger**. Mr. Guy Debonnet you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The report of the State Party was received on 18 January, outlining the progress made in the implementation of corrective measures. The State Party report notes that the property has been affected by instability and civil conflict following the outbreak of a new Tuareg rebellion in February 2007. A Peace Accord was signed recently, which should resolve the security concerns. However, the report does not give any more details about the current accessibility of this 77,000 km² site to the management authority. It is therefore unclear to which extent regular management activities such as anti-poaching patrols are being taken.

The State Party also does not provide clear information on the impact of undertaken activities for the State of Conservation of the property. The report notes that so far 1,134 hectares of degrading land have been restored. While this is an important effort, there is still a long way to go to reach the objective of the restoration of 65,000 hectares as set by the State Party in the framework of the ongoing GEF project. Given the large size of the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the view that it will take a significant amount of time to restore the degraded lands across the property.

With the current GEF project ending in 2011, there are also some concerns about the continuation of these restoration efforts. So far, no wildlife survey has been undertaken, making it impossible to assess the current state of critical wildlife conservation, which is key to the Outstanding Universal Value. With no information available on the current status of the Outstanding Universal Value, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger. With the signature of a Peace Agreement and the improvement of the situation, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN express their hope that efforts to implement the corrective measures can now gain momentum. IUCN has also a comment on this report. Thank you.”

IUCN:

“IUCN emphasizes that undertaking wildlife surveys is crucial to determining the current status of the property values to define a desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as the timeframe needed to achieve this. Therefore, IUCN recalls the Decision of the Committee of a joint monitoring mission which should be invited to the property only after this comprehensive threatened species survey is undertaken.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is now open. Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you very much. I think that my earlier comment on Ethiopia is actually directed to this property. However, we want to share comments made by IUCN about the effort that Niger has made to ensure this site is protected. Nevertheless, we would want to share discussion, although IUCN said it might be premature, on the removal of the property from the in Danger List.

It is still very important to encourage the State Party and if they are in this room, if they could shed light on this survey of endangered species, whether they have started the programme and the challenges they are facing regarding security in that region. What I mean is that it is very important that IUCN should support them through this project with the Species Survival Commission of the IUCN, to ensure that this survey is carried out and successfully concluded, so that we know what type of species are endangered and the support they require to ensure that the site is well protected. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Nigeria. Before I give the floor to the concerned State Party, I give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, Chair. We also would like to emphasize the improvement we have noticed regarding the management of the site, especially by appointing a director and an associate director, which is a very good step taken by the State Party. We feel also that there are positive steps in the direction of the State Party wanting to remove the site from World Heritage in Danger List.

However, we share the Advisory Body’s position regarding the two issues addressed and we would like to forward this to the State Party. The first issue, the degraded habitat and restoration, which according to the report represented only 10 percent of what is recorded. The second issue regards the survey of the Addax and Dame gazelles and the reintroduction programme for the two species. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Chair. The Brazilian Delegation would like to join voices with the Delegations of Bahrain and Nigeria. We welcome the efforts carried out for the property and we do bear in mind the magnitude of the complete restoration and rehabilitation of this property. Brazil would like to echo Bahrain’s and Nigeria’s declarations, and if the representative of the State Party is in the room, then we would love to have some clarification as to what was said. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Is the representative of Niger here? No, so I give the floor to the Secretariat of IUCN to respond to the comments made.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. In response to the points raised by the delegates of Nigeria, I would like to inform that, as soon as access is possible, IUCN would be glad to carry out necessary assessment on the status of key wildlife populations, including desert antelopes, with the support of the IUCN Species Survival Commission and in particular the antelopes specialist group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Secretariat, would you like to add something? No, then we move on to the adoption procedure of the Draft Decision and give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 34 of the English, and 35 of the French version of document 7A and I have not received any written amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.10 including paragraphs 1 to 11? I see none, so **Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.10** is adopted in its entirety. Thank you.

We are moving to the last site of this region, the **Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal**. The floor is to Mr. Guy Debonnet.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. As requested by the World Heritage Committee, a joint IUCN World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission was carried out at this property from 4-11 May. The mission noted that despite efforts undertaken by the State Party—since the 2007 mission—to start implementing the corrective measures, including strengthening anti-poaching efforts and increasing the budget to the Park, there has been little change on site.

While it was not possible to evaluate precisely the status of the Outstanding Universal Values because no recent data on the wildlife population was available, the mission concluded that the Outstanding Universal Values seem still to be seriously degraded, as a result of important reduction of wildlife populations and the impact of this reduction on changes in the eco-system.

The Park’s integrity remains threatened by reversible human activities such as poaching, livestock raising and agricultural encroachment. The property therefore should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, the mission noted that the trend of deterioration can be reversed, if massive and urgent action is taken by the State party with the support of the local communities and the financial and technical assistance of the international community. Unless corrective action is taken urgently, it is likely that the continued degradation of the Outstanding Universal Values could have catastrophic consequences.

The mission updated the corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation, as reflected in the Draft Decision. The mission also developed a proposal for the desired state of conservation consisting of six indicators that can monitor the restoration of the ecological values and integrity. These indicators are described in the mission report. IUCN would also like to comment.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. IUCN emphasizes that the severe threats affecting Niokolo-Koba National Park can be reversed, if immediate action is taken and sustained by the State Party with the support of local communities and the financial and technical assistance of the international community. The completion of two key corrective measures, notably strengthening anti-poaching action, through combined aerial and land patrols and drilling boreholes outside the Park to minimize the number of cattle grazing within the property, would do much to aid the recovery of Niokolo-Koba’s wildlife. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open for comments or questions regarding this site.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, au nom de la Délégation française je souhaiterais souligner la volonté gouvernementale des autorités sénégalaises quant à la conservation et à la gestion du Parc, mais aussi les signes concrets encourageants qui ont été enregistrés sur le terrain. J'en noterais deux en particulier.

Tout d'abord la présence de jeunes parmi les mammifères, c'est un signe extrêmement encourageant par rapport à la situation précédente et enfin je souhaiterais revenir sur les problèmes d'assèchement des mares comme souligné dans ce rapport. Les causes sont nombreuses et complexes. Des études pour essayer de déterminer les causes ont été mises en place et des mesures vont suivre, ce qui est un signe encourageant.

Nous souhaiterions donc au nom de la Délégation française que le projet de Décision rende mieux justice aux efforts du gouvernement sénégalais et aux résultats concrets qui ont été obtenus sur le terrain et nous avons proposé un projet d'amendement en ce sens. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. Est-ce que le représentant du Sénégal est dans la salle ? Oui, je vous donne la parole... non ? Alors, il n'y a pas de représentant du Sénégal, d'autres États membres souhaitent prendre la parole ? Le Mali ».

Mali:

« Merci. C'est une question pour l'IUCN, mais avant je tiens à dire que la Délégation du Mali appuie la proposition de la France. Ma question : suite aux efforts entrepris par l'État partie, c'est pour savoir si les éléments qui ont entaché la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site et qui ont conduit à son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril n'ont pas évolué ? Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Le Secrétariat de l'IUCN souhaite-t-il répondre à la question du Mali ? »

IUCN:

"Thank you to the Delegation of Mali for the question and picking up on the point raised by France. There are clearly some points of progress noted. The big picture with the site is one of major phases of degradation and impact which results in the site's values being largely degraded compared to those which were present at the time of inscription. The mission has noted a certain number of points Mr. Debonnet outlined in the desired state of conservation, but, as we have noted, it is still a picture requiring very clear and decisive action and very significant mobilisation of capacity and resources to really address the points that are present in our report and noted as affecting the site. I hope that answers the point of the distinguished delegate."

The Chairperson:

"No one else would like to take the floor? I hand it over to our rapporteur for adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.11."

Rapporteur:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. Le projet de Décision 34 COM 7A.11 se trouve dans le document 7A.ad page 27 dans les versions anglaise et française. J'ai reçu deux révisions du projet de Décision soumis par les Délégations de la France et de la Suisse. Les deux premiers paragraphes 1 et 2 restent inchangés. La France propose un nouveau paragraphe 2bis :

Prend note des efforts entrepris par l'État partie pour satisfaire aux exigences des mesures correctives.

Le paragraphe 4 reste inchangé, dans le paragraphe 5a la Délégation de la Suisse propose de supprimer la fin de la phrase, ce qui donne : a) *Renforcement et mise en place du dispositif de lutte anti-braconnage*. La fin : *basé sur des moyens aériens et terrestres conjugués* est supprimé.

Les paragraphes 6 à 11 restent inchangés ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci*. IUCN, would you like to react to the amendment?”

IUCN:

“Just a reaction to the amendment of Switzerland. This is a very large site and the reason for quoting *aerial means* is to see that as a critical part of any effective anti-poaching strategy. So, I am not sure what the intention of Switzerland is, but there is a reason for mentioning both territorial and air-based surveillance. This is our reaction to that deletion, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, on se réfère au rapport de mission qui soulève la grande difficulté des coûts pour des survols aériens. C'est juste à cette fin que nous souhaitons laisser plus ouvertes les mesures de lutte contre le braconnage et ainsi d'éviter de mettre trop la pression sur l'État partie dans la nécessité de devoir effectuer des reconnaissances aériennes ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 1 and 2 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.11? I see none. Now, I will ask our rapporteur to re-read paragraph 2, please.”

Rapporteur:

« Le nouveau paragraphe 2 bis :

Prend note des efforts entrepris par l'État partie pour satisfaire aux exigences des mesures correctives. »

The Chairperson:

« Merci, est-ce que quelqu'un souhaite objecter au paragraphe 2 bis ? Non, paragraphe 2 bis adopté.

Paragraphe 3, 4 et 5 restent inchangés ».

Rapporteur:

« Pardon, mais il y a un changement dans 5a ».

The Chairperson:

« Pardon. Donc paragraphes 3 et 4 restent inchangés. Des objections ? Aucune, donc paragraphes 3 et 4 sont adoptés.

Je donne la parole à notre rapporteur pour la lecture du paragraphe 5a ».

Rapporteur:

« Le nouveau paragraphe 5a :

a) Renforcement et mise en place du dispositif de lutte anti-braconnage ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 5 containing sub-paragraphs a to g? I see none. So, paragraph 5 is adopted.

We are now moving to paragraphs 6 to 11, which remain unchanged. Any objections to them? I see none so, paragraphs 6 to 11 are adopted. Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.11 is adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Let's proceed to the next region under this topic: Latin America and the Caribbean. The first site in this region is the **Belize Barrier Reef System in Belize**, and I would like to invite Mr. Marc Patry for the presentation of this site.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. A reactive monitoring mission visited the property in 2009 and based on its observations regarding government policy for the sale or lease of mangrove islands for the development within the property boundary, the mission concluded that the property boundary was within ascertained danger. The World Heritage Committee consequently inscribed the property on the List in Danger at its meeting last year.

In its state of conservation report sent to the World Heritage Centre earlier this year, the State Party explained that all new land transactions have been halted, land leases cancelled and privatisation of land suspended within the property. Though the World Heritage centre and IUCN welcome this announcement, there is no indication as to whether this is a permanent or temporary measure, nor is there any information on the legal framework upon which this decision is being implemented. Without this information it is difficult to be assured that the decision effectively meets the Committee’s request for permanent cessation of development within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have recently learnt of the existence of petroleum contracts equivalent to active concessions within the property. The Committee would recall that oil exploration and mining are considered incompatible with the preservation of World Heritage sites. In this regard, the State Party should enact legislation to prohibit exploration within the Belize Barrier Reef System.

Until the State Party has clearly demonstrated its long term commitment to halting development in the property and until it has demonstrated that oil exploration will not take place within its boundaries, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the property remains on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN has additional comments.”

IUCN:

“IUCN would like to note that in addition to the concerns presented and considered in the Draft Decision, it has received credible reports about oil concessions which appear to have been granted in blocks along the entire coast of Belize, including in all component sites of the property. IUCN recalls that oil exploration is not compatible with World Heritage status and notes that it would have serious negative impacts on the property values which are already severely threatened, as detailed by the representative of the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor for comments. I see none. The floor is to our rapporteur to review Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.13.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 41 of the English and 43 of the French version of Document 7A and I have not received any written amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.13, including paragraphs 1 to 9? I see none. Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.13 is adopted in its entirety.

We are now moving to the next site in this region, **Los Katios National Park in Colombia.**”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you, Chair. This property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger last year, following a request by the State Party. A combination of complex issues involving security, illegal logging, hunting and fishing and the recent establishment of human settlements within the property prompted the State Party to conclude that the inscription of the List on the World Heritage in Danger would help it gather the necessary national and international support in dealing with these issues.

In addition to these challenges, there are proposals underway for major utility corridors that would pass through the property and into Panama. It is important to recall that this relatively small property abuts the much larger Darien National Park, a World Heritage property in neighbouring Panama. The State Party has proposed a set of interim corrective measures that are under discussion with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. It indicated that a time frame of six years would likely be required for achievement of these interim corrective measures assuming that sufficient support would be forthcoming.

The mission requested by the Committee last year did not take place, due to logistical difficulties in meeting the security measures imposed by the UN field security office. For this reason, work is still in progress regarding the drafting of a statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the corrective measures and the desired state of conservation for removal of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. There is no new information to report. IUCN would like to add some comments.”

IUCN :

“We do not have any further comments on this site.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is open to members of the Committee. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you, Chair. We know that Colombia is doing everything it can to reduce its threats to the Outstanding Universal Value. There has been a dialogue with the indigenous community, proposals for sustainability, and other efforts along these lines. On the other hand, we know that Colombia is ready to have an IUCN mission take place, and we would like to hear from the Colombian Delegation into which efforts have been deployed along these lines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. If there is a representative of Colombia in the room, you may have the floor.”

Colombia:

“Thank you Chair and to the delegate of Mexico for bringing us to the discussion. We wanted to inform you on some advances that have been raised by Mexico regarding the national government and its efforts to correct and reduce various threats that have been mentioned. Firstly, regarding the indigenous community which lives within the borders of the Park, we have managed to have a dialogue and a round table with them, so that they can reset their sovereignty and dignity, which obviously are part of the objectives of the World Heritage *Convention*.

With regard to sustainability, we have allocated money for projects along this line and the concerned communities around the edges of the Park. All of these efforts are part of a consultation process, so that we can come up with an utilisation agreement. We have got a calendar drawn up with the different communities. On the one hand, we can identify the status of the *Convention*, so that those living outside of the boundaries do have a sustainable base and that the resources used will be sustainable in the long term.

Regarding achievements, the cooperation with UNESCO and IUCN has enabled us to come up with a three-year plan estimated at circa US\$230,000, and currently we are assessing a Management Plan and looking at how we could possibly correct the different threats that have been identified. The strategies used in the conservation programme deal with monitoring and improving management techniques. In accordance with the procedures of the illegal logging activities, we have given the local police forces the authority to confiscate materials and take the perpetrators to court. We have heard that there have been requests that the authorities should be present in the Park, which is the reason the Colombian armed forces are present in the Park.

Finally, we have heard that there are certain drainage systems that have been set up in parts of the Park which are going to join with the electrical grid and we have been told that the corridor planned between Panama and Colombia infringes the principles of the Outstanding Universal Value and of the Park. We will do everything we can to make sure that the IUCN mission can go ahead. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madame. Are there any other requests for the floor? IUCN, would you like to comment?”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. We would like to point out that IUCN is fully aware of the progress made in Colombia. We are in permanent communication with the Park services in Colombia and are of course ready to support them. IUCN would also like to point out to the Committee the approach to the in Danger List as an exemplary example of the use of this instrument. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to move for adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.7A.14.”

Rapporteur:

“The Draft Decision is on page 34 of the English and 35 of the French version of Document 7A.ad. Please note that the number of the Draft Decision in the English document is incorrect: It should read 7A.14 and I have not received any written amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.14? I see none. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7A.14** is adopted in its entirety including paragraphs 1 to 10.

I would like to adjourn our session and hand the floor to the Secretariat for any announcements.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je souhaite attirer votre attention sur le fait qu'il y a de nombreux événements en marge de notre session aujourd'hui et je vais vous en informer d'une manière chronologique. De 13 h à 14 h dans la salle E se réunit le Groupe de travail sur le budget. Il y a également à 13 h en face de l'hôtel Alvorada un départ pour une visite du Congrès national et un déjeuner est offert par la Chambre des députés, ceci prendra place également demain. Cette visite est pour un maximum de cent personnes par journée, vous comprenez bien les contraintes.

Il y a également à partir de 13 h 15 jusqu'à 15 h dans le Bureau : la réunion d'information sur le CIC de Haïti. Également à 13 h 15 dans le lobby de l'hôtel, un point d'information sur les travaux de l'UICN et de la Fondation MAVA, ceci prendra place également demain midi.

Aussi, de 13 h 30 à 14 h dans la salle F, un point d'information sur le Patrimoine mondial d'origine portugaise et enfin si vous arrivez à suivre tout cela, il y aura de 14 h à 15 h dans cette salle et de manière exceptionnelle, le Groupe de réflexion sur l'Avenir de la *Convention*. Je vous remercie de votre attention et bon appétit ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup Anne, la session est clôturée et bon appétit à tous ».

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 28 July, 2010

Wednesday, 28 July 2010

SEVENTH MEETING

Afternoon session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
M. Mohamed El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

The Chairperson:

“I would like to request the Delegations to take their seats, so that we may start this afternoon session. We will look now into the **Galapagos Islands, Ecuador**. The Secretariat will make the presentation.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. This property is recognised in large part due to the manifestation of evolutionary processes occurring there. This has led to the development of live forms found nowhere else on the planet. Preventing the arrival of alien species to the Galapagos remains the main management challenge there. The arrival of alien species on islands usually leads to severe ecosystem disruptions; these are very commonly followed by extinction.

This property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007 due to growing concerns related to inadequate bio-security measures which failed to effectively prevent the arrival of alien species. Closely linked to this concern is tourism-related population growth. The Committee also recognises the vulnerability of the Galapagos Marine Reserve to illegal industrial fishing, to poorly articulated artisanal fishing and to the illegal practise of shark finning, feeding the large overseas market for shark fin soup.

A mission visited the property for five days in April to monitor progress in the implementation of the corrective measures. It visited four islands and met with many different stakeholders. Progress was observed in several of the fifteen corrective measures. For example, fumigation of arriving aircraft is now a routine practise. And the bio-security agency is now more robust, though its capacity remains inadequate for the task at hand, particularly in regard to bio-security infrastructures and protocol relating to shipping goods from the continent.

The Park now benefits from a satellite tracking system for larger Ecuadorian fishing and tourism ships, which helps identify illegal activities in real time from its headquarters (the slides illustrate how the Park uses the system). But concerns remain over the poor track record of the Park’s larger control vessels, which tended to be out of service for periods far exceeding their time on actual duty.

The Park is under intense pressure from national and foreign interests to open up the Galapagos to commercial sport fishing. It was compelled to accept the practise on the absence of a regulatory framework, putting in doubt its sovereignty over the decision making process regarding the use of the reserve. The principal recommendations of the mission relate to:

- 1) The need for fully equipped bio-security facilities both in the port of Guayaquil and in one selected arrival port in Galapagos, without which the threat from alien species remains very high.
- 2) The replacement of old cargo ships with new vessels specifically designed to reduce bio-security risks.
- 3) The development of a concerted vision and policy framework for tourism in the Galapagos.
- 4) Placing a moratorium on sport fishing until the activity has been thoroughly considered in light of protecting the property's Outstanding Universal Values.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that continued progress on the corrective measures in general and demonstrated achievements in regard to the main issues noted above must be reported, before the property can be removed from the World Heritage in Danger List. Mr. Chairman, I believe IUCN has further comments.”

IUCN:

“With your permission Mr. Chair. IUCN has very carefully considered its input to the report and on the draft desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger. It notes that it includes proposed indicators designed to assess progress on the state of the property's ecological values, integrity and management, which are the basis of its OUV, Outstanding Universal Value. IUCN wishes to emphasize that the desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in its current form is a draft and will require further discussion, in detail, with the State Party prior to being finalised and being used as agreed guidance. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now open to members of the Committee. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The Brazilian Delegation expresses its appreciation for the effort that has been made in the Galapagos. We would like to congratulate the Centre and the Bodies for the report that is submitted to us. It is an extremely detailed and enlightening report on the situation, especially regarding the difficulties faced at the site. Nevertheless, I would like to note that we have received information that the State Party is seeking to implement and better adjust this special legislation of protection of the Galapagos and it is also making effort towards improving governance.

It seeks, with the means that the State Party has, to control illegal fishing and it is undertaking efforts to reducing immigration rates as well as making an effort and taking actions so that tourism at that site may become sustainable. Of course, the difficulties at this site are huge and complex, but we believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have to acknowledge the effort that the government of the State Party has been making; putting in effort and a lot of commitment, sometimes with limited resources, in order to improve the current situation at the site.

We acknowledge the problems identified partially, but at the same time we underscore the will of the State Party to overcome these problems and above all the concern of the State Party to keep the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. There is also an effort being made by several members of this Committee and of UNESCO, besides the pertinent Agencies and Bodies, in making a contribution to the State Party.

In this regard, I would like to remind you that Brazil has been offering partnership to the State Party between the National Parks of Fernando de Noronha and Galapagos. Both are sites of the World Heritage and have very similar features. The purposes are to identify existing problems, and to exchange good environmental management practises as well as those for preservation and conservation of the site. In this regard we believe that the site should be removed from the World Heritage List in Danger, and to this purpose, Brazil forwarded an amendment changing the final part of the Draft Decision.

Finally, Mr. Chairman with your authorisation, the Brazilian Delegation would like the State Party at stake to answer us the following questions: what are the actions taken by the State Party in order to improve governance at the Galapagos islands, with the purpose of solving problems in such a way, that it would justify their removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger? Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of the State Party to respond and provide the clarification requested by the Brazilian Delegation.”

Ecuador :

“Thank you very much, and also thank you for your very warm welcome to Brazil. I would like to say that the State of Ecuador has taken many measures to change in-depth the governance of Galapagos, and in particular a constitutional amendment, where we recognise the high-level panelling charge of the Park of Galapagos. It is also the policy of our government to ensure conservation of the archipelagos. This is one of the priorities of our country and this is important for the conservation of the environment, but also for the local population. This is why one of the measures taken by the government is to mitigate the risk of alien species coming in onto the archipelago, which would unsettle the balance that exists. We have reduced access points and increased bio-security measures.

As a State Party we recognise that there are ongoing threats to the archipelago, but we have taken measures in order to control alien species; also we have regulated sport fishing and we have worked with fishing communities, so that they are more environmentally friendly when carrying out their activities. This is undertaken and supervised by the authorities of the Park. We are also controlling the number of visitors to the Galapagos.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, visitors do not visit the protected area, they visit the settlements. This is why we talked about a new tourist model, the one we have implemented to try to control the amount of visitors, as well as the boats and ships reaching the Galapagos. Galapagos has been included since 2007, but we have not benefited from international cooperation. All the efforts we have carried out have been done through the efforts of the people of Ecuador who have funded this. This is why, we would like, in view of the effort that we have made, to be withdrawn form the World Heritage List in Danger. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“The representative of Mexico has the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you. Mexico would like to put a question to the State Party. I know Ecuador has just taken the floor but we have further questions. What are the corrective measures that have been taken by the government of Ecuador in the Galapagos?”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais au nom de la Délégation française encourager l'État partie dans les efforts qu'il a déjà consacrés et les souligner et faire part de la position de ma Délégation au soutien de la proposition qui a été présentée par le Brésil, pour que l'on examine la possibilité de ne pas maintenir les îles Galápagos sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Nous aimerions entendre l'État partie sur un point précis : à savoir les mécanismes qui ont été mis en place pour justement contrôler le nombre de visiteurs dans les îles Galápagos . Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the State Party to give more information on the questions asked by the representatives, including the ones asked by Mexico.”

Ecuador (English translation):

“Thank you Chair. To answer the question from Mexico: the State of Ecuador has carried out a number of measures to mitigate the threats, in particular the control on the number of visitors. As a State Party, we know that there are more visitors to settled areas and that is where we are changing our plan, so that we regulate hotels, as well as the quality of services on a number of boats that operate in the island. What we want to express, here, is that this is the way of controlling the number of visitors to the archipelago.

On the other hand, we must also underscore that we have controlled access ports and harbours and we have improved bio-security control. These are more measures which are in the pipeline, they have been already implemented and in the report it is set that Te Baltra should be the only access point for freight, but, as a State Party, we are committed to carrying out a technical analysis and a feasibility analysis to see whether it is possible to have this place as the only access point to the archipelago. Also, activities such as sport fishing are regulated and added to the fishing sector. Regarding illegal fishing, it has been greatly reduced and governance overall has improved. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. We would like to echo Brazil and France in congratulating the State Party for the effort that it has made in relation to the measures outlined as the threats to this property. We are particularly happy to hear that, giving the long history of the property. May I, through Mr. Chairman, perhaps address a question to IUCN? Clearly the State Party has brought to us a great deal of encouraging information. I would like to hear from IUCN whether this information was broadly available to it at the time the Draft Decision was drafted or in the view of IUCN, the information that we have heard from the State Party materially changed as it approached to the Decision. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“IUCN you can clarify this point.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. IUCN fully acknowledges important progress made, as described by various distinguished delegates, including of course Ecuador. IUCN is confident that the conclusion drawn based on the recent missions and other sources of information constitute an accurate reflection of the situation. The threats leading to the Committee's decision to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger have been considerably addressed, but in our view not to a degree that would allow for removal from the World Heritage in Danger List at this point in time. In IUCN's view, the List of World Heritage in Danger is an appropriate instrument to jointly further address the situation and IUCN is ready to contribute in this process. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would any other Delegations like to take the floor? Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I apologise for speaking a second time. I would like to praise the question made by the delegate of Australia to IUCN. I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that the Delegation of Brazil is taken aback and to a certain degree disappointed, because, if this information was conveyed fully to IUCN in due course and if these measures could have led to a change in the text of the Decision, I do not see why the comments, information and data provided by the State party should not be duly taken into account.

Therefore, I believe that the efforts of the State Party should be acknowledge and reflected in the document. I would then like to record the disappointment of the Delegation of Brazil in view of the explanations provided by IUCN. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Jordan has the floor.”

Jordan:

“Mr. Chairperson, according to the information received and the positive action done so far, Jordan would support the removal of the site from the List in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. Barbados finds itself in a bit of a quandary. We certainly felt that with the extremely positive report that was put forward, and now with the response of the State Party on the request of Australia, we find ourselves in a situation where we cannot quite comprehend why the move cannot be made more positively towards encouraging by the action, as suggested by Jordan. We find ourselves very much in support of the suggestion made by Brazil and wanting to move positively forward in this respect. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Any other Delegations would like the floor? Observers, State Parties? No? So the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 40 of the English document 7A.ad and on page 41 in the French version. I have received one amendment from the Delegation of Brazil which concerns only paragraph 8. This means that paragraphs 1 to 7 remain unchanged.

Paragraph 8 would change as follow. The initial text is deleted and replaced by:

8. Decides to remove the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the World Heritage Centre to continue to cooperate with the State Party to follow up and assess the progress on the implementation of the recommendations contained in Paragraph 6 above, with a view to attaining the objectives set out in the Statement of the desired State of Conservation and in line with the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value proposed by the State Party.

I repeat the paragraph a second time; Brazil suggests replacing current paragraph 8 with:

8. Decides to remove the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the World Heritage Centre to continue to cooperate with the State Party to follow up and assess the progress on the implementation of the recommendations contained in Paragraph 6 above, with a view to attaining the objectives set

out in the Statement of the desired State of Conservation and in line with the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value proposed by the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of IUCN, who wants to make a statement.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. To note that the desired state of conservation which is referred to is the result of a mission that I was on in the Galapagos which concluded on 6 May. So, the main answer to Australia is in relation to the degree in which information was known and introduced into the State Party report. I think it is important, leaving aside that point, that in redrafting this point that the desired state of conservation that is being put forward is related to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

So, it would be a curious way to draft a Decision to remove the property from World Heritage List in Danger and would also request that the desired state of conservation that is necessary for the removal of the in Danger List is included in the Decision, so that might be a drafting point for the rapporteur to consider, at least in terms of the logic of the proposal put forward. Otherwise, I think that it is worth noting that we feel that the report is current and based on a mission that was late in the cycle and completed on 6 May. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“I am asking the committee if we should start approving the Decision. Before that the rapporteur would like to take the floor following the comments made by IUCN.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I take the intervention of IUCN as an amendment with regard to deletion of the statement of the desired state of conservation. The amendment would read as follows:

8. Decides to remove the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the World Heritage Centre to continue to cooperate with the State Party to follow up and assess the progress on the implementation of the recommendations contained in Paragraph 6 above, in line with the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value proposed by the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Brazil would like to comment.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Chair. As regards the observation made by the IUCN representative, we agree with it and we thank the rapporteur for the new wording and agree with it too.”

The Chairperson:

“Do all members of the committee agree to the new wording that includes the amendment of Brazil and the comment of IUCN? I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Monsieur le Président, la Suisse souhaite tenir au projet de Décision initial de ne pas retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril au vu des explications de l’UICN et au vu du rapport de mission. Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Sweden also thinks that although there has been some progress on the site’s management, the existing problems do not yet allow for its removal from the in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Anyone else would like to comment? In that case we are going to proceed to a vote. The floor is to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman, I am trying of a way through this that might recognise the efforts of the State Party. I wonder if it would be possible to introduce a form of wording in the final paragraph that would be along the lines:

on the basis of the information described on the above paragraph, looks forward to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session of the World Heritage Committee.

This is not the exact wording, but this is to put forward a concept that might help us to prevent us coming to a vote of the State Parties, which I think would be preferable to avoid, if we can. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. We have closely listened to the proposal of Australia, but it does not follow the objectives contained in our amendment. Our amendment is very clear: It is to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and the Australian proposal, which is very constructive, does not go with the sense of our intention, which is to remove the site from the in Danger List. Therefore, I would like, if you agree Mr. Chairman, that the State Party should express their opinion. We want to maintain our amendment to the Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to consult and ask if other member States are in favour of removing the site from the List, because if we have already five member States in favour we would not have to proceed to a vote. I give the floor to South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Thank you, Chair. We have been listening to the discussion around this site. There seems to be a consensus that a great amount of work has happened, there is no dispute about that and if there is no dispute, it would seem to be unfair if we are acknowledging the work and then saying: “deleting you next year”. Why can’t we do it now, when there is a general acknowledgement of the good work that has been done? This would encourage the State Party to keep up the good work by removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Any other Delegation would like to take the floor? I will ask the legal advisor to explain the voting procedure.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a matter that is covered by the *Convention* as in accordance to article 37: *Decisions of the Committee on matters covered by the provisions of the Convention shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting.*

Under Rule 39: *For the purpose of the present Rules, the expression "States members present and voting" shall mean States members casting an affirmative or negative vote. States members abstaining from voting shall be regarded as not voting.*

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We do regret that this is coming to this, but can I clarify, through you, that the legal advisor has outlined a part of the process, but certainly we are not exactly sure which we are voting for. I wonder if we could hear the complete picture of all of this, to reflect on it, as we unfortunately appear to be moving to this very regrettable situation.”

The Chairperson:

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

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. We would then vote on the amendment that was put forward by Brazil, which I will simplify for the matter of voting as: *The World Heritage Committee decides to remove the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador, from the List of World Heritage in Danger*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Let’s proceed to voting. Please members of the Committee, we will vote by a show of hands. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We would then ask for the Committee members to vote in favour of the amendment which reads:

Decides to remove the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador, from the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

The Chairperson :

“There are 14 votes in favour.”

Rapporteur:

“Please take your signs down. We will then ask for the State Parties to vote against the: *Decision to remove the Galapagos, Ecuador, from the List of World Heritage in Danger.*”

The Chairperson:

“Five votes against.”

Rapporteur:

“Now the State Party who would like to abstain, please.”

The Chairperson:

“One State Party. The floor is to the rapporteur, who will announce the official results.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We have recorder 20 State members voting: 14 in favour, 5 against and one abstention, this means we have reached the two thirds’ majority.”

The Chairperson:

“The number needed was 12.6, Galapagos is removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

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

Document : WHC-10/34.COM/7B, 7B.Add, Add.2 and Add.3

Decisions: 34 COM 7B.1 à 7B.116

The Chairperson:

We are now moving to point 7B, the state of conservation reports of the World Heritage sites considered to be put on the in Danger site List. Everyone knows that this deals with reactive monitoring, as defined by paragraph 169 of the Operational Guidelines, the reports carried out by the World Heritage Centre and other organs of UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies, on specific property that are not on the in Danger List. I now give the floor to Mr. Rao who is the Deputy Director of the World heritage Centre and will present a summary of item 7B.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Chair. The documents that we consider under 7B are four: 34 COM. 7B, 7B.Add, 7B.Add.2 and 7B.Add.3. So, there are four different documents to be considered in this session of the State of Conservation report of properties that are not on the in Danger list.

These lists of State of Conservation reports were prepared jointly by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and the basis for preparing this List were the decisions taken by the committee, either at its previous sessions, or at the time of inscription of the site. The list also includes properties that have come under serious threat since the

last session of the Committee. It also includes properties that are proposed to be included on the in Danger List.

The Committee would note from the various Draft Decisions that we have presented, that we try to establish at least a two-year reporting cycle, which will then enable a proper follow-up of the decisions that the Committee takes. It also offers us the opportunity to bring forward the State of Conservation of properties which have never been reported before.

The process for preparing the State of Conservation report has been described in working document 7B. It also describes how we consult with the State Party to verify information that we receive from third party sources. We will present the properties which are proposed to be included on the in Danger List or where significant new information has come to light. All those properties which have been proposed to be discussed by the Committee members, in accordance with the request that they submitted prior to 9 July 2010.

As in the previous sessions, we have also prepared an analytical summary of the State of Conservation of all those properties that were assessed by the Committee in the past five years. This analytical summary provides the trends in the State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties. This trend in analysis is contained in document 34 COM.7C. I will not go into the details of the strengths and analysis of the document as a separate time slot is available on the agenda for the Committee to discuss this item.

I would also like to clarify, because this question is often raised by the Committee, the different type of missions that are undertaken. One of course is the reactive monitoring missions that we undertake to assess the State of Conservation of properties and these are decided by the Committee. Secondly, there are reinforced monitoring missions, which are also decided by the Committee, or by The Chairperson and the director general of UNESCO. Then, we have missions that are undertaken in the framework of projects or activities that are carried out in different properties. Lastly, sometimes the staff or people from IUCN visit these sites in the framework of other events and workshops that may be taking place at these properties or in their vicinity. We have also provided in document 7B.ad2, a list of all the missions that we have requested this year, including budgetary implications.

The introduction part of 7B also contains some of the actions that we have taken to implement the climate change initiative agreed upon by the Committee. We have now initiated a pilot project in Indonesia with financing from the German Ministry of Environment to promote biological connectivity and adaptive forest management at the tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra site. A similar project on adaptation has also been approved by the Swiss Development Cooperation for the Manu national Park in Peru. It has yet to commence. We also prepared some tool kits to help World Heritage site managers to assess climate change. Two new publications on the project have also been brought out on the subject by UNESCO recently.

As for the World in Danger List, we will look at Cultural Heritage properties first before passing on to the Natural Heritage properties. You may wish to give the floor to the Director for announcing some changes to the list of the properties to be discussed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Rao. The floor is to Mr. Bandarin.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you. I would like to refer to the list that was distributed to you earlier. This is a new list of sites to be discussed. As you can see, this list is different from the other one you have received earlier on. In fact there are seven sites that have been withdrawn.

They are the following: number 25, Virgin Komi Forest (Russian Federation), number 32, Talamanca Range, La Amistad Reserve (Costa Rica), number 81, the Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria), number 94, Kizhi Pogost (Russian federation), number 103, Kiev, the Saint Sophia Cathedral and 104, Lyiv Historical centre (both Ukraine) and number 113, Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama).

These sites have been withdrawn by the member States that had originally proposed them, so they are not included in the list that has been submitted to you. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the Russian Federation’s representative.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. I would like to say that Russia wants to keep for discussion the Virgin Komi Forest and Kiev’s Saint Sophia Cathedral and Pechersk Lavra and related monastic buildings. We submitted some amendments to the Draft Decision. Besides, we would like to ask members of the Committee to open the discussion on an item which was not listed here, the middle Rhine Valley, as it is necessary to make some amendments to the Draft Decision on this. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I think the Russian Federation intervention has actually covered the one issue I wished to mention.”

The Chairperson:

“It is actually up to the Committee to decide if these cases should be reviewed to answer to the Delegation of the Russian Federation. I give the floor to the representative of Mexico.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Sir. Just a brief comment. We support the proposal that Ukraine put forward in terms of discussing their project.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“We support the discussion on the three sites proposed by the Russian Federation.”

The Chairperson:

“Anyone else would like to take the floor regarding these three sites, so that we decide to include them for review or not? Iraq, please.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Chairperson. I completely agree with the assessment of the Russian Federation and support it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. C’est juste pour aller dans le même sens que la Russie et appuyer la discussion sur les trois sites ».

The Chairperson:

“Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“We also endorse the suggestion by the Federation of Russia. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Brazil has the floor.”

Brazil:

“Brazil agrees with the stand voiced by the Russian Federation.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to ask a question: do we have anyone that objects to the inclusion of these three items as it seems to me that there is a majority supporting the proposal from the Russian Federation delegate? No objections? Ok, then I think that we can go ahead and consider the three items that have been proposed accepted for discussion. The proposal put forward by the Russian Federation Delegation has been accepted for discussion.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

The first point to be discussed concerns the **Tombs of Buganda’s Kings at Kasubi (Uganda)**. The floor is to Mr. Eloundou for his presentation.”

The Secretariat:

« Monsieur le Président, le bien qui fait l’objet de cet examen se trouve en page 92 de la version anglaise et en page 97 de la version française du document 7B.ad. Le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2001, sur la base des critères (i),(iii), (iv) et (vi). Le 16 mars 2010, un incendie a ravagé une des composantes majeures du bien appelé le Muzibu Azaala Mpanga. Il s’agit d’un bâtiment historique qui abritait les tombes royales des quatre rois de l’ancien royaume du Buganda.

Pour vous donner une idée de ce bâtiment : c’est un bâtiment circulaire au toit de chaume soutenu par des colonnes en bois enveloppées dans du tissu d’écorces. Ce bâtiment est un témoignage exceptionnel d’un style architectural développé par le royaume du Buganda depuis le XIIIe siècle. Il avait été construit en 1882 comme palais et était devenu un tombeau royal. Il a subi plusieurs modifications, dont la plus importante en 1938 avec l’introduction d’une structure enlacée dans le système de toiture reposant sur les piliers.

Vous vous souvenez également que, comme première réponse à cette tragédie, la Directrice générale de l’UNESCO a envoyé une mission dirigée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et comprenant des experts du Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain et de l’organisation CRATERE basée en France. Cette mission s’est déroulée du 7 au 9 mars 2010 et elle a fait les constatations suivantes : presque toute la totalité du bâtiment a été détruite, toute la structure végétale constituée de poteaux en bois et d’anneaux ainsi que toute la partie en écorce et une partie des symboles du royaume ont été entièrement consumées par le feu.

Suite à cette destruction, de nombreuses pratiques traditionnelles ne peuvent plus être exécutées sereinement. Les tombes royales, qui sont très sacrées, sont exposées aux intempéries, ce qui provoque un traumatisme très visible auprès de la population. La mission a appuyé la demande de l’État partie de voir le Muzibu Azaala Mpanga entièrement reconstruit. Mais la mission a souligné l’importance de ne pas hâter cette reconstruction, soulignant la difficulté d’une reconstruction rapide en raison de la complexité de la structure, des éléments intangibles qui lui sont associés et du besoin de s’assurer la permanence de la main-d’œuvre traditionnelle qualifiée tout au long des travaux.

En outre, la mission a considéré qu’une reconstruction sans étude appropriée pourrait amener des changements irréversibles qui pourraient nuire à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Elle a, par conséquent, demandé qu’une stratégie de reconstruction qui indique clairement comment le bâtiment serait reconstruit et que la base des preuves, soient préparées. Sur recommandation de la mission, l’État Partie a soumis une demande

d'assistance internationale d'urgence afin de lui permettre de mettre en œuvre les activités les plus urgentes. Cette requête a été soumise au mois de mai 2010 et a été examinée par les organisations consultatives (l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM en parleront probablement).

Depuis la rédaction de ce rapport qui vous a été soumis, l'État partie a initié un ensemble d'actions visant à préparer la reconstruction du Muzibu Azaala Mpanga et satisfaire aux recommandations de la mission UNESCO. Le 16 juillet 2010, il a soumis un rapport au Centre du patrimoine mondial qui explique la stratégie de reconstruction. Ce document a été préparé au cours d'un atelier national organisé avec le soutien financier du Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain le 27 mai 2010. Ce travail a également bénéficié de l'assistance technique d'un expert financé par le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain.

Le document liste l'ensemble des matériaux et la main-d'œuvre nécessaires pour assurer la reconstruction. Il explique également la méthode de gestion concertée entre le gouvernement et l'ancien royaume du Buganda et propose un Plan d'action pour la reconstruction. Ce document enfin, justifie les raisons de la décision de reconstruire le bâtiment sur le modèle de 1938, car c'est le mieux documenté en termes de dessins et de photos. Le document propose également un projet architectural du modèle à reconstruire, comme vous le voyez sur l'écran, ainsi qu'une estimation budgétaire de la reconstruction d'environ 1 million de dollars des États Unis. ICOMOS pourra éventuellement faire un commentaire sur ce document.

Enfin, le Centre et les Organisations consultatives sont d'avis que la destruction de ce bâtiment affecte la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Ils considèrent que sa reconstruction nécessite une surveillance étroite de la part du Centre et des Organisations consultatives, afin d'assurer la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

En outre, ils considèrent que le bien répond aux critères d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, conformément au paragraphe 179 des Orientations. Cette conclusion est d'ailleurs confirmée par l'État partie qui a adressé le 7 juillet 2010 une lettre au directeur du Centre l'informant de son souhait que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Enfin, l'État partie a également soumis le 12 juillet 2010 le Plan de gestion 2009-2015 récemment révisé. ICOMOS souhaite faire un commentaire ».

ICOMOS:

“First of all, ICOMOS deeply regrets this tragic fire and the almost complete destruction of the main Tomb building. Although we do not consider that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been lost, it certainly has been severely threatened by the loss of this structure. However, ICOMOS considers the significance of the building and the nature of its authenticity should allow full reconstruction to be acceptable in this instance.

We consider that the significance of the building lay partly in the way it reflected typical Ugandan traditions and also in its size, elaboration and sacred use and the way it needed constant maintenance and irregular renewal. Buildings such as these are maintained over time and their authenticity lies more in the reflection of traditional material and practices than in the age of their components parts.

ICOMOS considers that such a case can thus be made for the reconstruction of the Royal Burial Ground providing a clear strategy is agreed and set out in advance that provides a rationale for the chosen approach and clearly documents the process.

We also consider that this should be seen as an exemplary project and for that reason substantial funds will be needed. We also believe that such a project should be seen not only as a way of restoring the Outstanding Universal Value, but as an education and training opportunity.

As you have heard, the State Party has submitted an emergency international assistance request and this has been reviewed by ICOMOS and ICCROM. ICOMOS strongly supports the principal of this request for support for the key elements identified by the mission related to the immediate urgent works necessary for the future reconstruction process, such as: detailed research and documentation, particularly into traditional practices associated with the building; documenting information; securing the property; fire prevention and resources for a full and detailed reconstruction strategy that allows the justification of the option chosen and a complete record of the way this project will be carried out.

We have, during this meeting in Brasilia, had a meeting with the State Party to discuss this and we hope that this will lead to a successful request for assistance. Thank you.”

The Secretariat:

« En raison des nouvelles informations soumises par l'État partie, le Comité pourrait peut-être considérer amender le projet de Décision. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for this very detailed and comprehensive report that will help us to take a decision. The floor is open for your comments, Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. Barbados is in full agreement with your assessment in terms of the presentation by ICOMOS and the Centre, as for the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and the possibility to retain this through a painful reconstruction as documented. We feel that this merits the complete attention and support of the international community.

We have only one amendment to paragraph 6, as it seems rather packed and needs to be clarified in a certain way. As for the presentation given by the Centre, they seem to have decided to use the 1938 model as the reconstruction model. Then maybe we need to remove the other elements that have been listed in paragraph 6. I have presented the rapporteur with my amendment and I would like that to be taken into consideration. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je vais être très bref. Je n'ai pas tout à fait suivi, il semble qu'il y a eu un contact entre l'État partie et une mission de la part du Fonds africain du patrimoine mondial sur le site tout de suite après le drame, je n'ai pas eu de retour par rapport à cette mission. Deuxième point, hier nous avons eu une présentation du Fonds du patrimoine africain et nous avons tous pu juger de l'importance de l'application de ce Fonds et du Centre de catégorie 2 en Afrique du Sud en ce qui concerne le patrimoine africain, et nous allons apporter là-dessus un amendement sur ce point au projet de Décision.

Ensuite, je souhaiterais avoir plus d'informations en ce qui concerne la stratégie de reconstruction de la part de l'État membre, s'il y a un représentant dans la salle, je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“I open the floor to those who may be able to shed light to the request of the representative of Egypt.”

Uganda? (transcribers assumption):

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The strategy is summarised in the document which I will distribute to the members. Regarding the construction strategy, we have a figure of some US\$1 million and the reconstruction will cost also US\$67 regarding the rituals and related costs associated with the reconstruction.

So, to summarise: the strategy is distributed, if the member would like one, and as a separate document you have the details of reconstruction to what it was in 1938.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Thank you very much. I just wanted to align myself with the presentation that has been done by the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It is indeed a great tragedy that has occurred at this site, and we want to acknowledge and appreciate the work that has been done by the State Party in terms of salvaging the situation at this site. I would also like to take this opportunity to appeal to the World African Fund to devise a strategy that will focus on the risk management of all African World Heritage sites.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you very much. Nigeria would also like to align its support to the decision by both the Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the need to completely restore this site even though it is slightly against the established procedure. But given the potential for training and the possibility of retaining or restoring the Outstanding Universal Values of this property, I think it is a very good decision that Nigeria would like to be associated with.

We would also like to call on the international community to support the efforts that have already been made by Uganda to restore the site, so that they will be encouraged. The resources that are required, that have been estimated at over US\$1 million are actually huge for an African country. Therefore we would like to lend our support to this call for international assistance given the importance of this site, not only for the people of Uganda but of any origin. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali, you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais simplement rappeler le fait que pour la première fois depuis que les débats ont commencé : l'État partie, le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que les Organisations consultatives en charge du dossier, toutes ces entités sont d'accord qu'il y a lieu de procéder à des réparations et à une restauration.

En la matière un processus a déjà été engagé. Il y a eu une mission conjointe et aussi une stratégie de reconstruction élaborée par l'État partie. Donc, on peut considérer que les travaux ont déjà commencé et que les travaux lourds de reconstruction vont exiger énormément de moyens. Je joins ma voix à celle de mon collègue du Nigeria pour inviter la communauté internationale à assister l'Ouganda dans la reconstruction de ce site extrêmement important. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Any other members would like to take the floor? Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Bahrain regrets that this property is proposed to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. But, given the current circumstances we support the Draft Decision proposed. However, we wish to propose a slight amendment to paragraph 13, in which we request the mission to not only assist the State Party in developing corrective measures and a timeframe but also to provide assistance in establishing a desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. We have submitted this to the rapporteur. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We would like to support the decision for reconstruction of the site. However, we would like to say that the proposed reconstruction strategy and detailed design should be revealed by a joint group of experts comprising both of the Advisory Bodies' experts and local know-how. I would also like to say that this has to be conducted on site rather than just a test. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to ICCROM.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you very much. I just wanted to take this opportunity to say a few words. This site is a site where ICCROM has been involved through the AFRICA 2009 Programme, and actually before its inscription on the World Heritage List. I just wanted to make a couple of points in relation to the comments that have been made.

It is very important that we pay attention to the structure, obviously for the physical integrity of the site and of the structure of the Tombs. But I think it is equally important to know the intangible aspects related to this site, in relation to the traditional management system, in relation to the traditional construction techniques and in relation also to the ceremonies and religious practices that go on there.

I think it is a very good example. Earlier we were discussing the relationships between the 2003 Convention and this *Convention*. Here is an example of where the intangible aspect heritage of the site is as important as the physical tangible element of the site.

The second point that I wanted to make is to actually support the comment made by one of the distinguished delegates of Africa in relation to Disaster Risk Management. On this particular site, unfortunately there was no Disaster Risk Management and this is a site which obviously is prone to fire risk and perhaps others. So, it is important that as a general principle we try to promote Disaster Risk Management in this region and obviously in the whole region and for the world.

Specifically in the reconstruction plan, ICCROM wants to emphasize the need for Disaster Risk Management to be taken into account in the overall management of the site, and more particularly because of the very high risk of fire at a site like this, that specific fire fighting systems are incorporated into the reconstruction effort. So, ICCROM feels that it is very, very important that it should be an element of the final reconstruction plan.

Finally, on the issue of reconstruction, again we were pointing out that in the Operational Guidelines it does allow for reconstruction in the case of exceptional circumstances and whether there is adequate documentation, and we think that this is the case for this site and follows, in that sense, the normal regulations. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Anyone else would like to take the floor? Iraq, you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Chair. Iraq fully supports the reconstruction of the site, it is not only important for us in Africa but for everybody all over the world. Something like this cannot be allowed to waste. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B. 53 is on page 95 of the English and page 100 of the French version of Document 7B.ad. I have received three written amendments to the Draft Decision from members of the Committee: Barbados, Bahrain and Egypt. Those amendments address paragraphs 6 and 13. Paragraphs 1 to 5 remain unchanged.

Barbados is proposing a redrafting on paragraph 6. I believe in order to clarify the existing arguments in the paragraph but without major changes in the content. I will read out to you the new formulation of paragraph 6 which is now broken down into a chapeau paragraph and two sub paragraphs. It reads:

6. Further considers that the reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga could be justified, provided, that the new structure is based on authenticity in design, materials, and techniques as well as continuing use; and that:

Here Barbados proposes to insert sub paragraph a and b:

a) a clear rationale for the overall project is set out and agreed in advance that sets out the basis for the chosen approach,

b) due consideration is given to the various options, such as re-building as in 2010, 1939, 1911 or as in the 1980s, based on sound documentation and traditional materials and techniques,

I repeat the paragraph once again as I made a mistake in reading it and it is complex:

6. Further considers that the reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga could be justified, provided, that the new structure is based on authenticity in design, materials, and techniques as well as continuing use; and that:

a) a clear rationale for the overall project is set out and agreed in advance that sets out the basis for the chosen approach,

b) due consideration is given to the various options, such as re-building as in 2010, 1939, 1911 or as in the 1880s, based on sound documentation and traditional materials and techniques.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. The rapporteur was accurate in what she reported as my redrafting. However, in the presentation made by the Centre, it seemed to me that the Centre has reached with ICOMOS a process of selection in which they selected the 1938 version. If that is the case, then I will be prepared to accommodate that change within the current redrafting. Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“The Secretariat, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“I would like to make a comment on that. I think the document that the State Party has provided so far outlines reconstruction strategies and suggests 1938, for which evidence exists. But, I think and we suggest that in the more detailed reconstruction strategy that will be put forward, there is a need to evaluate the various options and justify the chosen one, so it might be preferable to keep your initial wording.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you very much ICOMOS. I will then keep it, yet, I note a slight discrepancy between the original text and my re-drafting which, is 1938 instead of 1939. Can we have that as the final date? Thank you.”

The Secretariat:

“You are correct. It should be 1938.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“I then note that the date changes in b. Thereby the dates would be as follow: 2010, 1938, 1911 or as in the 1880s.

The following paragraphs 7 to 12 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 13 has amendments by Egypt and Bahrain. The amendment of Egypt proposes to include the African World Heritage Funds into the joint mission that is proposed to the site. The proposal of Bahrain is to propose that the mission assists in the development of the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property.

The complete paragraph with both amendments would read as follows:

13. Also requests the State Party to invite, as soon as possible, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICCROM/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and the African World Heritage Fund to the property, to assess the state of conservation of the property, and develop, in cooperation with the State Party, the corrective measures to address the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value as well as a time frame for their implementation, a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to advise the stakeholders on the overall reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga;

Paragraph 14 following would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any comments to make or can we adopt the Decision? Iraq would like the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you; we endorse what Egypt and Bahrain suggested. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Australia is also very happy to support those amendments, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“Mr. Chairman, as we are enhancing the intangible heritage, we take that into consideration and we endorse what has been proposed by the delegates of Egypt and Bahrain.”

The Chairperson:

“Everyone seems to agree. Therefore we consider that the Draft Decision as read by the rapporteur is approved.

The floor is to the Minister from Uganda who wishes to comment.”

Uganda:

“Thank you Chair. I had prepared a speech, but I am overwhelmed by the reception and therefore I would like to first of all to thank the director general of UNESCO for the quick response and by sending a UNESCO assessment mission led by the World Heritage Centre. Uganda would also like to thank the African World Heritage Funds for supporting the workshop that built the consensus on the reconstruction strategy for the Kasubi Tombs.

I summarise here, because I am really overwhelmed by the support. I would like to state at this junction that I wish to explain that the Ugandan government will follow the guidelines provided by the World Heritage Committee through the construction process. The

government is going to work with all the stakeholders to make sure that the reconstruction and the restoration of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga is done according to the World Heritage Committee and Stakeholders' guidelines.

I would like to thank the government of Brazil for hosting this convention, for the good hospitality given to my Delegation. I would also like to let the convention know that in my Delegation we have the representative of the Buganda Kingdom; the head of the ruling clan is with us. This shows that the Ugandan government is working closely with the Ugandan traditional leaders and governments in the restoration of the Kasubi Tombs.

Finally, I would like to call on all the stakeholders of this conference to respond to our appeal. The Ugandan people have already contributed over US\$200,000 and the appeal is still ongoing and therefore we should be assisted, because we need materials and labour and we need to train further staff for the restoration and reconstruction of our Tombs.

I thank the Committee for being very receptive to our request and I am going back and for any Delegation that will come to Uganda expect to receive the assistance and cooperation from the Government and the Kingdom of Uganda. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Anyone else would like the floor? Mexico."

Mexico:

"Thank you very much Sir. Before we continue to examine the remaining state of conservation reports, we would like to put a request to the Committee so that it is included in the discussion. We would like to discuss Decision34 COM. 7B.100, it refers to Seville in Spain and the Caracol Palace. This is at the request of the State Party."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Let's move on to the next item, the site of Aksum in Ethiopia."

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous n'avons pas d'informations supplémentaires que celles déjà incluses dans le rapport, cependant le Comité a souhaité discuter de ce bien. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"The Floor is open for comments of the members of the Committee. Would anyone like to comment? No, then the floor is to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Chairperson. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Barbados which addresses paragraph 10, and the Delegation of Barbados suggests the deletion of most of the first line of the paragraph, up to *further request*. So the

deletion would be: *regrets the development of site museum within the property.* Paragraph 10 would then read:

10. Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about changes and new construction within the property and its proposed buffer zone including the planned Church Museum, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, before any commitment is made.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICCROM has the floor.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you. Just as a matter of clarification. We are not regretting the building of the site museum itself, what we are regretting is, that the site museum has been established in the core zone and the visual impact it causes on the property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you. I very much appreciate the explanation given by ICOMOS. I did understand perfectly that this was the case. Unfortunately the language was excessive and did not take account of that. I think we just need to delete that first part of the paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“More comments? If not, we move on to the adoption. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. It is Brazil’s view that with the remarks made by Barbados, we seem to have overcome the problem that we had.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to ask if the Committee agrees with the amendments and the Draft Decision. Ok, it is approved.

Now let’s move on to the **Old Town of Lamu (Kenya)**. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je voudrais rappeler que le Comité sur ce bien avait décidé l'envoi d'une mission de l'ICOMOS, de l'ICCROM et du Centre du patrimoine mondial au cours de l'année 2010 pour lui permettre d'examiner l'état de conservation du bien lors de sa 35^e session en 2011. Mais en raison des informations que nous avons reçues sur l'imminence potentielle du projet portuaire de Lamu, le calendrier de la mission a été avancé et l'examen du bien ramené à la 34^e session. Par contre le calendrier de soumission de l'État partie n'ayant pas été modifié, il est normal que l'on ne le retrouve pas dans les documents de cette session.

La mission de l'ICCROM, de l'ICOMOS et du Centre du patrimoine mondial qui s'est rendue à Lamu du 7 au 9 mai 2010 a fait les constatations suivantes. Le site proposé pour l'installation du nouveau port se situerait sur le côté continental de la baie de Manda à 15 kilomètres environ du bien et permettrait de desservir une zone incluant : l'Éthiopie, le Soudan, la Somalie, l'Ouganda, le Rwanda, le Burundi et la partie orientale de la République Démocratique du Congo.

Un consultant japonais a été engagé pour mener l'étude de faisabilité. D'après les informations reçues par la mission, le projet pourrait commencer dans un an. Les informations actuelles en possession par la mission ne permettent pas de dire si l'État partie a complètement abandonné l'idée d'une prospection pétrolière dans la même zone. La mission est préoccupée par la taille et l'étendue du projet du nouveau port qui pourrait avoir un impact sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

La mission a noté les impacts potentiels suivants : une perturbation des pratiques de pêche traditionnelle qui font partie du rôle traditionnel de Lamu en tant que port. Une dégradation environnementale du bien par la dégradation de l'écosystème marin, ce qui aurait un impact négatif sur l'intégrité du bien. D'importantes pressions inévitables dues aux développements causés par l'afflux des populations dans le territoire du bien, de même que des pressions sur l'architecture traditionnelle et les fragiles ressources telle que l'eau douce des dunes de sable de Sheila.

Par conséquent, la mission s'est inquiétée de l'absence d'une évaluation de l'impact environnemental qui traiterait de l'impact sur la Valeur universelle du bien et que celle-ci n'aurait pas encore été préparée. Les autres questions liées à l'état de conservation sont dans le rapport qui vous a été soumis. Je passe la parole à l'ICOMOS ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS is concerned by the potentially and possibly enormously drastic impact that the proposed port could have on the property. There is a need for a very focused and precise impact assessment that targets precisely the impacts on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value and considers indeed the further survival of the archipelago. The island of Lamu and its surrounding archipelago are totally interconnected, a sustainable system with a very delicate balance between Lamu and surroundings, particularly the vital water supply from the dunes which underpins the whole development of the town.

Although the port is several kilometres to the north of Lamu, in the light of the proposed—as we understand it—40m dredging for the port, the entire survival of the island must be considered, as any changes in the sea current could have the potential to overwhelm these very fragile land areas. There is, therefore, a need for a fully detailed and focused environmental impact assessment based on detailed hydrological information. It is of

the utmost importance that this is received and reviewed before any commitment is made. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is open for comment. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you. The Brazilian Delegation would like to congratulate the Centre and ICOMOS for the very informative and well presented report we have just heard and also for the monitoring mission that was carried out in May 2010. The Committee should bear in mind that we should not stop the economic development of a region such as that of Eastern Africa; however, we should ensure the environmental sustainability of the site at hand.

It is Brazil’s view that the Draft Decision reads well and that it should be voted on as it is, and we encourage the Committee to actively engage its resources to make sure that the development of Eastern Africa takes place in a sustainable fashion without any threats to the site at hand. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would anyone else like to comment on the issue? No, the rapporteur has the floor”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The decision can be found on page 7 of the document 7b.ad2 in both the English and French versions of the document and I have not received any written amendment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we consider moving to the approval of this Draft Decision? Yes? So it is approved.

The representative of Mexico earlier on asked us to put forward a site in Seville. We need the approval of the Committee to this matter. Could the representative of Mexico please quickly present his suggestion?”

Mexico:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. As said earlier on, the State Party would like to refer to this matter, and in view of the fact that this is a very open minded Committee, we have put it forward and hope for a positive hearing. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections to the proposal put forth by the delegate of Mexico? Otherwise I have thereby its writing into the agenda.

Next item is the old town of Djenné in Mali. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

Secrétariat:

« Merci. Comme pour le bien d’Axoum, nous n’avons pas d’informations supplémentaires à apporter à ce que contient le rapport, mais le Comité a souhaité ouvrir ce bien pour la discussion. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is opened to any Delegations which wish to take it. Representative of Mali, you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Au niveau de la vieille ville de Djenné, il n’y avait pas de problèmes majeurs sauf pour l’assainissement et un plan de conservation a été élaboré et adopté. Les menaces principales concernaient l’assainissement. Il y a eu un Plan de gestion élaboré et accepté et qui prend en compte les demandes correspondant à ces menaces. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to take the floor? No. Then I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.47 can be found on page 86 of the English version and 90 of the French version of document 7B.ad and I have received one draft amendment by the Delegation of Barbados which, I believe, aims at improving the current wording of the English version of the Draft Decision in paragraphs 4 and 6.

In paragraph 4 it replaces the two words *operated on* by *occurring to* so that the paragraph reads:

4. Reiterates its concern with regard to the absence of control tools (town planning and construction regulations) to mitigate the changes occurring to the ancient built fabric and threats to the integrity of the archaeological sites.

The second change of wording addresses paragraph 6 where the Delegation of Barbados suggests replacing the words *provide responses adapted to* by a new wording *address or ameliorate*. The complete paragraph 6 then reads:

6. *Calls upon the international donor community to support actions to address or ameliorate the waste disposal problems in the ancient fabric.*

The other paragraphs, 1 to 3, 5 and 7 to 8 remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Would anyone like to make a comment? Otherwise we proceed to the adoption.

Ok, I ask the Committee if we can approve the Draft Decision which was just presented by the rapporteur? Yes, so it is Approved.

Next site is **Timbuktu in Mali**. The floor is back to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le bien de Tombouctou a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2006 sur la base des critères (ii), (iv) et (v). Le mécanisme de suivi renforcé a été levé sur le bien lors de la 33^e session du Comité du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Une mission du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS a visité le bien du 22 au 29 mars 2010.

La mission a observé que le Centre Ahmed Baba n'était toujours pas fonctionnel. Par contre, l'État partie a fait l'effort de modifier les couleurs extérieures de la façade principale comme recommandé par la mission de suivi réactif de 2008. L'on peut regretter que l'État partie ait construit une clôture autour du Centre Ahmed Baba. La mission a observé que cette clôture n'a pas contribué à résoudre le problème de l'intégrité visuelle qui se pose autour de la Mosquée de Sankoré. Sur la question du déplacement des salles de classe et des toilettes publiques, la mission a noté que cela n'avait pas été fait. Elle a néanmoins constaté que des efforts avaient été entrepris pour modifier la toiture et les menuiseries en faveur d'une typologie architecturale locale.

La mission a aussi été informée qu'un projet d'espace public autour de la Mosquée de Sankoré serait conduit par le Fonds d'affectation spécial Aga Khan pour la culture. L'État partie espère que ce travail permettra d'aider à recouvrer une partie de l'intégrité visuelle perdue avec la construction du Centre Ahmed Baba. Sur la question de la création d'un Comité national interministériel devant évaluer la pertinence de tous les projets d'envergure dans et autour du bien, l'État Partie a informé la mission de sa création, mais aucun document légal sur la création de ce Comité ni sur la liste de ses membres n'a été fourni au Comité du patrimoine mondial.

En ce qui concerne la question d'un règlement d'urbanisme ainsi que d'un Plan d'aménagement du territoire, la mission a noté qu'un avant projet d'urbanisme et un manuel de conservation étaient en train d'être finalisés. Enfin, la mission a noté que le débat avec la population avait été relancé sur l'opportunité d'entamer le travail d'extension des limites du bien à l'ensemble de la vieille ville. Je passe la parole à ICOMOS ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. Three Mosques and the Mausoleum make up the property set within the overall city of Timbuktu. This is an extraordinarily coherent entity, with a well defined boundary quite separate from the later development around it. The property was inscribed as a reflection of the once great City of Timbuktu which was both an international market and an international centre of learning. Without the surrounding city as a living city, the Mosques and

Mausoleum lose their context and therefore their significance. At the time of inscription in 1998, the vulnerability of the urban fabric was recognised and the need to conserve its essence was seen as urgent.

The recent work to involve the local community and to draft regulations for the city is to be commended. However, as the mission has highlighted, there is now an urgency to considering whether the Old City might be considered as an extension to the property, as the pace of development is such, that unless some action is taken in the near future to document the city and encourage traditional skills, the success of an extension might be greatly lessened. The earthen architecture of the Old City is reaching a critical stage and it is essential that work commences on the necessary documentation and planning immediately, which, the mission considers, could take several years before the prevalence of more modern materials has reached an irreversible stage.

ICOMOS considers that surely it must be the responsibility of the global community to do all in its part to sustain the Old City of Timbuktu as a living, thriving city that conveys strongly distinctive architecture. In the meantime, there is need to raise awareness of the Management plan and to protect the totality of what has been inscribed, in particular the Mausoleum where no conservation at all is taking place at the moment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now open to the Committee. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Effectivement, le cas de Tombouctou est un cas assez spécifique. Il faut dire que dans un premier temps nous avons pris des mesures exceptionnelles. Il y a eu l'élaboration du règlement d'urbanisme accompagné du manuel de conservation. Cependant, leur mise en application pose problème. Dans l'optique d'une meilleure implication des populations dans la gestion de ce bien, nous avons mis en place ce que l'on a appelé le Comité de gestion et de conservation de la vieille ville de Tombouctou.

Ce Comité de gestion comprend les chefs locaux, les services techniques, les élus, tout le monde, toutes les parties prenantes. Nous avons expliqué que nous avons besoin de mener un certain nombre de missions de sensibilisation, de réunions d'explication pour convaincre les différentes parties prenantes. Ceci nous l'avons magnifié au sein du patrimoine mondial, ce besoin d'une certaine assistance pour nous accompagner.

En ce qui concerne la cohabitation entre la Mosquée de Sankoré et l'Institut Ahmed Baba, nous avons de l'espoir, car nous sommes en train de travailler avec l'Aga Khan sur une autre Mosquée jusqu'en septembre. À partir de septembre, celui-ci va évoluer vers la Mosquée de Sankoré, ce qui nous permettra d'envisager un vaste plan d'aménagement de l'ensemble de la place historique qui prendra en compte la Mosquée, les divers bâtiments et aussi les toilettes en question.

Au sujet de l'extension du bien avec la vieille ville de Tombouctou, le dialogue a été engagé. Il y a des réunions en cours, mais cela prend du temps et l'une des exigences de l'ICOMOS étant un *Master Plan*, celui-ci est prévu avec l'Aga Khan dans le cadre de la coopération entre le Mali et Aga Khan. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any Delegations who would like to make comments? Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Chair. Once again Brazil would like to congratulate the Centre and ICOMOS and also the State Party at stake for its efforts in involving the local population. This actually proves the involvement of the State with the site at hand. They want to make this site a living site. We would also like to congratulate the Aga Khan foundation for their assistance as funding partners and providing training for conserving this site without stopping the measures for developing the surrounding areas. Brazil supports this motion and congratulates the State Party for its efforts.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like the floor? Jordan please.”

Jordan:

“Jordan would also like to congratulate the State Party for involving the local community in various aspects of this property and also the Aga Khan’s contribution to the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like the floor? The rapporteur has the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“I apologise Chair, the Draft Decision is on page 122 of the English version and 128 of the French version of Document 7B. I have received no written amendments regarding this Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Committee, can we approve the Draft Decision on Timbuktu? Yes? It is then approved.

The next site is Aapravasi Ghat. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. Le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base du critère (vi). En janvier 2006 le Centre a été informé de démolitions à répétition et de modifications architecturales concernant la zone tampon. Parmi

les 16 édifices démolis, l'on compte le bâtiment de la marine marchande situé dans le voisinage immédiat du bien.

Au moment de la rédaction de ce rapport, l'État partie n'avait pas encore répondu aux demandes du Centre du patrimoine mondial lui demandant de fournir un rapport sur l'état de conservation, et notamment sur les démolitions, et en particulier sur le retard pris dans l'adoption du guide sur la politique de planification, un document qui vise à contrôler les éventuels changements qui pourraient être opérés dans la zone tampon.

Ce rapport a été soumis le 8 juillet 2010 au Centre du patrimoine mondial, il fait le point sur les efforts fournis par l'État partie en vue d'endiguer les pressions de développement auxquelles le bien est confronté depuis son inscription. La phase II du projet de développement du front de mer de Port-Louis et du bâtiment du marché aux poissons en 2008 sont deux projets qui auraient apporté, selon l'État partie, beaucoup en matière d'économie, mais deux projets que celui-ci a choisi d'abandonner.

Le rapport confirme la démolition des seize bâtiments historiques. Sur la démolition du bâtiment de la marine marchande en 2009, l'État partie explique que celui-ci était sur le point de s'écrouler et que son propriétaire, la Sailors Home Society, n'avait pas pris de mesures pour le restaurer.

Enfin sur l'adoption du guide pour la politique de planification, l'État partie annonce dans son rapport que des dispositions seront prises pour que celle-ci soit effective au cours du mois de juillet 2010. Je passe la parole à l'ICOMOS."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you. The inscribed area of the property, which is the immigration depot, was inscribed as a powerful reminder of the endangered labourers who landed at the port to begin a new life. The property is very small and it relies for its context on the buffer zone that extends towards the sea on the current port. ICOMOS regrets the demolition that is taking place in this zone, but notes that the State Party report that was received recently underscores the importance of the buffer zone and the intangible links to the property and that there are 130 graded buildings in the buffer zone. These are protected by the Heritage Act and it is the responsibility of the Municipal Council to see that this protection is put in place.

We understand that the planning policy guidance has been developed and that a finalised version will be submitted to the Ministry and should be enforced by July this year. The enforcement by the municipal authority of this new guidance is crucial. This is positive progress, but it does need measures to ensure that the tangible link between the property and the buffer zone that reinforces the idea of universal significance that justifies criterion (vi) is sustained. Thank you."

The Secretariat:

« Le Comité pourrait peut-être considérer amender le projet de Décision du fait de la soumission du rapport de l'État partie. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is open for comments from the floor. Australia please."

Australia:

“Thank you very much. Just on the comment made by ICOMOS, which refers to paragraph 3. We recognise the very difficult situation faced by the State Party and fully sympathize with them in trying to protect this property. Can I ask, through you Mr. Chairman, a question to ICOMOS: as I understand there is not a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property, can I just confirm there is not one? And if not, can we propose the normal paragraph that would call upon the State Party to produce one. We recognize of course the difficult circumstances, but that is really just following standard practice in this case. If we could just check with ICOMOS if there is currently a statement of Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to ICOMOS to answer.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. As part of the periodic reporting process in Africa, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been developed and is in the process of being reviewed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. **The** floor is still open. Mexico, I give you the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you very much Sir. With respect to the comment made by the Bureau, and in case the representative of Mauritius might be here, we would like to hear from that State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Would the State Party like to express their views as suggested by Mexico? The State Party is not present. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B. 49 is on page 88 of the English and 92 of the French version of 7B.ad. I had originally received an amendment from Bahrain which concerns paragraph 3; however, I assume since the Secretariat requested to delete paragraph 3, perhaps the amendment from Bahrain is not relevant anymore. Yes, ok thank you, so I do not have any draft amendments concerning the Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain for withdrawing the amendment. Can we consider the Draft Decision approved? Ok, the Draft Decision is approved.”

I have to leave **for** a meeting and I would like to reiterate on behalf of the Government of Brazil, of the Ministry of Culture and of the President of the Committee, the invitation to the reception in our Chancellery in one of the most beautiful building in Brazil, a reception opened to all the delegates to the NGOs and the Secretariat at 7:30pm. Mohammed will replace me to continue the proceedings.”

The Vice Chair (hereafter referred as The Chairperson):

“Let’s continue our meeting with the next site, **Mapungubwe Cultural landscape in South Africa**. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2003 sur la base des critères (ii), (iii), (iv) et (v). En février 2010, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives ont été alertés de l’accord d’une concession minière à la société australienne Core of Africa Ltd. Il s’agit d’une mine de charbon qui serait située à environ 5 à 7 kilomètres des limites du bien. La concession qui est accordée servirait à extraire du charbon qui serait utilisé dans une centrale électrique thermique pour laquelle un projet existe également.

Le 9 mars 2010, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a adressé une lettre à l’État partie lui demandant des clarifications sur cette information. À l’heure de la rédaction du rapport qui vous a été soumis, l’État partie n’avait pas encore soumis son rapport. Celui-ci a été fait un peu plus tard, le 21 mai 2010. D’après les informations en possession du Centre du patrimoine mondial, la zone de concession serait située à l’intérieur de la zone de conservation transfrontalière qui, selon le dossier de conservation examiné en 2003, constituerait la zone tampon du bien.

Le projet d’extraction aurait également fait l’objet d’une évaluation d’impact environnementale. Il semble cependant que cette évaluation n’ait pas pleinement pris en compte les impacts culturels et naturels. Des mesures d’atténuation ne semblent pas prendre en compte la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que les organisations consultatives n’ont point été consultés. Ce point de vue est renforcé par celui de l’Association des archéologues professionnels d’Afrique du Sud qui a fait appel de cette décision d’octroi de la concession. D’après cette association, des recherches récentes ont démontré la présence d’art rupestre de valeur scientifique dans la zone de la concession et la présence de vestiges datant de l’âge du feu et de la pierre.

L’association craint aussi que ce projet provoque une industrialisation de la zone, ce qui aura un effet négatif sur l’intégrité du bien. D’après les informations également reçues par le Centre, plusieurs hectares de forêt indigène et contenant des baobabs géants auraient été rasés par la société minière sans que celle-ci ait obtenu une autorisation gouvernementale par les services concernés.

En réponse à la demande d’information du Centre, l’État partie dans son rapport apporte les précisions suivantes : *“Le droit de concession minière a été donné à l’extérieur de l’aire protégée, c’est-à-dire en dehors de la zone de contrôle de la South African National Parks et donc du mandat du World Heritage Convention Act”*. Les évaluations d’impact se sont focalisées sur la zone de concession minière.

Des discussions se poursuivent donc en ce moment entre le département des Affaires environnementales et le département des Mines pour prendre en compte l’impact sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et surtout pour envisager les solutions

permettant de les mitiger. Une équipe technique a été mise en place par l'État partie pour suivre le développement de ce projet en même temps que les discussions interministérielles qui se poursuivent.

L'État partie affirme enfin dans son rapport son engagement à assurer la protection du paysage naturel de Mapungubwe dans le cadre des lois en vigueur, et assure le Centre du patrimoine mondial que tous les moyens seront mis en œuvre pour empêcher que le projet d'exploitation minière n'affecte la Valeur exceptionnelle universelle. Je passe la parole à l'ICOMOS ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. As you heard, at the time of inscription, the property was inscribed without clear boundaries for the buffer zone. The site was actually recommended for deferral. The buffer zone around the property was, however, described in the nomination document. Furthermore, the delineation of the area for the proposed Limpopo transfrontier conservation area was also shown in the nomination dossier surrounding the nominated area. Subsequently, we understand that a tripartite agreement has been signed for this transfrontier conservation area, with a section to the east of the property having been taken into account. So, the transfrontier area no longer surrounds completely the property and no longer acts as an enhanced buffer zone, as it was said it would do at the time of nomination.

The difference between what was understood at the time of the inscription and what is now presented for the buffer zone and the transfrontier conservation area is crucial, as it appears to affect the implementation of controls by the State Party. The State Party in its report states that the Ministry of Natural Environment, the Management Protection Act, the World Heritage Act and the National Parks have no mandate in the area considered for mining, as it is not in the buffer zone of the property.

ICOMOS considers, that what was set out at the time of the inscription should be respected. Furthermore, it should be recall that a buffer zone, as a means to protect the setting of a property and the area at the east of the property, is undoubtedly still part of the setting of the property, whether or not it is protected by a buffer zone. This area is not a neutral area, as you have already heard. There is huge sensitivity in terms of archaeology, but also in terms of water resources. Although a heritage impact assessment has been undertaken, this sensitivity in either archaeology or water resources has not been addressed, nor the overall impact to the property set out. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now the floor is open to the members for comments, Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'exposé auquel nous venons d'assister est un exposé extrêmement intéressant, mais il faudrait reconnaître que du côté Sud Africain il y a eu des efforts qui ont été consentis. Si au début de l'inscription, comme l'a dit la représentante de l'ICOMOS et du Centre, le bien ne disposait pas d'une zone tampon, qui n'est d'ailleurs pas une exigence dans le processus d'inscription, de nos jours le bien dispose d'une zone tampon. Et la zone tampon qui nous a été communiquée équivaut à 3 fois le périmètre protégé c'est-à-dire 5 000 hectares. Une zone tampon de 5 000 hectares pour un périmètre classé de 30 000 hectares.

En plus de cette zone tampon, qui est un moyen de renforcer la protection du site, il y a eu une zone transfrontalière entre l'Afrique du Sud, l'État partie et ses voisins en l'occurrence le Zimbabwe et le Botswana et cette zone transfrontalière vient conforter la zone de protection. Cependant, il y a eu un petit problème à partir du moment où l'État partie a accepté d'octroyer une licence à une compagnie minière australienne. Là encore, selon les informations reçues, il y a eu des mesures prises par l'État partie qui a mis en place un Comité interministériel pour veiller sur le bien.

Suite à ces efforts, il faut reconnaître que l'État partie n'a pas accepté l'installation d'une usine dans la zone classée avec la construction de routes. Donc, pour ces différentes raisons, l'État partie du Mali a élaboré un nouveau projet qui a été soumis et, à titre d'éléments complémentaires, souhaiterait également écouter l'État partie. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali, avant de donner la parole à l'État partie, le Secrétariat souhaiterait-il apporter un complément d'information ? »

ICOMOS:

"I just would like to clarify the issue of the buffer zone. At the time of inscription, the buffer zone was described as surrounding the property within South Africa and it was also said that the proposed transfrontier area covering parts of three countries, Zimbabwe, Botswana, South Africa was totally surrounding the property and giving enhanced protection.

There is now a buffer zone in place, but it does not cover the area considered for mining. That has been excluded, and furthermore the transfrontier area has now been reduced in size and that too no longer covers the area to the east where the mining is proposed. I am just trying to set out the facts quite clearly."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I would like to give the floor to the State Party concerned to give us more information on the issues raised by Mali and to the observations of ICOMOS. South Africa, you have the floor."

South Africa:

"Thank you very much Chairperson. I will make my input and be assisted by my colleague. I just want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Committee that, while a mining license has been granted, the State Party has not approved permits for associated infrastructures, such as the setting for plants."

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker].*

"Excuse-me, but you only have three minutes."

South Africa:

"I just wanted to bring to your attention that while a mining license has been granted, the State Party has not approved permits for associated infrastructures, such as the setting

for plants, construction of access roads and the extraction of water, as critical environmental issues have yet to be addressed.

These environmental issues are in accordance with national legislation and there is no envisaged exercising of mining rights until such time there is compliance. The authorities in the State Party which have been on site inspection and met the Company last week, are now issuing a final directive to the mining company, after which they will proceed to charge them with criminal offences if they still continue with their unauthorised activities in terms of the environmental assessment regulations. Thank you Sir.”

South Africa (New speaker):

“I would like to add that the transfrontier conservation area has not been reduced in size. Just to bring to the members of the Committee that the transfrontier area is being developed in phases and, as and when there are agreements with the relevant land owners these parcels of land are added into the transfrontier conservation area. As a result, the heads of States will be improving on the previous signed memorandum of understanding by elevating this to a treaty before the end of this year as a country commitment to ensuring conservation of the region.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. The Brazilian Delegation could not possibly fail the opportunity to and would like to praise the efforts undertaken by the government of South Africa although a mining license has been granted to a mining company, but the fact is that topical and localized actions have been undertaken with a view to ensuring actual conservation of the site at hand. As well as the political commitment at the highest level of the State Party, South Africa and with neighbouring countries, in order to ultimately ensure the broadest possible protection to the property and of course the plans at the highest level of government. This could only be praised by us. Brazil cannot fail to pass the opportunity and voice that praise. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“China, you have the floor.”

China:

“We would like to support the State Party, as actions have been taken by the State Party to maintain conservation of the Outstanding Universal values of the site. We would also like to express our concern that there might be the possibility that underground encroachment might harm the integrity of the site as well. In addition to the current legal instrument, we would like to say that the State Party may consider that another legal requirement may be needed to prevent underground encroachment of the area.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Would you please precise what you are asking to the State Party if you have a question?”

China:

“Mining operations might not only harm the above ground environment, but also subterranean areas as well. So, we say to the State Party that they might have the need to put in place a legal instrument to prevent underground encroachment within the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“According to the current spoken information, we propose to delete paragraph 2.”

The Chairperson:

“Excuse me Jordan, are you talking about the Draft Decision?”

Jordan:

“Yes.”

The Chairperson:

“We will come back to it. Thank you. Now I give the floor to the State Party to reply to China. You have two minutes, Sir.”

South Africa:

“Chairperson, I do not really understand the question that has been asked by China, so if you could please assist?”

The Chairperson:

“It is about underground encroachment. Now, I would like to ask China to repeat and to be precise about what you are asking.”

China:

“What we would like to say is that the State Party might consider establishing a legal instrument to prevent many activities that go on underground which may harm the safety of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. South Africa you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you very much, Sir. I understand now. We will do everything in our power as a State Party to ensure there is conservation around this site, so our approach will not be narrow but a broad one in terms of protection of the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you South Africa. Are there any further comments? I see none. ICOMOS, would you like to add something? No. Let’s proceed to the review of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. The Draft Decision is on page 91 of the English and 96 of the French version of document 7B.ad. I have received one written amendment by the Delegation of Mali and I have heard one oral amendment by the Delegation of Jordan. I believe Jordan that your oral amendment is being taken care of by the written amendment of Mali already.

The written amendment of Mali, which was written in English, concerns paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. It is rather complex and I would suggest to put it on the screen. We need the help of the technical team to put it on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to our rapporteur to read out the text.”

Rapporteur:

“I will take you once through the whole Draft Decision and then I believe it will be helpful to consider it paragraph by paragraph. The amendments submitted by Mali were in English and I will take you through the original language version. I will kindly request the French speaking members of the Committee, if they see any discrepancies in the French translation, to please note them and pass them to us later as we are accepting the English version of the Draft Decision.

Paragraph 1 remains unchanged, Paragraph 2 is deleted and is replaced by the following text:

2. Takes note of the detailed information provided by the State Party in the state of conservation report of the property.

In paragraph 3, the Delegation of Mali proposes to delete two words: *extreme* and *some*, which would then read:

3. Expresses concern at the granting of a mining licence for coal 5 km from the boundary of the property and the remaining part is unchanged.

Paragraph 4 is again deleted in its entirety and replaced by the proposal of Mali with the following text:

4. Calls upon the State Party to take appropriate measures to ensure that the Values for which the property is inscribed on the World Heritage List are not adversely affected by the proposed mining and further urges the State Party to ensure that these measures are in line with the recommendations of the Technical Workshop on World Heritage and Mining adopted at the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee that was held in Cairns, Australia in 2000.

Paragraph 5 Mali proposes to delete the phrase: *it has been reported that the ownership* and replaces it by *sections* and to delete the phrase: *that has been claimed by private land owners* to replace it by *are subject to a land claim*.

5. Also Notes that sections of the property are subject to a land claim and requests the State Party... and the remaining part is unchanged.

Paragraph 6 is unchanged. Paragraph 7 is completely deleted in the proposal of Mali and replaced by the following text:

7. Also notes that while a mining license has been granted the State Party has not approved permits for associated structures such as the setting up of a plant, construction of a access roads and extraction of water as critical environmental issues.

Finally in paragraph 8 the Delegation of Mali suggests to delete the wording: *response to the above* and replace it by *detailed of the status of the mining licence*, so that paragraph 8 would read:

8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** an updated report on the state of conservation of the property including details of the status of the mining license for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to proceed to the adoption of that Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 remains unchanged. Are there any objections to paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I see none. Paragraph 1 is adopted.

Paragraph 2 is to be re-read by our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. You can see paragraph 2 on screen. It now reads:

2. Takes note of the detailed information provided by the State Party in the state of conservation report of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I see none. Paragraph 2 is adopted.

Paragraph 3 is to be re-read by our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, I would suggest not to read it again. Deleted are the words *extreme* and *some* as you see on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I see none. Paragraph 3 is adopted.

Paragraph 4 is to be re-read by our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, paragraph 4 would now read:

4. Calls upon the State Party to take appropriate measures to ensure that the Values for which the property is inscribed on the World Heritage List are not adversely affected by the proposed mining and further urges the State Party to ensure that these measures are in line with the recommendations of the Technical Workshop on World Heritage and Mining adopted at the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee that was held in Cairns, Australia in 2000.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The Secretariat would like to make a comment on this paragraph.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. I would just like to place for the consideration of the Committee, that the comment refers to a workshop on *Mining and World Heritage* which was held in 2000, but subsequent to that, the Committee would recall that in 2003 the International Council on Mining and Minerals had adopted a position statement of not mining in and around World Heritage property, so this is a setback for that position statement and we would like to put that for your consideration.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; are there any objections to or comments on paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I see none. Paragraph 4 is adopted as amended.

Now, paragraph 5 which remains unchanged. Are there any objections to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52?”

Rapporteur:

“Excuse me Mr. Chairperson. There are changes to paragraph 5, if we could have it on screen? On paragraph 5, Mali proposes to delete the phrase: *it has been reported that the ownership* and replaces it by *sections* and to delete the phrase: *has been claimed by private land owners* to replace it by *are subject to a land claim.*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I see none. Paragraph 5 is adopted.

Paragraph 6 remains unchanged. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 6? I see none, paragraph 6 is adopted.

Moving to paragraph 7, the floor is to the rapporteur for reading.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Paragraph 7 is deleted in the proposal of Mali and replaced by the following text:

7. Also notes that while a mining license has been granted the State Party has not approved permits for associated structures such as the setting up of a plant, construction of a access roads and extraction of water as critical environmental issues.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“We are just reflecting on the statement made by Mr. Rao. I realise that with your permission, my comment actually relates to paragraph 4.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 4 has been adopted, so I would rather you took the floor after adoption of the whole text. Thank you very much. Any comments regarding paragraph 7? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous aimerions rester avec la version originale qui dit de suspendre ce projet avant que les autres conditions aient été remplies, car il nous paraît un peu bizarre de séparer la licence des actions concrètes sur le terrain ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci je me tourne vers le Mali, avez-vous un commentaire à faire après le commentaire de la Suisse ».

Mali:

« Je suis d'accord avec eux, mais nous, on avait posé une condition par rapport aux effets éventuels néfastes. Car en dépit du fait que le permis a été octroyé, c'est fait, maintenant il faut faire attention par rapport à l'impact environnemental, sinon on n'a rien contre la proposition ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Jordan you have the floor."

Jordan:

"Thank you. I am just wondering how a licence for mining has been granted without the relevant infrastructures on one hand, and the environmental impact on the property. I think there is some kind of contradiction, in spite of the end of the paragraph, where it states that *the State Party has not approved permits for associated structures*. Why could you give a permit for mining then? Does it make any sense? Thank you."

The Chairperson:

« Le Mali demande la parole, vous l'avez ».

Mali:

« Monsieur le Président, je pense que par rapport à ce que l'Australie a proposé c'est de renforcer la surveillance. Il n'y a pas de contradiction. Nous disons que dans un premier temps, le permis a été octroyé, mais maintenant l'État partie doit veiller à ce qu'il n'y ait pas d'impact environnemental néfaste et dire qu'il faut soit arrêter le projet soit le suspendre, c'est la même chose, les deux se rejoignent ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Avant de donner la parole à l'ICOMOS, je souhaite le point de vue du conseiller juridique. Je voudrais demander à la Suisse à nouveau de répéter ce qu'elle proposait pour le conseiller juridique, merci ».

Switzerland:

« Monsieur le Président, il nous semble effectivement illogique que l'on dise qu'une concession a été accordée et ensuite de dire que l'État partie n'a pas accordé de permis. En fait, puisque la concession a été accordée, l'État partie peut donner les permis en tout temps, quand cela lui plaît. Donc ce qui nous paraît essentiel dans le texte en rouge maintenant biffé, c'est le fait qu'il est demandé que l'État partie suspende le projet minier, ce qui disparaît dans le paragraphe 7 et rend ce paragraphe 7 dans la version, à notre sens, illogique. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse, qu'est ce que vous proposez précisément ? »

Switzerland:

« Nous proposons de garder l'ancien texte ».

The Chairperson:

« Du paragraphe 7 ? »

Switzerland:

« Oui, absolument. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Mali, tenez-vous à votre amendement ? »

Mali:

« Nous acceptons la proposition de la Suisse ».

The Chairperson:

« Vous acceptez la proposition de la Suisse ? »

Mali:

« Nous l'acceptons mais ce n'est pas ce que nous souhaitons exprimer... »

The Chairperson *(interrupting Mali)* :

« Vous l'acceptez, merci. Je demande au rapporteur de relire le paragraphe 7 et après je donnerai la parole à l'ICOMOS ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Paragraph 7 would then read:

7. Urges the State Party to halt the mining project until the joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies mission has assessed the mining impact, and to submit as soon as possible details on the status of the mining licence, the status of the appeal, the position of the State Party and fuller details of ancillary projects.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? I see none, so paragraph 7 is adopted.

The floor is now to ICOMOS for further explanation.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Chair. I wanted to try and explain the rationale for that paragraph which has now been adopted, so I think I will not intervene.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now we are moving to paragraph 8.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 8 has a slight amendment on the suggestion of Mali. It suggests to delete *response to the above* and replace it by *detailed of the status of the mining licence*, so that the decision would read, I am just reading the last part of the paragraph:

an updated report on the state of conservation of the property including details of the status of the mining license for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding paragraph 8? I see none. Paragraph 8 is adopted.

The **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52** is adopted ^[The Chairperson is interrupted], Bahrain you have an objection? The floor is yours.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much, Sir. Bahrain would like to ask the legal advisor on the impact of paragraph 4 on the previous Committee decisions and the mining associated decisions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain. I give the floor to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman, but I need to look at the text.”

The Chairperson:

“I’ll give you a couple of minutes.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that this is a question that I can answer without more facts. I do not know what were the previous decisions and their impact. Perhaps the Secretariat could assist. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Bahrain, you are asking, if I am right, what is the impact of paragraph 4 regarding the previous decision adopted by the committee last year, right? Thank you.

I am going to ask the Secretariat if they have the decision of the Committee from last year and then we will revert to the legal advisor for her point of view. Secretariat you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. It will take us some time to pull out the Decision but the point that I was making on paragraph 4 is that the ICMM, the International Council for Mining and Minerals, adopted a position statement of treating World Heritage sites and their surroundings as no-go areas for mining.

The Committee has consistently been adopting decisions to that effect, and in this case what I was pointing out is that we are going back to some date prior to 2003. We have found a Draft Decision where there is language we constantly use. If you want, the legal advisor can read it out. It is a Decision related to another site, and this the language we adopted.”

The Chairperson:

“If this could help the legal advisor, I accept to give the floor to IUCN, but only after we finish dealing with this issue. Thank you. Legal advisor, you have the floor.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. In reply to the question put by the Delegation of Bahrain; it is my understanding that there is an issue of inconsistency between what has recently been

adopted with a prior decision. It is within the prerogative of the Committee to take new decisions, and it is to the Committee to decide if the decision is in accordance with what the committee wishes to do.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Complying with what you said on your reply to Bahrain, we are going further for the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM7B.52. Are there any objections? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we have this wording consistent with previous decisions. I am not sure there is a need to have any discussions on the need to change something which has been a common practice for the past seven years. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voulais juste dire que nous soutenons la proposition australienne. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“I am going to ask the rapporteur if she has received any other amendments.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I did not receive any written amendments or additional paragraphs for this Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. So we are going further for adoption of the Draft Decision 37 COM 7B.52. Are there any objections for the adoption? Australia you have the floor, but before could you please tell us what you are exactly asking for and if there is any feeling that I will need the opinion of the legal advisor, I will ask for it. Thank you.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman, I suggest we use language that I would like to propose to the floor. We can put it up in writing...”

The Chairperson *(interrupting Australia):*

“Excuse me, are you going to insert a new paragraph or amend a paragraph that we have already adopted?”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman, if you ruled it already adopted and closed, we will not reopen it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. So, are there any objections to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52? I seen none. So Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.52 is adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

Now, I give the floor to Australia, if you have any comments, and then IUCN and ICOMOS. Any other members would like to comment on the Draft Decision adopted? No, IUCN, you asked for the floor, please.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. The comment was about noting drafting which is used in this kind of Decision but if the Decision is closed, then I do not think we need to make any interventions.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS would you like to add something? No, so we are moving to the next site which is the last one in this region, concerning the **Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania)**. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 2000 sur la base des critères (ii), (iii) et (vi). Au cours du dernier examen du bien lors de la 32^e session, le Comité du patrimoine mondial a demandé à l'État partie, sur la question de l'agrandissement du port, de procéder à une étude environnementale qui comporte un programme de suivi de trois à cinq ans afin de permettre la mise en place de mesures de mitigation des conséquences de cette extension.

Dans son rapport, l'État partie regrette de ne pas avoir terminé tous les processus de cette étude d'impact, mais affirme qu'il continuera à prendre les initiatives pour le suivi de ce projet. Aucun détail dans son rapport ne procure de précision sur les moyens qui seront mis en œuvre pour assurer ce suivi.

L'État partie signale également qu'il essaye d'inclure l'étude d'impact demandée par le Comité au sein d'une étude d'impact environnemental et social conduite par la Banque mondiale pour le projet du front de mer, financé par le Fonds d'affectation spécial Aga Khan pour la culture. ^[diapo] Cette étude d'impact environnemental et social pour ce projet de front de mer (ici une image) a été présentée le 24 mai 2010 à Stone Town à Zanzibar et une copie

de l'étude a été transmise à l'ICOMOS pour avis technique et recommandation sur le projet. Je passe la parole à l'ICOMOS ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS is undertaking an initial review of the material provided for the Seawall project along Mizingani Road, under the auspices of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture. This project concerns the sea front, in front of the larger buildings, such as the customs house. We support the rationale of this project to provide a seawall which protects the buildings and accept the need to build this on the sea side of the existing wall.

However, we do consider that although the principle is satisfactory and the project will provide enhanced public space, we do have comments on the design and materials. We consider that it is crucial that the project reinforces the distinctiveness of Zanzibar and particularly the prominent sea front building and that this project does not create a space that might be found in any seaside resort with standard material and furniture and regular rows of trees. We will be submitting our observations to the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, the floor is open for comments. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you, Chair. Sweden is very concerned about the development in and around Stone Town; the Swedish government has invested a lot of resources into Stone Town, including both manpower and financial means to strengthen the management of the site. The new harbour is already in place where the environmental aspect and the effects on the site need to be assessed and audited. The sea front project's part 2 is in its planning stage, where plans seem to change the sea front setting and where the important accessibility to the sea front risks being broken.

There are also other developments taking place in the heart of Stone Town itself. Developments that we deem are connected to the pressure from tourism and traffic and the under investment in the maintenance of the urban fabric. Done little by little, it can, in the long-term, if repeated, jeopardize the Outstanding Universal Value. We understand that the living town needs some kind of development to function for its inhabitants. That development must be carefully planned. Change and conservation must go hand in hand, and heritage must be looked upon as a resource for community welfare in all aspects.

Development must be planned and designed with care to become a contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value for which it was once inscribed. We therefore believe that it is urgent to propose a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS retrospective monitoring mission to explore the actual situation since the last mission, and we have delivered an amendment accordingly.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We would like to associate ourselves with the comment made by Sweden, especially in areas regarding the environmental impact audit that should be taken on the site. And given the contribution of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, which is a NGO, I think it would be proper if we asked the State Party to indicate the extent of work that has been carried out there and the awareness for the environmental impact audit that is planned for the site. So, I would like to ask The Chairpersonman to give us additional details on this. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Before giving the floor to the State Party, would the Secretariat of ICOMOS like to add further information? No? Is a representative of Tanzania in the room? You have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Regarding the seawall, the current activities are preparatory with the design and, as has been said, the preliminary drawings are ready and have been submitted to ICOMOS. ICOMOS is examining them and will provide feedback with comments. Concerning the port itself, as said it has already been constructed, and there is no point of doing an environmental impact assessment and instead environmental auditing could be of the utmost priority and we feel that this could be combined with the priority environmental assessment of the seawall because they operate in the same area. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Any further comments or requests from the members of the Committee? I see none, so the floor is to the rapporteur for examination of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.54.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 100 of the English and 105 of the French version on document 7B.ad. I have received one amendment by Sweden. With the integration of this amendment the Draft Decision remains unchanged until paragraph 6. Then Sweden is proposing a new paragraph 6bis, which would read:

Further Requests the State Party to invite as soon as possible after 1 December 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to investigate new developments and interventions to the urban fabric and assess their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

In Paragraph 7, Sweden suggests an amendment which aims at having this property examined by the next session of the Committee. The suggestion is to delete 2012 and replace it by 2011 and to delete 36th and replace it by 35th. The paragraph reads:

Requests moreover the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011 on the progress made on the above points for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to adopt this Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph again.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Paragraphs 1 to 6 remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraphs 1 to 6 remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding paragraphs 1 to 6 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.54? I see none. So paragraphs 1 to 6 are adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, the amendment of Sweden is to introduce a new paragraph 6Bis:

Further Requests the State Party to invite as soon as possible after 1 December 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to investigate new developments and interventions to the urban fabric and assess their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraphs 6bis? Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. The suggestion made by Sweden includes the verb *investigate new developments* and I would like to know if a reactive mission should have the proactive role of investigating or only assessing. My problem is the word *investigate*.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any suggestions?”

Brazil:

“I would say it would be enough to mention the reactive monitoring mission without saying *investigate new development*, because reactive monitoring mission already has its own mission which is very clearly defined.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Sweden, would you like to react?”

Sweden:

“We can accept the proposal of Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. So I am going to ask the rapporteur to read the text again.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, I fear I need an additional clarification from Brazil. I assume the suggestion is to delete the sentence after *mission*, is this correct? Yes, thank you. New paragraph 6Bis reads:

Further Requests the State Party to invite as soon as possible after 1 December 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraphs 6bis? I see none. Paragraph 6bis adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“In Paragraph 7, Sweden suggests *deleting 2012* and replace it by *2011* and to delete *36th* and replace it by *35th*. I do not think I have to read it once again.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? I see none. Paragraph 7 is adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.54** is adopted in its entirety paragraphs 1 to 7. Thank you very much.

I would like to adjourn our working meeting today and the Secretariat has some announcements.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme cela a été dit par le ministre de la Culture, le ministre des Affaires étrangères, le ministre de la Culture et l'IPHAM ont l'honneur d'inviter les participants à une réception au Palace Itamaraty ce soir à 19 h 30, le transport sera assuré devant l'hôtel à 19 h 15.

Deuxième annonce qui concerne les travaux de demain matin. Je souhaite attirer votre attention qu'il y a comme d'habitude le Groupe de travail sur la révision des orientations de 8 h 30 à 9 h 30 dans le Bureau, ça vous le savez déjà. Ce que vous ne savez peut-être pas c'est qu'il y a un sous-groupe créé par le Groupe de travail sur le futur de la *Convention* et ce sous-groupe traitera très spécifiquement du tourisme et se réunira de 8 h 30 à 9 h 30 dans la salle E. Je vous remercie de votre attention et vous souhaite une très bonne soirée ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Secrétariat. Nous nous retrouvons demain matin à 10 h, je vous souhaite bonne soirée, la séance est close ».

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 28 July, 2010

Thursday, 29 July 2010

EIGHT SESSION

Morning session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

The Chairperson:

« Bonjour à tous, nous allons commencer nos travaux. Auparavant, je passe la parole à Monsieur Bandarin qui va nous faire part des décisions des réunions du Bureau de ce matin ».

Mr. Bandarin:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I would like to convey to you some of the decisions taken by the Bureau this morning concerning the time management of the session. We have looked at the situation, which is quite satisfactory, although of course there are a lot of items which are open for discussion. The Bureau concluded that it would be wise to have tonight an evening session.

The proposal is to have an afternoon session from 3pm to 6pm and then to have an evening session, like we did the last time from 7pm until 9pm. Of course, if there is any objection, this will be discussed by the Committee, but it really matches the situation for time management.

We would like to announce the organisation of the working groups today. The one on the Operational Guidelines already took place this morning. The Group on the Budget will continue from 1pm to 2pm in room E like yesterday, and the Working Group on the Future of the *Convention* will meet at 2pm in the Bureau downstairs.

There are also two special events, if you want to take note: at 1pm is the thematic study on archaeo-astronomy. It will be presented until 1:30pm in the room here, the plenary, and in this same room from 1:30pm until 2:45pm, in the plenary, the Ibo-American World Heritage Youth Forum will take place. This is the situation for today's working groups. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Bandarin. Let us give you some information regarding the review of the agenda of the Committee. The bureau also decided to go further with items 7B and 7C, but before this, we are going to proceed and we are going to finish all items still pending from item 7. Are there any objections? No, thank you. The next item is to test the electronic voting system.

Ce matin, le Bureau a décidé de tester le système de vote électronique et nous allons procéder à un test, pour voir les réactions des membres du Comité. C'est un système fiable qui fonctionne au Brésil depuis plus de 40 ans et qui ne s'utilise que pour le vote secret. Je pense que les techniciens ont distribué l'outil pour pouvoir voter aux membres du Comité. Je vais donner la parole à la personne responsable, qui va pouvoir vous expliquer comment fonctionne le système ».

Mr. Bandarin:

“Thank you Mr. Chair; we would like to explain briefly how this system works. As indicated by The Chairperson, this system can only be used in case of a secret ballot. It cannot be used in the case of open voting of a show of hands, as the system does not allow for the name of the countries to be projected. Thereby, for the open vote, we will continue with the traditional show of hands. We could, and this is a proposal, use this new system for a secret ballot in case it is needed.

The legal advisor indicated to us that in the case that the Committee adopts this system, the Committee would have to suspend its Rules of procedure, because the Rules of procedure only include a system for the Secretariat that is described in the Rules of procedure. If you are convinced, at the end of this experiment, that it is a viable solution, and if there is a secret ballot, the Committee will have to suspend its Rules of procedure.

The way it works is simple, but like many simple things it has to be tested. You have in your hand this gadget, and the only buttons that are relevant for this voting are the buttons named: 1/A, 2/B, and 3/C. Please disregard any other buttons. The way it functions is the following: Button 1/A equals yes, a vote in favour; Button 2/B equals no, a vote against and the 3/C button is for abstention. It seems to be simple, but we are still proceeding with a test.

It will only be possible to vote by pressing the button once. Once you have pressed the button, it is deactivated, so you cannot vote twice. We will have to do an experiment to see if this material is viable and if the members of the Committee are confident and ready to replace, in the case of secret ballot, the traditional system.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Bandarin. One of the members would like to take the floor. Germany, the floor is yours.”

Germany:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président, au nom de l'Allemagne je souhaiterais faire le point. N'étant pas membre du Comité, je trouve que devoir changer les *Rules of Procedure* qui ont été soigneusement établies par la conférence de cette institution, le Comité du patrimoine mondial, ne devrait pas être fait aussi facilement ainsi que de suspendre la session aussi facilement. C'est pour cela que je souhaiterais savoir quelles sont les raisons pour lesquelles l'on change les procédures au milieu d'une réunion. Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Allemagne, en fait la raison est simplement celle de gagner du temps. L'efficacité de ce système permet d'aller plus vite dans nos procédures et de ne plus avoir à distribuer des enveloppes, de suspendre la séance et de la reprendre pour le vote.

Avant de donner la parole au conseiller juridique pour nous faire un point sur le processus de vote, je souhaiterais que l'on commence par tester le système, afin que les membres du Comité soient confortables avec cet outil, puis ensuite, si un membre du Comité n'approuve pas ce système alors nous ne persisterons pas plus en avant. Merci beaucoup.

Monsieur Bandarin vous souhaitez prendre la parole ? ».

Mr. Bandarin:

“When I explained the use of the voting device, I said that you can only press it once. In fact, you can also correct your vote if you think you have pushed the wrong button, and what will count is the last button that you have pushed, so you can correct in case you make a mistake and want to change your vote.”

China:

“How many times?”

Mr. Bandarin:

“I do not think there is a limit, so you can go back and forth, yes-no, yes-no, but the last one is the one which counts.”

The Chairperson:

“I think that we will proceed to the voting process. I will then give the order for voting and maybe I allow you two or three minutes and then I’ll say stop and the voting procedure ends. Germany, you have the floor.”

Germany:

“Sorry Mr. Chairman, but this is the reason why I would like to take the floor again. I do think that filling the ballot paper and really considering seriously what you want to decide and not wanting to change it three times, is not the most serious way to proceed. I would like this to be taken to protocol, if possible. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Germany. Any other members of the Committee would like to comment? No, so we can proceed to the test and then decide. Thank you very much.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. The question to the members of the Committee is: *whether they would prefer to be served tea instead of coffee in this room*. Those who are in favour of being served tea should press 1; those Committee members who would rather keep coffee should vote no and press button number 2; for those who like both equally, they can of course abstain accordingly and press button number 3. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“So, let’s do a test and start the process of voting ^[time elapses].”

En fait, il y avait un outil en trop sur le podium, quelqu’un a voté et maintenant le chiffre 22 apparaît. Je ne sais pas si l’on peut refaire un test. Il semble que si, donc on va remettre la machine à zéro. Il n’y a que 21 outils qui ont été distribués dans la salle et avant chaque vote ou après chaque vote, l’outil sera distribué puis rendu.

Can you reset the machine? Ok, now we can start voting. You have a couple of minutes. We have made two unsuccessful attempts, and for more credibility I think it is better to keep with the traditional procedure of voting.

Thank you very much. the session is now suspended.

[after 30 minutes recess, the session restarts] I have the request from an Observer to make a statement. The presenter of the Sovereign Order of Malta is here to make a presentation. You have two minutes. Actually, he is not here so let's proceed with our agenda.

We start with the first item in the region of Europe and North-America. Meanwhile a member of the Committee would like to take the floor. Thailand, you have the floor.”

Thailand:

“Thank you Chair. I would like to raise the motion according to Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure regarding the item 66 of Preah Vihear Temple.”

The Chairperson *(interrupting the delegate)*.

“Item 66?”

Thailand:

“Item 65, sorry, on the document related, according to rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure...”

The Chairperson *(interrupting the delegate)*.

“Excuse-me, just a minute. I am actually asking that instead of starting with the Asia-Pacific region, we will move now to the regions of Europe and North-America. Then, when we come back to Asia-Pacific region I will give you the floor for your statement. Do you agree to this?”

Thailand:

“Ok, Mr. Chair.”

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

CULTURAL HERITAGE

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any other comments from the members of the Committee on the fact that we start with the region of Europe and North-America? No, thank you. So I would like to invite Ms. Rossler to present the reports on the state of conservation and for discussion. We are going to start with the **Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France)**.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. This is in your document 7B. the decision is on page 164 in the English and 171 of the French version. We have only received one email, as new information, from the representative of the International Committee for the Preservation of Lascaux, which covers the comparative analysis of the cave’s condition and the follow-up to the recommendations of the symposium of 2009, which was provided to ICOMOS and the State Party concerned. I believe that ICOMOS would like to make a statement.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS considers that, although considerable investigative work has been undertaken, there is a need for full transparency on the proposed actions and for the protocol that is being followed, in order for the Committee and the wider public to understand fully how what is perceived to be of great danger for the painting is being addressed.

In order to respond to the Committee's request for a full understanding of the conservation methodology and for a full information of future action plans and for public knowledge of the protocol on intervention. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open to members of the Committee for comments. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you very much indeed Chair. We have asked for the floor because we would like to put a question to the State Party about the present situation. Could they tell us what is the state of the cave’s surfaces? It is in our opinion that there has not been an unfavourable development in that particular area. However, we would like this to be brought out by the State Party whether that is the case.

Now, moving on to something else, I thought it would be a good idea Sir, if it was possible to give the floor to the director of Heritage of the Ministry of Culture of Spain, because, you see, she belongs to the Committee of International Experts and she is in the room right now. I believe she is perfectly aware of the latest development concerning Lascaux, so I thought it would be a good idea to call on her.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. France would you like to take the floor?”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme cela est indiqué et pour suivre les recommandations du Comité du patrimoine mondial, la France a mis en place le 15 février dernier un nouveau Comité scientifique international qui est présidé par l’anthropologue Yves Coppens. Le Comité s’est déjà réuni deux fois, dernièrement les 14 et 15 juin, c’est donc assez récent. Il appartient à ce Comité d’organiser la recherche qui doit se poursuivre en vue de la conservation de la grotte de Lascaux.

En ce qui concerne l’état de la grotte actuellement, les rapports reçus des autorités compétentes qui gèrent la grotte font état d’une grande stabilité. Depuis 2009, et suivant les protocoles qui avaient été accordés, il n’y a pas eu de traitement biocide dans la grotte, simplement on surveille le développement des micro-organismes et des champignons qui s’y trouvent. D’une part les moisissures blanches dont on a noté récemment un décroissement, donc une amélioration. Un décroissement aussi bien en surface qu’en épaisseur. Par contre, les taches brunes sont dans un état stationnaire. Il n’y a pas de croissance notable, mais pas non plus de disparitions.

Je pense que ce sont les éléments que l’on peut noter à présent. Le Comité avait aussi recommandé une politique de communication, je tiens à dire qu’un site Internet, donc extrêmement accessible à tous, fait le point sur toutes les informations disponibles, y compris l’historique puisque comme vous le savez, la conservation de la grotte de Lascaux est un enjeu pour la France depuis plus de 40 ans. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. La parole est à la Barbade ».

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. Barbados is deeply appreciative of the comments and information provided regarding the state of the grotto. As I stated previously, I am afraid that I am still of the same view. My concern, with respect to this site, is with regard to whether or not a significant portion of the art has been obscured by the bio growth on the surface. I am not a scientist and I am not able to follow the scientific explanations as to what has been presented, as to the reasons and the status of the site.

However, what I am responding to is that, while the State Party has indicated that no Biocide treatment was applied during 2009 and reported there has been a tendency for the white moles and black stains to diminish, nevertheless it did note that, during October 2009, a limited presence of apparently new reticulations was noted and marked. This suggest that there is still growth occurring.

What I am interested in is to know what is happening. The State Party has indicated that the simulator has had the result of controlling the growth. I did not hear that this is necessarily successful in seeing the receding of the growth, because what we are interested in is seeing a diminution of the situation.

The final part I want to ask about is again going to the business of the communication strategy. I appreciate that you have noted that it is in place, but we need to have this circulated. I have presented a number of amendments to the rapporteur on this.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. I would like to give the floor to the State Party to react.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. En ce qui concerne l'impact des champignons sur la surface peinte de la grotte : il faut avoir à l'esprit que, certes, il y a des moisissures qui se trouvent à certains endroits des peintures, mais que la surface ainsi contaminée est une proportion infime du total des peintures de la grotte de Lascaux. Il y a des moisissures sur des parties peintes, mais cela représente une partie extrêmement réduite des célèbres peintures de la grotte de Lascaux.

En ce qui concerne l'évolution, je pourrais répéter ce que je viens de dire, il n'y a pas de traitement biocide, car la problématique de la conservation de la grotte depuis de très nombreuses années a mené à une accumulation de très grands nombres de traitements et d'interventions, et de l'avis des scientifiques qui ont eu à gérer la conservation et spécialement depuis les épisodes invasifs de 2001-2002, on a pensé qu'il valait mieux mettre sous surveillance ce qui se produisait plutôt que d'introduire et de répéter de nouveaux traitements.

C'est dans le cas de cette surveillance et des programmes de recherche qui visent à comprendre quels sont les processus à l'œuvre dans la grotte de Lascaux dont l'écologie et le comportement général qui ont changé. On ne sait pas trop bien, si c'est provoqué par le changement climatique ou d'autres facteurs, mais il est clair que la grotte a subi une évolution dans ses conditions générales environnementales et le programme de recherche qui sera mis en œuvre par le Comité scientifique vise à comprendre tous ces phénomènes de manière à pouvoir apporter les correctifs nécessaires au bon endroit, avec les bonnes pratiques et traitements, au bon moment. Dans la période actuelle, la situation peut être qualifiée de stable. Je crois que j'ai répondu aux questions. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France, s'il n'y a pas d'autres demandes de la part des membres du Comité, j'ai une demande de la part d'un observateur, l'Espagne. L'Espagne vous avez la parole ».

Spain:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. indeed, Spain belongs to the Scientific Committee, including several members who are extremely well known who also come from Museums and various autonomous regions of Spain, and therefore we are aware that France did everything it could in order to comply with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. Over the last year, as has already been explained, the scientific Committee has been meeting and new international experts have been invited from many countries. Seville wanted the Committee to be more independent and the conclusions of the Committee more scientifically rigorous and to this aim a greater number of countries were invited to participate.

I am particularly happy that some of the new members are well-known. This year a certain number of projects have been adopted to contribute to the conservation of Lascaux and these will be taken up transparently within the meeting of the expert group with all the scientific rigour that must be applied in circumstances of this nature.

All of the biological aspects are kept under constant surveillance and control, so there is no unfavourable development, I repeat no unfavourable development. This is pointed out by the Spanish expert and scientist that has been participating in this Committee and I must insist that there are no unfavourable developments. Thank you, Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Spain. ICOMOS, would you like to add something?”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Chair. I think the discussion that we just had underlines the need to make this extremely technical information perhaps more accessible. So that there is an understanding of the baseline, of what is an improvement and so on and so forth. It is crucial that there is absolute confidence in the excellent work that has been undertaken by the Scientific Committee and the State Party.

So, we would stress the need for a formal communication strategy that sets out, in the most accessible language possible, some of the issues that have just been put on the table: how many paintings are affected, precisely what is happening and where? There will then be, perhaps, a better understanding of the progress that has been made.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you ICOMOS. I do not see anymore requests for the floor. We can then ask the rapporteur to start examining Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.85.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Draft Decision 7B.85 is on page 164 of the English version and 171 of the French version of document 7B. I have received one amendment by the Delegation of Barbados concerning paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. I will take you through the amendment first and then we can examine the Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The first amendment of Barbados concerns paragraph 3 where Barbados suggests deleting the first five words *Welcomes the progress made* and replace these words by *Takes note of*. The paragraph would then read:

3. Takes note of the extensive and detailed observation, monitoring, analysis and research and so on, the remaining part remains unchanged.

In paragraph 3, Barbados suggests deleting the entire paragraph and replacing it by the following text, I meant paragraph 4, I apologise:

4. Regrets that no substantial progress has been made in developing and delivering a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely

understood and urges the State Party to begin this programme with appropriate scientific advice.

I repeat a second time if you allow:

4. Regrets that no substantial progress has been made in developing and delivering a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin this programme with appropriate scientific advice.”

The Chairperson:

“Barbados, you ask for the floor. Can we go further with the rest of the Draft Decision and come back to you after that?”

Barbados:

“Certainly. I just wanted to note that in view of the information from the State Party, I am prepared to change the amendment, taking note of the fact that they said that they are preparing a strategy, but have not delivered it yet. I’ll come back to that when you have concluded.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is back to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Chair. I understand from Barbados that this amendment will be to paragraph 4. So I will continue to read paragraph 5, which will not be affected by this second amendment. In paragraph 5, the State Party suggests deleting the first half of the paragraph: *the progress with research to identify appropriate mechanisms to control the climatic condition of the cave*. The remaining paragraph would then read:

notes the new management arrangements which separate scientific research and administrative functions.

This is all for the moment Mr. Chairperson, but I am waiting for a further amendment from Barbados.”

The Chairperson:

“The other paragraphs remain unchanged?”

Rapporteur:

“Yes, paragraphs 6 to 9 remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. In order to save time, I would like to ask Barbados to read the amendment to paragraph 4.”

Barbados:

“Chair, I would suggest that we remove the word *Regrets that no substantial progress has been made* and that we replace them by:

notes the progress made with respect to the development of a formal communication strategy then deleting and delivering then to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin the delivery of this programme... and continue as follows.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you repeat that slowly please?”

Rapporteur:

“Chair, I actually think I have got it. So, I will repeat it and Barbados can confirm or correct me. I understood the amended paragraph 4 by Barbados would then read:

Notes the progress made with respect to the development of a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin the delivery of this programme with appropriate scientific advice.

Barbados thinks that is correct, so I read it slowly once again:

Notes the progress made with respect to the development of a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin the delivery of this programme with appropriate scientific advice.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland asked for the floor, please.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je suis très content que la Délégation de la Barbade ait modifié sa proposition d'amendement du paragraphe 4 et je l'accepte tout à fait. Car nous avons eu des explications qui nous ont été données. Il apparaît qu'il n'y a qu'une proportion infime de moisissures sur les murs, que la situation est stable, l'expert de la Délégation espagnol nous a fait part des progrès, des analyses scientifiques qui ont été faites.

En vérité, je me demande à ce stade pourquoi supprime-t-on le paragraphe 4 original, parce que je pense que le Comité pourrait effectivement se féliciter du fait qu'en : *2009 aucune évolution défavorable...*C'est ce qui a été dit par les experts. Je ne vois pas pourquoi, l'on supprimerait cela. Donc, je propose de prendre le sous-amendement de la Barbade qui deviendrait le paragraphe 5 et de conserver l'ancien paragraphe 4. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Je souhaiterais proposer que l'on poursuive l'adoption paragraphe par paragraphe, et que la Barbade et la Suisse puissent prendre une minute pour se concerter et que l'on projette le paragraphe 4 à l'écran une fois celui-ci finalisé. La Barbade vous avez la parole ».

Barbados:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Whilst I am always willing to work with my colleagues, I want to stress that, without delaying further the deliberation of this Committee, I am not satisfied with the results of the reporting given. I do not wish to detail the analysis at this point in time, but I have not seen, based on the report provided, the suggestion that significant improvement has been made. The matter of the fraction of the painting cannot be addressed on the point with one visual in front of us and needs to be fully explicated.

My recommendation is to simply delete the reference to *almost no adverse changes* when in the document itself there are indications that other developments did occur, whether or not as deleterious as the previous. So, I am not satisfied and I am not willing to include this paragraph. But I am willing to work on some other wording, if somebody has something, I can support. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. Egypt, you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte est tout à fait d'accord avec l'intervention du distingué représentant de la Suisse, pour garder la formulation initiale du paragraphe 4, surtout que les avis de l'expert sont clairs dans le rapport présenté au Comité. Je ne vois pas pourquoi il faut changer la formulation étant donné qu'il y a le terme *pratiquement* qui laisse une marge de manoeuvre. Donc, je ne comprends pas trop l'intervention de nos collègues de la Barbade. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte. Le Mexique a la parole ».

Mexico:

“Thank you, Chair. In light of the tone the discussion is taking and considering what France, the State Party and what the Spanish expert told us, the way all this work of monitoring is being undertaken on this extremely important site, we should like to associate ourselves with the proposal put forward by the distinguished representative of Switzerland. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to suggest, for the moment, to go with the adoption paragraph per paragraph.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. I think we can combine paragraphs 1 and 2 because they remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.85? I see none. They are adopted.”

Rapporteur:

“In paragraph 3, the amendment by Barbados is to delete the first 5 words of the paragraph and replace them by *takes notes of*. The paragraph now reads:

3. Takes note of the extensive and detailed observation, monitoring, analysis and research to develop an understanding of the complex micro-biological and climatic dynamics of the Lascaux cave as a means to fully understand the causes of the surface decay.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 3? I see none, so it is adopted.

Now to paragraph 4.”

Rapporteur:

“I have only one written amendment from Barbados, but I heard at least four other members of the Committee concerning paragraph 4. They pointed out to sustain it, so I would therefore divide the two amendments. We would probably need to discuss first the Barbados amendment, which is the most removed from the initial formulation.”

The Chairperson:

“Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you chair. If members of the Committee are so minded to retain the first part of the paragraph *almost welcomes* then I would be quite happy to introduce another text from the report which notes that: *during October 2009 the limited presence of apparently new vermiculations was noted and was mapped.*

The information that is provided is in fact contradictory in nature, this is why I suggested deletion, but if we want to retain the first part of the paragraph then I would suggest the introduction from this sentence from page 162 of the report. Because the wording used is almost not in accordance with scientific standards...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]*:

“Which paragraph on page 162?”

Barbados:

“The paragraphs are not numbered in that way.”

The Chairperson:

“Does it start by *The State Party reports*?”

Barbados:

“I’ll find it for you Chair: *The State Party also informs that during 2009 no biocide treatment has been applied*, it continues down the fourth line: *during October 2009 the limited presence of apparently new vermiculations was noted and was mapped*. I would suggest that if you want to retain the *almost welcomes* you are going to have to include this other aspect. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the rapporteur to continue.”

Rapporteur:

“I would then propose, following the suggestion of Barbados, to combine the previous paragraph 4 with this new amendment and the second amendment’s paragraph 4bis. Would that be acceptable to Barbados, or would you like everything to be combined in the same paragraph?”

Barbados:

“Sorry Chair, but really it does not make any sense to separate them, really.”

Rapporteur:

“Ok, so we keep them in one paragraph. I will very slowly read out paragraph 4, in combination with the initial paragraph and the two amendments by Barbados. It will then read:

4. Also Welcomes the fact that during 2009, there were almost no adverse changes to the surface of the cave, notes, that during October 2009 the limited presence of apparently

new vermiculations was noted and mapped and also notes the progress made with respect to the development of a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin this programme...

The Chairperson *[interrupting the rapporteur]*.

“Barbados, do you not agree?”

Barbados:

“I am sorry Sir, I must have been confusing. I meant that the paragraph 4 would end at *mapped* and then the new paragraph would be introduced on the communication strategy. Sorry, my mistake when you requested that clarification.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Barbados. This is as I suggested initially, as it will make the paragraph more readable, I believe. I would then read again the amendment to the existing paragraph 4 by Barbados:

4. Also Welcomes the fact that during 2009, there were almost no adverse changes to the surface of the cave, notes, that during October 2009 the limited presence of apparently new vermiculations was noted and mapped.

This would then be the complete paragraph, Mr. Chairperson.”

Barbados:

“Just with a minor adjustment, if you will Sir: *but notes, however, that during October 2009, that would be my final amendment on that.*”

The Chairperson:

“Could the rapporteur read it again please?”

Rapporteur:

“I read it again hopefully for the last time:

4. Also Welcomes the fact that during 2009, there were almost no adverse changes to the surface of the cave, notes, however, that during October 2009 the limited presence of apparently new vermiculations was noted and mapped.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, do you agree with this wording?”

Switzerland:

« Oui s'il n'y a pas trop de *néanmoins* et, *mais* répétitifs moi je suis d'accord avec tout ».

The Chairperson:

« Très bien merci. L'Égypte, vous êtes d'accord ? »

Egypt:

« Oui Monsieur le Président, merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 4 as amended and read by our rapporteur? I see none. Paragraph 4 is adopted.

Let's move on to paragraph 5.”

Rapporteur:

“It would then be paragraph 4bis at the suggestion of Barbados which reads:

5. Notes the progress made with respect to the development of a formal communication strategy to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin this programme with appropriate scientific advice.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 4bis? I see none. Paragraph 4bis is adopted. Now, let's move to the next paragraph.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. In paragraph 5 the Delegation suggested to delete the initial part of the paragraph, so that the rest of the text reads:

5. Notes the new management arrangements which separate scientific research and administrative functions.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding paragraph 5? I see none. Paragraph 5 is adopted.

Now, let’s move to paragraphs 6 to 9, which remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. Paragraphs 6 to 9 are adopted. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.85 is adopted in its entirety, paragraphs 1 to 9. Thank you.

We are now proceeding to the next site which has been moved forward and concerns the **Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany)**. Ms. Rössler, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. We have no new information except two letters from NGOs and political parties which we transmitted to the State Party and ICOMOS. On the statement of Universal Outstanding Values, it has been reviewed already, but it will be presented to the next session of the World heritage Committee. I believe ICOMOS would like to make a comment.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS has assessed the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Although the discussion on World Heritage is quite slight, nevertheless the report sets out quite clearly the potential impact of the proposed bridge on the property. The assessment notes its negative impacts in specific selected locations, particularly with respect to landscapes and settlements and their relationship with the Rhine and considers that in certain areas this relationship is in danger.

Overall the EIA concludes that the bridge options are all associated with visual impairments given the very delicate situation of the Valley area. However, it goes on to say that the planned bridge is located outside areas particularly sensitive in terms of cultural history or cultural landscape. In comparison with other sections of the upper middle Rhine Valley, this area is of subordinate significance with respect to the values and characteristics of the World Heritage property.

ICOMOS considers that the implications of this are that, only if it is accepted that part of the valley is of lesser with significance when it comes to Outstanding Universal Value, can the bridge be seen as acceptable. ICOMOS does not accept that part of the property is of lesser Outstanding Universal Value. We consider that the identified impacts, which are considerable, could impact diversely on the Outstanding Universal Value.

The landscapes of the Middle Rhine Valley were inscribed as an entity and need to be perceived as an entity in visual terms. The bridge could create an unacceptable intervention to the landscape. ICOMOS is also concerned about the potential increase in noise and pollution that an estimated extra 200,000 cars/day the bridge could bring.

Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity about future plans for the property, as the bridge is set to be only one building block many others, and we consider that a Master Plan for the Valley is an essential first step and that any improvement in the traffic improvement of the Valley should be set in this larger context, as set out in the Master Plan. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now open to members of the Committee. Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Mr. Chair, before I take the floor, could you give the floor to the representative of Germany, please?”

The Chairperson:

“Germany, you have the floor.”

Germany:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. Je suis très fier d’avoir à mes côtés le secrétaire d’État de la région de Rhénanie Palatinat et je lui cède le micro ».

Representative of Rhineland-Palatinate:

“Thank you. The citizens of the Middle Rhine Valley need to be able to cross over the Rhine. My country has, from the beginning, started the closest possible cooperation with the Committee and ICOMOS to lessen the impact on the site. We have submitted all documents and provided all information asked for, and it is now seven years. To develop the Master Plan that you ask for, you have to know that the planning procedure can start now. We need this for budgetary allocation. We want to closely cooperate in the future to maintain our culture heritage, we love it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are you satisfied Russian Federation? Would you like to add further comments?”

Russian Federation:

“We propose to insert point 6 to the existing resolution.”

The Chairperson:

“We will come back to this. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. When this issue was discussed last year, Australia outlined that, as the site is for 3 of its 4 valleys inscribed for matters related to transport and has been a transport corridor for the past 2000 years, it is not inevitable that building another

transport feature can fit with the values. This is something that we would like to perhaps seek the elaboration of ICOMOS on.

I understand that of the Values that are currently outlined, 3 of the 4 relate to transport and to that extent it is not clear that the criteria that ICOMOS was outlining, taking as an entity in its full visual component for example, is not actually a value for which the property is inscribed. I think we would like to anchor the discussion in the values for which the property is inscribed. Three out of four Outstanding Universal Values relate to transport. Mr. Chair, through you, we would like to seek the clarification of ICOMOS on that matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. Do you mind if I give the floor to other members of the Committee and return to ICOMOS at the end? No? Thank you. Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“I happened to have visited the area extensively and I am very much interested in the property as such. In view of the intense cooperation undertaken to preserve Outstanding Universal Value and the detailed information provided so far, I request to continue the close dialogue in the course of the emerging national planning process. I have the impression that the authorities in the Middle Rhine Valley have undertaken so many steps to secure a safe undertaking not to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the area.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Jordan. Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you, Chair. I would like to congratulate the reporters, as they have given us a detailed, thorough report. I welcome all the work they have done in their preparation. I would like to ask a question to the colleague from the Russian federation. The Brazilian Delegation was very satisfied with the response given by the State Party and I should like Mr. Chairman, through your guidance, to ask for a little more detail on the work undertaken by the State Party in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and, as may be the case with the Advisory Bodies. How does the dialogue take place? Have they been exchanges of information, in particular between the Centre and the State Party? Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you very much. There were visual and environmental impact studies done among others which were accepted by the World heritage Centre, so far. In Germany a planning process takes up to eight years and for four years everyone can have their say: Environmentalists, nature protectionists, transport systems representatives, the villagers, everybody. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next speaker is Barbados.”

Barbados:

“I am satisfied with the representation made by the State Party and on the basis of the issue of the Values for which the site was inscribed, there is room in the Draft Decision so that we can accept the accommodation in this kind of development, but I look forward to hearing from Russia what it proposes. I did also support Australia’s intervention and would also like this to be clarified.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, la Délégation française voudrait exprimer toute sa satisfaction à l’égard des précisions importantes qui nous ont été apportées à deux reprises par l’État Partie. Nous rendons hommage et valorisons plus particulièrement le processus de consultation qui a été entamé depuis longtemps par l’État partie avec les Organismes consultatifs et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, un processus de dialogue extrêmement nourri. Nous soulignons aussi l’engagement de l’État partie en ce qui concerne le schéma directeur et tout ce processus de planification nationale qui est en cours. Nous connaissons les difficultés de ce processus qui est très long et souvent il faut donner du temps au temps. Ce processus, qui va être entamé, est un processus extrêmement important ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. La parole est à la Suisse ».

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, nous aussi nous souhaiterions commencer par féliciter l’État partie, l’Allemagne, d’avoir très tôt consulté les Organisations consultatives au sujet de la construction de ce pont et d’avoir tout fait afin d’évaluer l’impact du projet de construction de ce bien dans un esprit de dialogue et de coopération.

Cependant, il est incontesté que la valeur exceptionnelle s’étend sur tout le bien. À notre avis, les parties soi-disant moins spectaculaires de ce paysage contribuent également et de manière intégrale à la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce paysage exceptionnel. En même temps, nous trouvons aussi que l’État partie a droit à une position claire sur la question de savoir si la construction de ce pont est possible ou non. Je dois dire que selon notre propre considération, sachant que nous avons la chance de connaître à la fois le site et le projet du pont qui a été proposé, et comme exposé par ICOMOS, nous avons de très grands doutes qu’un projet de construction de pont dans ce bien puisse être possible sans affecter la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site. Nous trouvons aussi que l’on devrait demander à l’État partie d’abandonner ce projet de construction d’un pont sur le Rhin. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Encore une demande de deux États parties puis je fermerai la liste, merci. Irak vous avez la parole ».

Iraq:

“Thank you Chair. I endorse completely the statement of the distinguished representative of Jordan. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Could you please try to be brief and not to repeat what has been said previously when you take the floor. The last speaker is China.”

China:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. We welcome the initiative of the State Party in developing the Master Plan in view of the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. We would like the Draft Decision to take into consideration the time-frame needed for the planning process. Also, we would like to say that this process should be conducted in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Now the floor is to the representatives of ICOMOS and of the Secretariat for further comments.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I am just answering the question from Brazil. Yes, there has been a close collaboration with the State Party. It is actually one of the few cases when the State Party informed us in advance and that we were not informed by NGOs or from the press about the project. They have been seeking collaboration from the beginning. In 2008 an advisory joint mission took place with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS would like to confirm that the Environmental Impact Assessment which the Committee requested has indeed been produced by the State Party, but as we said earlier, that impact assessment provides considerable negative impacts.”

However, on the questions that have been asked regarding the Universal Outstanding Value of the property and how that relate to the current proposals: The property was inscribed for the way the prosperity generated by transport along the River was clearly reflected in the settlements, landscapes and vineyards of the Rhine Valley. The State Party has produced a draft statement of Outstanding Universal value which underscores what I just said, that:

“this 65km stretch of the Middle Rhine Valley is a cultural landscape of great diversity and beauty that has organically evolved. Its exceptional number of castles, small historic towns, vineyards and infrastructures still clearly reflect the century’s long process that turned the dramatic natural landscape into the cultural landscape it is today. It is a transport route that reflects bygone prosperity, the River transport which made it a key artery within Europe.” The Statement goes on to say: “moreover, the area has exercised a powerful influence on writers, artists and composers for hundreds of years.”

In terms of the criteria: Under criterion (v), it was said in the justification at the time of inscription that: “this former land use”, by that it meant vineyards and so on “is under threat from the socio-economic pressures of the present day”. So, what the Rhine valley was inscribed for was the impact of a particular moment in a specific period in history, when the Rhine Valley was a hugely important transport artery which generated enormous prosperity. This in turn shaped the landscapes in terms of prosperous villages, estates and so on. What it was not inscribed for was the railway, roads and modern transport infrastructures. In terms of what is set out in the conservation report...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]*.

“Could you conclude please?”

ICOMOS:

“Cultural landscapes are seen as evolving. However, the way they evolve should be in a way that respects the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value for which they are inscribed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.87 and thereby give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.87 is on page 171 of the English version and page 180 of the French version of document 7B. I have received one written amendment by the Russian Federation and if you allow me, I will introduce it. It is a new paragraph between paragraphs 5 and 6 which we will introduce as 5bis:

In view of the intense cooperation undertaken to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value and the detailed information provided so far, requests to continue the close dialogue in the course of the now starting national planning process.

I repeat the paragraph:

In view of the intense cooperation undertaken to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value and the detailed information provided so far, requests to continue the close dialogue in the course of the now starting national planning process.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“The other paragraphs remain unchanged?”

Rapporteur:

“Yes, only paragraph 5bis is new.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.87? I see none. Paragraphs 1 to 5 are adopted.

Our rapporteur will now re-read 5bis for the third time.”

Rapporteur:

“As proposed by the Russian Federation, paragraph 5bis reads as such:

In view of the intense cooperation undertaken to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value and the detailed information provided so far, requests to continue the close dialogue in the course of the now starting national planning process.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5bis of Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.87? I see none. Paragraph 5bis is adopted.

Paragraphs 6 to 8 remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. Paragraphs 6 to 8 are adopted.

The Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.87 is adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

We are moving to the next site which is the **Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia)**. I give the floor to our Secretariat representative, Ms. Rössler.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Sir. This item was opened by the World Heritage Centre because it concerns an in Danger listing issue. On the left hand side of this picture you see Bagrati, and Gelati on the right hand side. We had an advisory mission sent to the property. As previously said we had another mission in Georgia so we benefited from this mission and that regarding the state of conservation and the reconstruction work at the Bagrati Cathedral.

The mission considers that the proposed reconstruction project of the Bagrati Cathedral will destroy much of the existing authentic fabric of the ruins and would impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We informed the State Party on 28 May that we are proposing in Danger listing for this session. Since then we had a very intensive exchange with the Georgian authorities and on 12 July the State Party sent us a letter. They endorse many recommendations of the mission, you can refer to the full mission report, but they inform the Centre on the disagreement with the proposal to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

However, I believe they have changed their position; Mr. Chairman, this is very important and the State party is here in the room. They have added new information and say that they would like to prepare a re-nomination of the property with extended boundaries and additional criteria. They have also decided within the framework of Disaster Risk Preparedness to stabilize and reinforce Bagrati Cathedral. The State Party wishes to establish a close coordination with international experts to ensure the overall consolidation of the monument. They would like to organise an international conference as requested by the World Heritage Committee to raise funds. They are sending international assistance requests. They also acknowledge the increasing role of the Georgian Orthodox Church in the management of the site.

The State Party requests the Committee to take into consideration the high symbolic and spiritual significance of the Cathedral, as well as positive measures undertaken. The State Party underlines its openness for active cooperation with the Centre, ICOMOS, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee. On 22 July we also officially received the assessment of seismic risks for Bagrati Cathedral. The analyses show that a 7.0 earthquake would significantly damage the walls if it happened and they took into consideration the vicinity of highly seismic sounds near the property.

I would also like to inform you that under item 8D you have the clarification of the boundaries of the property. ICOMOS would like to take the floor. Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you; ICOMOS would like to go into slightly more detail, while we consider the current action proposals are not in our view acceptable. Bagrati Cathedral commenced construction in the 10th century and was completed in the early years of the 11th century. It is now a ruin, as it was partly destroyed by the raiding Turkish army in 1691. Most of its walls remain, but the large dome and roof are no longer in place. A programme of restoration was started in the 1950s, and as the state of conservation report sets out, further interventions have now begun again.

ICOMOS convened a small panel of distinguished stone conservation architects to consider the specific issues relating to the rebuilding proposal. We consider this project raises a number of issues relating to authenticity, restoration philosophy, technology and the use of the building. The overall fundamental issue is how the project will impact on the attributes of the Cathedral that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. As set out in paragraph 86 of the Operational Guidelines, reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture, and should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances. We considered whether the proposals were exceptional circumstances.

From the plans submitted it is understood that about 15 percent of the original fabric of the monument is now preserved in situ, including parts with serious defects that need repair. A further 20 percent was added in the 20th century. This means that for reconstruction, more than 60 percent would need to be reconstructed, including very basic parts of the building, such as the upper part of the walls, the arches, vaults and domes. It is obvious that

the new construction will be dominant over the original masonry. This new construction, according to the plans produced, will be partly of reinforced concrete and partially of stone, whether natural or artificial.

The building up of the additional material needed for the total reconstruction would impose a huge weight on the original fabric, which could be, in the opinion of experts, even catastrophic for the monument. Also, it is not clarified whether the old and new materials would harmoniously interrelate and this is particularly crucial in a seismic sensitive region. In the case of strong seismic activity the different reacting factors between concrete and stone, could mean that the building might collapse.

The proposed reconstructions are not in our view reversible. Their extent and the special part of the building they will cover make it impossible to envisage their removal in the future. The original fabric will be incorporated forever into the proposed rehabilitated construction. The proposed reconstruction would give back to the ruin its original function and create a national symbol. However, this will destroy very much of the authentic material and substance as well as the authentic crafts and techniques still well-represented in the ruins.

ICOMOS considers that a perfect replica, a new building with completely renewed surfaces and a large percentage of modern material will not pay respect to the special historic, aesthetic and scientific values of one of the most important witnesses of medieval architecture in Georgia, which was the reason it was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS, thus, concluded that there are no exceptional circumstances that can justify the sort of intervention envisaged. However, ICOMOS would like to stress that previous missions to the property have considered other ways to make the church usable, through a combination of possible reconstruction of the 400 old fragments still on the site combined with some sort of light weight roof. Options such as these have not been fully explored. Furthermore, no details have been provided as to how the church might function, or a detailed review of the church community.

The State Party has raised the possibility of re-nominating the property under further criteria such as criterion (vi) and the possibility of extending the boundary. However, such re-nomination would be considered on its merits and ICOMOS does not believe that this is relevant to the current issue of concerns, as these relate to the Outstanding Universal Values that were identified with the property at the time of inscription.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now open to members of the Committee to voice their comments. No one seems to want to take the floor. As the representative of Georgia is in the room we give you the floor.”

Georgia:

Thank you Mr. Chair. On behalf of the State Party I would like to express my gratitude to the World Heritage Centre for its continued cooperation and express our deep respect towards any decision of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee. We remain hopeful that in the process of reaching a Decision on the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, the World Heritage Committee will take into consideration the positive measures undertaken by the State Party towards the conservation of the Gelati Monastery.

We would like to reassure you that Georgia places significant importance on the implementation of the World Heritage *Convention*. In this realm we are open to continued

exchange and our intensive cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and its Advisory Bodies on the different perspectives for the rehabilitation of the Bagrati Cathedral. We are deeply concerned with the crucial need for preservation of this outstanding World Heritage site for future generations, and consider essential the mobilisation of national efforts and international assistance to reach adequate and mutually acceptable solutions for the preservation of this World Heritage site.

Along these lines, we hope that the inscription of the property on the List of the World Heritage in Danger will facilitate productive dialogue with the international expert community and raise international awareness of the problems faced by this site. Once again, I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Committee members for this important consideration. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to start with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.88. The floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.88 is on page 152 of the English and 160 of the French version of the document 7B.ADD. I have not received any amendments concerning this Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you. We have a small written amendment which relates to the State Party, to develop a statement of Outstanding Universal Value to the property to report back to the Committee at its next session. It is a short insertion and will be coming up directly. The reason for this is a position of general principle particularly where a reactive mission is requested but also in situations like this which are rather serious, it is important that there is a statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS, would you like to add something?”

ICOMOS:

“No, we totally agree.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia asked for the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry Mr. Chairman. The rapporteur has requested the paragraph number. it is paragraph number 8bis.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 8bis, thank you. We are going to adopt the first 8 paragraphs. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 8 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.88? I see none. The first 8 paragraphs are adopted.

Now, I give the floor to our rapporteur for reading out amendment 8bis as proposed by Australia.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The newly inserted paragraph at the proposal of the Australian Delegation would read as follows:

Requests the State Party, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to provide a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, for the Committee’s consideration at its 35th session in 2011.

I repeat it a second time:

Requests the State Party, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to provide a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, for the Committee’s consideration at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 8bis? I see none. Paragraph 8bis is adopted.

Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 9 to 12? I see none. They are adopted. The **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.88** from paragraphs 1 to 12 is adopted.

We are now moving on to the next site: **The City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy)**, Ms. Rössler, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you. On 14 June, we sent a letter to the Delegation of Italy requesting the specific map indicating the location of the Dal Molin military base and I am happy to inform you that we have received this map. I acknowledge that it was very difficult, also for the State Party, to obtain it.

On 7 July, we received a letter from the Delegation informing UNESCO that the executive report for the completion for the south Val d’Astico motorway project, including the requested design changes, has been approved by the motorway construction agency. ICOMOS has no comment to make. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Committee members, would you like to comment? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous aimerions remercier l'Italie d'avoir adopté ce projet d'autoroute parce que c'est un processus toujours difficile et cela a été fait avec succès. Maintenant nous aimerions que l'on donne la parole à l'État partie pour qu'il nous transmette plus d'information sur ce nouveau point, qui est apparu sur ce site, l'aéroport d'Almoline. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, le représentant de l'Italie est-il dans la salle ? Oui, vous avez la parole, Madame ».

Italy:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would just confirm what Ms. Rössler said some minutes ago, that regarding point 5 of the Draft Decision, we have already sent the plans requested. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chair:

“Thank you. I would like to move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.90. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.90 is on page 156 in the English version and on page 164 of the French version of your document 7B.ad. I have received one amendment by the Delegation of Barbados.

They suggest the insertion of a new paragraph 7 at the end of the Draft Decision which reads as follows:

Also Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regarding significant developments with respect to the above issues considering the requirements of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and to give particular attention to these issues in their contribution to the periodic reporting process .

I repeat:

Also Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regarding significant developments with respect to the above issues considering the requirements of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and to give particular attention to these issues in their contribution to the periodic reporting process.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados, would you like to take the floor?”

Barbados:

“Thank you. This is just to advise my colleague that what is attempted here is not a diminution of the Draft Decision. I am entirely satisfied with the report and the Decision made out. What I am trying to capture is some sort of consistency in the approach that there is some need for reporting, but on a basis that it is satisfactory simply to the Centre and to the State Party. So, it is just a linking up of what was actually left hanging by the Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you asked for the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'ai deux remarques. La première c'est que je n'ai peut-être pas très bien compris le sens de l'intervention de cet amendement de notre collègue de la Barbade. Car il semble que cette demande touche un peu tous les sites selon l'article 172 et j'aimerais lui demander ici, pourquoi dans ce cas particulier faut-il y faire si attention que cela doit être inclus dans la Décision ? »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados, you have the floor to answer.”

Barbados:

“Chair, I thank the distinguished delegate of Switzerland for his question. I did already address the rationale for my indication of the additional paragraph here. I do not think that there is anything more to say but to begin a process of bringing some of the reporting into certain alignments. For the time being the paragraphs, as laid out, do not mention any new date for reporting. This is because the site has reached a desirable position at this point in time.

What my amendment is simply advising is that we do need to recognise that, in the future, there is a need to keep in mind potential developments which should be brought to the attention of the Centre and Committee. This is the only reason as I am entirely satisfied with the condition of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. The Secretariat has informed me that they received a plan from the State Party. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Indeed, I forgot to mention this data which was presented to us in the power point presentation when I introduced to you the Decision. Paragraph 5 which requests the State Party to provide the maps is no longer necessary since the maps have been provided. Thereby, the Secretariat suggests deleting paragraph 5. And perhaps I can take the opportunity to read the amendment of Barbados another time:

Also Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regarding significant developments with respect to the above issues considering the requirements of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and to give particular attention to these issues in their contribution to the periodic reporting process.

This would be new paragraph 7, but since we deleted 5, 6 would become 5 and this would be the newly added paragraph 6. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I certainly understand the point being made by Barbados, which is reflecting on the fact that some developments took place without prior warning. But I think the point raised by Switzerland is probably correct, that the paragraph of the Operational Guidelines point out at properties in any case. I would therefore suggest that we do take note of what Barbados suggests. But the paragraph, as it is currently drafted, does require a precise set of information and that probably suffices. Our preference would therefore to request Barbados to, perhaps in this case, withdraw its suggestion.”

The Chairperson:

“Barbados, are you convinced?”

Barbados:

“Not entirely. I understand the point that Switzerland and Australia are making, but my point however, is that we are not indicating that there is a need for recognition. There is no request, as we have stated at previous meetings, for follow-up reporting. There is no rationale for doing that in the next two years according to my discussion with the Centre, or, indeed, for the next four years. So, I suggested that in the context of the periodic reporting. If you want you could reflect what I am suggesting there at the end of the former paragraph 6, now 5, to include a reference to the periodic reporting process and I would be entirely satisfied. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“So you would like to add these additions to the former paragraph6?”

Barbados:

“Yes, I did not try to add a new paragraph 6, but I am suggesting that the first part of my amendment might not be necessary any longer. Yet, what I want to retain, however, is the sense of continued reporting within the periodic reporting that I want to add.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I hope I captured the essence of the Barbados amendment correctly, and I will now read the amendment from former paragraph 6, which would then become the new paragraph 5:

Also Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any significant changes to the plans submitted and reviewed for the highway in the final approval process, in particular in the context of their contribution to the periodic reporting process.”

The Chairperson:

“We are now moving further for the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.90. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4? I see none. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are adopted.

Now, paragraph formerly 6 now 5. I give the floor to our rapporteur for reading it out.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. The paragraph would then read:

Also Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any significant changes to the plans submitted and reviewed for the highway in the final approval process, in particular in the context of their contribution to the periodic reporting process.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5? I see none. Paragraph 5 adopted. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.90, including paragraphs 1 to 5, adopted.

Before closing this morning's session, the Secretariat will make some logistical announcements.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaiterais attirer votre attention sur trois points. La première chose c'est qu'un papier a été préparé par le président du Groupe de travail sur le futur de la *Convention* et que ce papier est à votre disposition sur le site du patrimoine mondial, là où vous pouvez trouver l'ensemble de la documentation pour cette session du

Comité. Je vous en rappelle l'adresse, c'est le site du Comité : <http://whc.unesco.org/>. N'oubliez pas qu'il faut vous identifier en tant qu'utilisateur avec le mot Brasília et que le mot de passe est 2010. Voilà, ce papier est désormais en ligne.

Deuxième chose, en ce qui concerne les groupes de travail. Nous avons le Groupe de travail sur le budget à 14 h en salle E et nous aurons ensuite le Groupe de travail sur l'avenir de la *Convention*, de 14 h à 15 h au Bureau.

Ce document informel vous a été distribué sur l'ensemble des événements parallèles qui s'organisent pendant l'heure du déjeuner. Il y en a deux qui ne sont pas mentionnés et que je souhaite vous signaler. Un organisé par l'UICN sur le renforcement des capacités en Amérique Latine, c'est à 13 h 15 et c'est dans le coin du Bureau de l'UICN dans l'entrée de l'Hôtel Alvorada. Deuxième chose, il y aura dans la salle E, donc après la réunion sur le budget, une session d'information sur le rapport périodique dans la région Afrique. Je vous remercie de votre attention et vous souhaite un très bon appétit. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Secretariat. I am now closing the morning session and we will be starting at 3pm sharp. Thank you very much and bon appétit.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 29 July, 2010

Thursday, 29 July 2010

NINTH SESSION

Afternoon session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

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

CULTURAL HERITAGE

The Chairperson:

“I would like to request the Delegations to take their seats so that we may start this afternoon’s session. I am asking the Secretariat if we have reached the quorum. I would like to start with a site in Haiti and return to continue with Europe and the North American region. Are there any objections to this sequence of events? I see none, so we are now moving to the next point, the National History Park, Citadel Sans Souci (Haiti). The floor is to the Secretariat.”

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The item concerns the state of conservation of the **National History Park, Citadel Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti)**. As members of the Committee know, on 12 January 2010 an earthquake in Haiti caused more than 250,000 casualties and constituted one of the most devastating and tragic episodes in the history of natural and human disaster.

The Director General of UNESCO has led strong support for the reconstruction of the cultural heritage of the country, beginning with the first meeting organised in Paris on 16 February 2010. On the occasion of the meeting, the State Party requested a special emergency mission to assess the impact of the earthquake at the Citadel. The President of the World Heritage Committee approved the undertaking of the mission and the Haitian authorities provided all the necessary assistance and support to carry out the interdisciplinary mission despite the extreme difficulties experienced.

The mission assessed the key factors affecting the property; namely, the extraction of materials from the site, vandalism, deforestation and vegetation. The site has been severely affected by natural disaster in the form of earthquake and regular hurricanes during the season which runs from June to November each year. The fortified structure was damaged by the seismic activity that further destabilised the structure of the built heritage. The mission has recommended, as a matter of urgency, the development of a comprehensive conservation plan, including a risk management approach, by July 2011. It will include the topography and tomography of the property, surveys of mortar, plaster, stone and bricks and set up a local conservation management unit on site.

Despite of the effort made to safeguard the values of the property, there is no authority to ensure the decision making process in full coherence with the Universal

Outstanding Value of the site. If this absence is not fully addressed it will produce a dramatic impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. The construction of the road 3, as a National Road within the limit of the property, will become the main artery of communication between the capital and the north of the country. Public works have started without any consultation with the Ministry of Culture and Communication and the foreseen flux will dramatically increase the amount of traffic within the property. Landscaping values of the site will be equally affected. Alternative existing roads should be evaluated to mitigate the impact.

In terms of management, the State Party has been requested to establish an agreement for inter-ministerial cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and Communication and the Inter-sectorial Council of Territorial Planning. The Ministry of Tourism foresees a tourism exploitation of the site as a part of the National Tourism Plan for the north of the country. A visit facilitated by the Royal Caribbean Cruise Company is planned to offer an eight hour visit to the site. Other interventions to the site are needed to enable appropriate access. The new facilities of the port are low for large ships to dock in the port, and more than 10,000 tourists per week are foreseen.

The current precarious state of conservation of the property does not allow for this kind of exploration. The Management Plan including provision for public use is a necessary tool to set up governance for the property before any tourism exploitation can be started at the site. The International Co-ordinating Committee of UNESCO was informed of the results of the mission to ensure that the International Community in every possible way contributes to the implementation of the recommendations, as to promptly identifying the financial annual resources to assist the State Party.

A revised Draft Decision has been distributed to the members of the Committee. The State Party is in the room and ICOMOS will make further comment.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS would like to make a short statement. Within a week of the tragedy ICOMOS expressed to our colleagues in Haiti our solidarity in assisting them in the heritage recovery process. We offered to deploy the expertise of our network and a roster of more than 300 volunteer ICOMOS members has been identified, which has been drawn from the 28 scientific committees of ICOMOS. Two weeks after the earthquake we carried out an initial assessment mission and consulted with the Institut du Patrimoine.

Subsequently, ICOMOS sent to the Haitian authority a proposal of possible actions that might be of assistance in meeting the dual goals identified by Haitian officials: recovering from the disaster, and creating a sustainable institutional framework that will allow for the permanent conservation and management of the country’s cultural heritage.

Now I am turning to the state of conservation report. The inter-institutional mission that was recently carried out identified, as my colleague has mentioned, that in addition to the difficulties created by the earthquake, there are now development proposals that could potentially threatened the Outstanding Universal Value of inscribed properties. ICOMOS underscores the importance of prioritising actions to ensure the conservation of the property. We will continue to offer assistance to the State party in this effort. ICOMOS considers the state of conservation report constitutes an important report towards the sustained short, medium and long-term efforts that will be required to assist Haiti in the recovery, identification of conservation and protection of the wealth of heritage in the country. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Nous avons dans la salle M. Daniel Élie, il est le Directeur de l'Institut national du patrimoine à Haïti, et je souhaiterais lui donner la parole, car il doit nous quitter tout de suite après pour ne pas rater son avion ».

M. Daniel Élie:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, l'État partie a pris connaissance du rapport de la mission du Centre du patrimoine mondial réalisé en Haïti du 11 au 18 juillet 2010. Celui-ci reflète les attentes de l'État partie représenté par le ministère de la Culture et par l'Institut de sauvegarde du patrimoine national (ISPAN). L'État partie remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les membres de la mission pour la collaboration étroite établie avec le ministère de la Culture et pour l'efficacité du processus déjà en route. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to invite the members of the Committee to take the floor if they have further comments. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. The Brazilian Delegation would like to congratulate the Centre and ICOMOS for the work that was carried out, and we would like to ask if the representative of Haiti has anything else to add about the work that is being carried out now in Haiti. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Representative of Haiti, would you like to comment? You have the floor.”

Haïti :

« Excusez-moi, je n'ai pas très bien compris la question ».

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. The Brazilian Delegation would like to ask if the representative of Haiti has anything else to add about the work that is being carried out now in Haiti. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Haiti, Please, you have the floor.”

Haïti :

« Les travaux qui sont en cours commencent à peine. Au lendemain du tremblement de terre, nous avons entrepris différentes démarches auprès des organisations internationales, notamment avec l'ICOMOS et l'UNESCO, mais ce sont des démarches qui n'ont abouti que récemment. C'est la mise en place, par exemple, de toutes ces démarches qui vont permettre de faire face à ce problème ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia strongly supports the Draft Decision that is proposed. Particularly, we would like to join, I am sure with others, in expressing the deep regret of the Committee for the devastation that was caused in Haiti. We also would like to join with Brazil in congratulating the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their swift response in this matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. Any further comments from the floor? Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. Barbados is extremely pleased to have heard the results of the initiative of UNESCO in this regard. I want to stress that in terms of our region the Citadel of Sans Souci and all it stands for is not merely of importance for indeed the international community and for Haitians, but it represents the start of the liberation movement for the Caribbean people, and as such, we are extremely looking forward to ensuring that significant action and attention will be given in all areas, in order to ensure the security and viability of this site after interventions. We are extremely pleased to see progress being made and we join with others in supporting and congratulating ICOMOS and the Centre in this area, and we do support the Draft Decision as it stands.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you. We would like to reiterate what has been said by other speakers. Mexico is also grateful for the work that has been done in Haiti and we also support this Draft Decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. We are now proceeding to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.110.REV and I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Revised Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.110.REV has been distributed around the room on a blue paper in both languages. I would like briefly to take you through the Draft Decision to highlight the changes in relation to the initial Draft Decision.

Those changes concern the beginning of paragraph 4 which now reads *takes note* and initially read *acknowledges*. The end of the paragraph which is now added reads *in a prompt and timely manner*.

Paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 have been added to the Draft Decision and former paragraphs 6 and 7 have now become paragraphs 12 and 13. I have been asked by the Secretariat to point out that there is a minor mistake in this Draft Decision in paragraph 10d, in that the dates given are incorrect. Correctly it should read:

d) To complete and approve the conservation plan including a comprehensive risk management approach by July 2011, and the management plan including provisions for public use of the property by July 2012, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

I have also been asked to highlight that in paragraph e the *retrospective declaration of Outstanding Universal Value* should read a *statement of Outstanding Universal Value* in the English version. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Sorry to take the floor, but I understood from the rapporteur that the papers have been distributed, but we have not received a copy and I am unable to follow as a result.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am going to ask the rapporteur to read the text and specifically the paragraphs that are added and modified and also to give you a copy.”

Rapporteur:

“Apparently, the Draft Decision was distributed yesterday.”

The Chairperson:

“I will give some time to the members of the Committee to examine the Draft Decision. Actually, I will give five minutes for the members of the Committee to examine the Decision and then the rapporteur will read the whole text. Thank you.

Rapporteur you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Given the short time that some Committee members had to examine the revised Draft Decision, I will again explain paragraph per paragraph the changes as per the initial Draft Decision and I will read the entire text that has been added.

In the revised Draft Decision paragraphs 1 to 3 remain unchanged as to the initial Draft Decision. Paragraph 4 has a replacement of the two first words *takes note of* replaced *also acknowledges*.

Paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision has been amended by adding five words at the end of the paragraph, which now ends on *inter-institutional mission to the property in a prompt and timely manner*.

On the other side of the Draft Decision paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, which are highlighted, have been inserted into the Draft Decision. I will read them one by one:

6. *Commends the dedication and commitment shown by the Ministry of Culture and Communication to protect the property in spite of the difficult situation and humanitarian crisis;*

7. *Notes with concern, however, that there are limited capacities to ensure an effective decision-making process and satisfactory management of the property to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is sustained;*

8. *Also notes with concern that new infrastructure and development proposals aimed at increasing tourism could impact adversely on the vulnerable property;*

9. *Requests the State Party to establish an agreement for inter-ministerial cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and Communication and CIAT (Inter-sectorial Council of Territorial Planning) to prioritize and coordinate actions, within the framework of territorial planning, with the aim of preserving the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;*

10. *Takes note and fully endorses the recommendations provided by the technical mission report and also requests the State Party to implement them, should the situation allow it, giving priority to the following aspects:*

a) *To halt the construction of Route DN003 within the limits of the property pending the development of other alternatives to be evaluated, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention,*

b) *To halt the plans for the immediate foreseen touristic development at the property pending the finalization of the conservation and management plan,*

c) *To establish a local conservation management unit on site,*

d) *To complete and approve the conservation plan including a comprehensive risk management approach by July 2011, and the management plan including provisions for public use of the property by July 2012, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

Please note that the dates in this paragraph have been corrected.

e) *To submit the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and complete the Retrospective Inventory of the property, including the official delineation of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as well as their related regulatory measures.*

11. *Calls upon the international community to ensure, in every way possible, its support for the implementation of the recommendations to rapidly approve the financial and human resources to assist the State Party in the integrated conservation of the property.*

The former paragraphs 6 and 7 have become paragraphs 12 and 13 and remain unchanged and this is the complete revised Draft Decision submitted to you by the Secretariat. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.110.REV

Are there any objections regarding paragraphs 1 to 4? I have none. They are adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 5 and I am going to ask our rapporteur to highlight the modification.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. The modification is the addition of the following words at the end of the paragraph *in a prompt and timely manner.*”

The Chairperson:

Are there any objections regarding paragraph 5? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 6 and I am going to ask our rapporteur to read it again.”

Rapporteur:

“6. *Commends the dedication and commitment shown by the Ministry of Culture and Communication to protect the property in spite of the difficult situation and humanitarian crisis.*”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 6? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 7 and I am going to ask our rapporteur to read it again.”

Rapporteur:

“7. Notes with concern, however, that there are limited capacities to ensure an effective decision-making process and satisfactory management of the property to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is sustained.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 7? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 8 and I am going to ask our rapporteur to read it again.”

Rapporteur:

“8. Also notes with concern that new infrastructure and development proposals aimed at increasing tourism could impact adversely on the vulnerable property.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding paragraph 8? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 9.”

Rapporteur:

“9. Requests the State Party to establish an agreement for inter-ministerial cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and Communication and CIAT (Inter-sectorial Council of Territorial Planning) to prioritize and coordinate actions, within the framework of territorial planning, with the aim of preserving the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 9? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 10.”

Rapporteur:

“10. Takes note and fully endorses the recommendations provided by the technical mission report and also requests the State Party to implement them, should the situation allow it, giving priority to the following aspects:

a) *To halt the construction of Route DN003 within the limits of the property pending the development of other alternatives to be evaluated, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention.*”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 10a? Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“I just wonder if you need, just a minor amendment: *the retrospective statement* rather than *declaration of Outstanding Universal Value*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“We are not there yet, we are on paragraph 10a. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 10a? I seen none. Paragraph adopted.

Moving to paragraph 10b.”

Rapporteur:

“Please allow me to combine b and c as c is very short.

b) *To halt the plans for the immediate foreseen touristic development at the property pending the finalization of the conservation and management plan,*

c) *To establish a local conservation management unit on site.*”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 10b and c? I see none. Paragraph adopted.

Moving to paragraph 10d.”

Rapporteur:

d) *To complete and approve the conservation plan including a comprehensive risk management approach by July 2011, and the management plan including provisions for public use of the property by July 2012, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

Please note the change of dates as compared to the version in front of you.

And sub-paragraph e:

e) To submit the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and complete the Retrospective Inventory of the property, including the official delineation of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as well as their related regulatory measures.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 10d and e? I see none. Paragraph adopted.”

Moving to paragraph 11.”

Rapporteur:

“11. Calls upon the international community to ensure, in every way possible, its support for the implementation of the recommendations to rapidly approve the financial and human resources to assist the State Party in the integrated conservation of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 11? I see none. Paragraph adopted.

Paragraphs 12 and 13 remain unchanged. They are the former 6 and 7.

Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. Paragraphs adopted. **The Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.110.REV** is adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

With your permission, we are going to examine item 66 concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear in Cambodia. A Draft Decision has been distributed to you and the Secretariat will present this item:

Nous allons reprendre notre séance, je m’excuse, car certaines personnes concernées n’ont pas reçu le projet de Décision, donc je suggère que nous continuions nos travaux comme prévu avec les sites d’Amérique du Nord et l’Europe, puis nous verrons les autres régions après. Merci.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The next site is the **Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation)** and I give the floor to our secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much. The Centre has not received any new information regarding this site. However, on the evening on 26 July, here, we received information from the Russian Delegation: the Agreement referred to in paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was signed in October 2009, as an agreement between the government of the Russian

Federation and the government of the Republic of Lithuania on cooperation in pollution prevention of the Baltic Sea by oil and other harmful substances.

However, the Centre has not officially received this information and it was not mentioned in any State Party reports. However on July 27, we have received an email with the Russian version of the document of this Agreement and Lithuania confirmed orally that this is correct. The Draft Decision is on page 178 of the English and 187 of the French Version and ICOMOS would like to briefly comment. Thank you Mr. President.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. As a trans-boundary property, ICOMOS is concerned about the lack of an overall management strategy for the property and indeed the lack of regular contacts and exchange of information on the overall conservation of the property. As is highlighted in the state of conservation report, the threats to the property are mirrored on both sides of the international border with the impact of storms and a proposed new development that could overwhelm the scale of the village settlements.

ICOMOS would like to stress that this property, along a thin spit separated from the mainland by a lagoon, was inscribed as a cultural landscape for the very remarkable reconstruction of the sand dunes and subsequent reforestation in the 19th century, as results of their previous destruction from the felling of trees. It was also inscribed for the village settlement whose livelihood is based on fishing. This is not a robust landscape, rather a fragile and vulnerable landscape to the threats identified. The landscape is also coherent along its length. Although a collaborative management commitment was made at the time of the inscription, ICOMOS is concerned that currently there is no effective overarching management that could provide a framework within which to address common threats. I would just like to add that these comments are supported by IUCN.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open to the members of the Committee for comments. Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. As was stated, in October 2009, the Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Lithuania on cooperation in pollution prevention of the Baltic Sea by oil or other harmful substances was signed in Vilnius. According to article 4 of the Agreement, a joint Russian and Lithuanian Action Plan for cooperation in case of pollution accidents should be signed not later than 6 months after the Agreement has come into force.

The Agreement came into force in May this year. The above mentioned Action Plan is under development and is going to be signed very soon. Therefore, we consider that the signing of the Agreement is a positive step forward for the protection of the Baltic Sea, as well as the Curonian Spit World Heritage site. We ask the Members of the Committee to reflect it in the Draft Decision of the document, precisely by deleting point 3, and to change the formulation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. The Curonian Spit is a unique landscape of sand dunes in the Baltic Sea area. We support the proposal for the sending of a reactive mission to the site. In our view, bilateral cooperation between the two State Parties for the protection and management of the site still needs to be improved—and it is clearly illustrated by the current oil spill in the Mexican Gulf, of course. Potential threats from oil exploitation cannot be neglected. Regarding the latest information on the signature of the bilateral Agreement, we are pleased to hear that and we do not have any further questions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the Russian federation.”

Russian Federation:

“Chair, I would like you to give the floor to the representative of Lithuania.”

The Chairperson:

“Is the representative of Lithuania in the room? Yes, so you have the floor.”

Lithuania:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Delegation of Lithuania confirms the cooperation Agreement regarding pollution prevention which was signed and came into force on 20 May 2010. The Action Plan according to this Agreement is being prepared and must be finished in November 2010. The Lithuanian Delegation agrees with the proposal of the Russian Federation on paragraph 3.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. ICOMOS, would you like to add something? No. Are there any additional comments from members of the Committee? Iraq, you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. After the signing of the Agreement between the two countries, I think it looks promising, so I support that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Iraq. There are no additional requests for intervention. Let’s then move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.91. The floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur :

“Thank you very much. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.91 can be found on page 178 of the English version and 187 of the French version of document 7B. I have received two written draft amendments to this Draft Decision, submitted by the Russian Federation and Estonia. They concern paragraphs 3 and 5. All other paragraphs remain unchanged. I will therefore read out to you the amendments proposed.

In paragraph 3, the Russian Federation proposes deleting the existing paragraph and replacing it by the following text:

3. Welcomes the information that an "Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on cooperation in pollution prevention of the Baltic Sea by oil and other harmful substances" was signed in October 2009 and that a "Joint Russian and Lithuanian Action Plan for Cooperation in Case of Pollution Accidents in the Baltic Sea" is under development, and requests to continue environmental monitoring.

In paragraph 5 an amendment was submitted by Estonia inserting additional texts to the existing text in the middle of the paragraph. It now reads:

5. Expresses its concern about the possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad, and also requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to halt the development projects in the light of their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to provide full details of plans already approved, and in preparation, and their related Environmental Impact Assessments for evaluation to the World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are examining the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.91. Regarding the first two unchanged paragraphs, are there any objections? I see none, they are adopted.

Let's move to paragraph 3 and the floor is to our rapporteur to read it out.”

Rapporteur:

“In paragraph 3, the Russian Federation proposes deleting the existing paragraph and replacing it by the following text:

3. Welcomes the information that an "Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on cooperation in pollution prevention of the Baltic Sea by oil and other harmful substances" was signed in October 2009 and that a "Joint Russian and Lithuanian Action Plan for Cooperation in Case of Pollution Accidents in the Baltic Sea" is under development, and requests to continue environmental monitoring.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding amended paragraph 3, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 4 remains unchanged. Any objections regarding its adoption? I see none. Paragraph 4 is adopted.

Paragraph 5, and the floor is to our rapporteur for reading.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 reads with the Estonian amendment:

5. Expresses its concern about the possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad, and also requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to halt the development projects in the light of their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to provide full details of plans already approved, and in preparation, and their related Environmental Impact Assessments for evaluation by the World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding amended paragraph 5 are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraphs 6 to 9 remain unchanged. Any objections regarding their adoptions? I see none. Paragraphs 6 to 9 are adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.91 adopted in its totality, including paragraphs 1 to 9.

The next site on our List is the **Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation)**. The floor is to Ms. Rössler.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. The documents that we consider are under 7B.ad and the state of conservation was opened by a Committee member. The joint mission took place in March 2010 as requested by the Committee and, on 12 May, we received the document regarding clarification of the property component. As you remember this is quite a complex site not only consisting of the historic centre.

On 1 June the State Party reported that the administration of the President of the Federation of Russia had especially noted the Decision of the World Heritage Committee which requested that work on the construction of the Okhta Centre tower be suspended and that a new design, taking into account the building’s height, be considered.

The authorities underlined the importance of complying with the Decision of the Committee. You may have seen that we welcomed this support by the President of the Russian Federation with an online statement on 3 June. We also have received a number of

petitions from NGO's to suspend the work on the project and we have finally, on 26 July, received a letter from the Company Social and Business Okhta. It stated that the Company did take into account the opinion of citizens and experts that the proposed location of the building in the old industrial area avoids construction in the historic Centre.

The letter also highlighted that the proposed construction contributes to fulfilling the need of the economic development in Saint Petersburg. As you can see, we have received some contradictory information, and I turn over to ICOMOS with your permission, Mr. President."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor."

ICOMOS

"Thank you. ICOMOS would like to acknowledge the initial work that has been undertaken by the State Party on the boundaries and for providing a draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which is in the process of review. Both of these are positive steps towards clarifying the scope of the property but also the precise attributes of Outstanding Universal Value in relation to town planning and the sighting of the city in its landscape.

The statement of Outstanding Universal Value, when it is approved, and the boundaries, when clarified, together need to provide the foundation for the development of an overall management plan for the property which could define the appropriate degree of information for each element of the property. This is urgently needed in order to avoid the current damaging uncertainty of a large scale development and in order to allow coordination among all stakeholders. In the meantime, the work undertaken does, in ICOMOS' view, underscore the potential severe negative impact of the Okhta Tower on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, the floor is opened to member States for comments. China you have the floor."

China:

"Thank you very much. We would like to ask the State Party to report to the committee the latest development that has taken place on this site since the latest session of the Committee regarding this particular item."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you the floor is to the Russian Federation."

Russian Federation:

"Thank you chair. Distinguished members of this Committee, the Delegation of the Federation of Russia is grateful to the World Heritage Committee for its attention to the issue regarding the protection of the architectural jewel of our country, the historic centre of Saint

Petersburg. This issue is well-known to the members of the Committee; it has been discussed almost annually.

Within the past two-years we have had two UNESCO-ICOMOS inspections of the City. The problem is not easy. It reflects a contradiction between the aims of regional development and protection of heritage and involves the relations between different actors, including provincial and national authorities, NGOs, civil society and etc.

In previous sessions, the main concern of the Committee was the absence of reaction on the part of the Federal authorities concerning the construction of the Okhta Centre being too close, as many believe, to the historic centre. But this year the situation has changed; the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation spoke out in favour of keeping to the provisions of the *World Heritage Convention*, which is an important support for the decisions of the Committee. Moreover, the need to fulfil international obligation was expressed by the President of the Russian Federation. He convened a special meeting of the State Council devoted to cultural problems, in particular the situation with the cultural heritage in Russia.

All relevant federal and regional authorities have received instructions regarding the protection and conservation of cultural sites in the country, including the Historic Centre of St Petersburg. In response, regional authorities expressed their goodwill to proceed with a dialogue with UNESCO and its Advisory Bodies both on the Okhta Centre issue and on a more accurate delineation of the boundaries of this World Heritage site.

Thereby, the relevant federal authority has demonstrated their readiness to respond to the concerns of the Committee. It is important to reflect on these positive developments and to support further steps in the right direction. The supportive and influential opinion of the World Heritage Committee would really help us in this complex and sensitive issue.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“We had a problem concerning rather contradictory information around the president of Russia on the Okhta Tower project. I would like to mention it but we would be glad to receive information about it from the State Party of the Russian Federation.”

The Chairperson:

“Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“The problem with the contradiction is that some people think that the president of the Russian Federation cancelled the construction permit. But I would say the construction was not started. What existed was the project, expressing the will to build a building like this. It was some kind of recommendation on the part of the president, seriously rethinking this project. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chairperson. We had a request, but now we have heard the answer from the State Party and have no further need for additional information on that matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS would maybe like to comment? I see first Brazil, who would like the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, Chair. The questions that the Brazilian Delegation would have liked to address to the State Party have already been asked at this point in time. Nevertheless, the Brazilian Delegation would like to acknowledge the wealth of information given by the State Party on the matter at hand. It would seem that we have been given important and clarifying information. The Brazilian Delegation is fully satisfied as to the explanations, remarks and clarifications submitted by the State party. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you. Australia also has some questions regarding this matter so we thank the State Party for the information they started to provide, which I believe assists in clarifying the situation regarding the construction of the Tower. Australia believes that this new information should be reflected in the Draft Decision and has therefore submitted some new texts which simply attempt to simply reflect the situation of the Tower as we understand it. It is merely some text which will replace one paragraph of the current Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any requests for further comments? No, so let’s start with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.95 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.95 is on page 168 of the English version, and 178 of the French version of document 7B.ad. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Australia, as it has announced in its statement.

The amendment regards the deletion of paragraph 4 and the replacement of paragraph 4 by a new paragraph 4 and a new paragraph 4bis. I will read these two paragraphs for you. New paragraph 4 will be:

4. Notes with appreciation recent advice received from the State Party that it has reinforced to federal and regional authorities the importance of acting in accordance with the provisions of the World Heritage Convention, and that no official approval has yet been given for construction of the Okhta Centre.

And paragraph 4bis:

Also welcomes the advice that regional authorities have now expressed their willingness to proceed with further dialogue with UNESCO on this issue, and to undertake the independent UNESCO-ICOMOS impact assessment of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

All remaining paragraphs, that is 1 to 3 and 5 to 12, remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to proceed as usual with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.95 paragraph by paragraph.

Regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 3 unchanged, are there any objections? I see none. They are adopted.

The floor is to the rapporteur for paragraph4.”

Rapporteur:

“4. Notes with appreciation recent advice received from the State Party that it has reinforced to federal and regional authorities the importance of acting in accordance with the provisions of the World Heritage Convention, and that no official approval has yet been given for construction of the Okhta Centre.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding the adoption of paragraph 4, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

The floor is to the rapporteur for paragraph4bis.”

Rapporteur:

“Also welcomes the advice that regional authorities have now expressed their willingness to proceed with further dialogue with UNESCO on this issue, and to undertake the independent UNESCO-ICOMOS impact assessment of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, regarding the adoption of paragraph 4Bis, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

Now moving to paragraphs 5 to 13, which remain unchanged, and regarding the adoption of these paragraphs, are there any objections? I see China. You have the floor, Sir.”

China:

“Thank you Chair. Since the State Party has already provided substantial information on the proposed development, we propose to delete paragraph 7. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Regarding the adoption of paragraphs 5 and 6, are there any objections? I see none. Paragraphs 5 and 6 are adopted

Regarding the deletion of paragraph 7, would ICOMOS like to comment?”

ICOMOS:

“Yes please. ICOMOS considers that there is perhaps some misunderstanding. As far as we are aware, the extended buffer zone still needs to be addressed. This is part of the reappraisal of the boundary and the reappraisal of the extent of the setting of the whole property, and this is something that has not yet been undertaken. We consider that perhaps this recommendation should stay.”

The Chairperson:

“Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“We just wanted to say that we support the statement by ICOMOS.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. China, would you accept keeping paragraph 7?”

China:

“Thank you very much. May I request the State Party to clarify on the issue of the boundary again please?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation, would you like to comment?”

Russian Federation:

“This point 7 is in relation with point 10, where it says that it is necessary to precise the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, before we even mention the buffer zone. Thereby, first we have to precise the boundary and then deal with the buffer zone. So, if we delete point 7, point 10 still covers the buffer zone, in our opinion.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Estonia, would you agree with this explanation?”

Estonia:

“I am sorry, but we cannot accept it because paragraph 10 is about the international expert forum.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. It is actually concerning the boundary of the property.”

Estonia:

“Yes, but it actually suggests the forum.”

The Chairperson:

“So you want to keep paragraph 7 as it is?”

Estonia:

“Yes, we would like to.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“We do not have any objections. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation?”

Russian Federation:

“The problem is that for the moment in the Historic Centre of St Petersburg we do not have a precise buffer zone, so, to say, to do something on the buffer zone is already covered by paragraphs 9 and 10 providing for the *State Party to define appropriate buffer zones for the property*, and why did we speak before about the extended buffer zone? I do not understand the reason.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS, would you like to add something?”

ICOMOS:

“Perhaps I could try clarifying, as this was a request of the World Heritage Committee for an extended buffer zone as part of the means to protect the wider setting of the property. This is why the need to protect a wider setting was brought into focus, because of the development of the Okhta Tower. The request of the Committee was for the State Party to look at protecting the wider setting through an extended buffer zone. Clearly the buffer zone and the boundary are related, but I think the need remains for the protection of a wider setting as requested by the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the representative of the Russian Federation.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you, Chair. We agree, no problem, because in any cases it is necessary to work out the whole buffer zone. We will work in great cooperation with the World Heritage Centre.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Let’s come back to the adoption. Regarding paragraphs 7 to 13, are there any objections? I see none; paragraphs 7 to 13 are adopted.

Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.95** is adopted in its entirety from paragraph 1 to 13. Thank you very much.

We are now examining the next site regarding the **Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain)**. Ms. Rössler, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much. This item was opened by the World Heritage Centre in order to inform the Committee on the status on the work of the tunnel—which is included in your document—which affects two of the components. As you know, this is a serial of seven components and here, on the slide, you see two in particular: the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà. The technical expert mission from ICOMOS went on site in February. In March we had a meeting between these experts and the World Heritage Centre and they strongly recommended an independent protection system and the establishment of a monitoring body to control the construction of the high speed train tunnel close to the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà.

In April, we had another meeting with the experts. On 13 July we received a letter from the Spanish Ministry of Culture which corresponds to the first report of the board of experts, dated 1 July. It concerns safety measures, crack monitoring for Casa Milà and the establishment of safety measures to be finalised by the time construction reaches Casa Milà. It also transmitted a development agreement applying a protection system, and announced that an in-depth study about the use of vibration monitoring devices is underway.

On this picture you see the tunnel, which is way below the metro tunnel for those who know the site and the metro near Sagrada Familia. On 14 July, we received the summary report of the board of experts and they highlighted that the first 750 metres of the tunnel boring machine were carried out and the lining segment installed. The machine performed well and the surface settlements are significantly below the expected value. No unforeseen situations occurred during the tunnelling works. Currently, the machine is about 1,000 metres from the World Heritage property, the Sagrada Familia. The speed is about 14m/day. A safety check is foreseen 250 metres before the Sagrada Familia, which should occur by mid-August. The distance to Casa Milà, 2,300 metres, will be reached by the end of 2010. The technical monitoring will be extended and will start 200 metres before the section of the Sagrada Familia.

The crack monitoring at the Sagrada Familia and at the Casa Milà should be extended and I should also inform you that we need more structural knowledge about Casa Milà. It may be, and this is one of the opinions from ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, that Casa Milà is more fragile than the Sagrada Familia. It is, then, extremely important to deepen the structural knowledge of the Casa Milà. The next meeting of the board of experts will be on 26 August 2010. We have also received a number of NGOs against the tunnel project, which we have forwarded to the State Party and to ICOMOS for comments and information. I believe that my colleague from ICOMOS would like to take the floor. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. You have the floor, Sir."

ICOMOS:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le tracé souterrain choisi par l'État partie à Barcelone pour le passage d'un train à grande vitesse, qui passe sous les rues de la Sagrada Familia et de la Casa Milà appartenant aux œuvres de Gaudí, a une profondeur de l'ordre de 33 mètres. Dans ce cadre, l'ICOMOS a pris en considération les études de génie civil, les mesures techniques préventives, le système de suivi scientifique des effets de percement

sur les structures bâties appartenant au bien ainsi que de l'organisation du suivi du chantier par un Comité international indépendant.

La Sagrada Familia est une construction relativement fragile et sensible, notamment en termes structurel statique et en termes structurel dynamique. Les études de mécanique des sols ont conduit à la réalisation d'une volée de pieds de béton de grande profondeur dans un but de renforcement et de protection des fondations existantes de la Sagrada Familia. L'impact du percement doit, de ce fait, être réduit à des valeurs très faibles inférieures aux propres effets et au poids dus à la structure de l'église elle-même.

Un système de suivi des effets physiques exercés sur les sols accompagne le mouvement du tunnelier. Ces premiers résultats sont parfaitement compatibles avec les prévisions. Les systèmes de suivi des structures dans la Sagrada Familia doivent cependant être renforcés alors que le tunnelier est annoncé à son niveau pour le milieu ou la fin du mois d'août.

Le comité scientifique a rendu son premier rapport de suivi. Il attire notamment l'attention sur la possible fragilité du deuxième bâtiment concerné, la Casa Milà, qui sera approchée plus tardivement par le tunnelier. Une étude prévisionnelle et un dispositif de suivi similaire à celui de la Sagrada Familia doivent y être envisagés. L'ICOMOS considère que ces mesures sont indispensables et qu'il sera peut-être nécessaire d'envisager un dispositif de protection des fondations comme à la Sagrada Familia.

Le suivi par le Comité scientifique international est indispensable tout au long du processus de creusement. Pour la mise en service ferroviaire, le suivi et la prévention de la transmission des vibrations mécaniques aux structures bâties doivent être mis en place. Des dispositifs antivibratoires durables et de grande qualité doivent être installés pour supporter la voie ferroviaire. La vitesse des convois doit être limitée et contrôlée. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

"The floor is now opened to Committee members for further comments. Brazil you have the floor."

Brazil:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. First of all, we would like to express our thanks to the World Heritage Centre and to the Advisory Bodies for the report. We, indeed, have a very extensive and detailed report before us, but still we would very much like, through The Chairperson, to ask the relevant State party to kindly answer the following questions.

In the light of the report submitted, it is Brazil's view that the proposed construction and implementation of the proposed high speed train in the respective underground tunnel in the area of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà is obviously not a technical matter. The Brazilian Delegation would like to ask the State Party to provide as with the following clarifications: In other large cities of the State Party, are they similar tunnels or structures in use? We would also like to hear from the State Party as to the actual working of these similar tunnels, if any, especially with impact mitigation, devices and structures. The State Party could likewise elaborate a little on the work carried out by the monitoring commission. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Are there any representatives of the State Party in the room? You have the floor Madame.”

Spain:

“Thank you very much, Sir. First of all, I would like to thank ICOMOS for its work and all suggestions. The latter from the report are being incorporated in the project *per se*. Since it is a State and large scale project and has been underway for the past five years and run by a group of multidisciplinary experts, we are ready to include any suggestions from other State party.

Now, taking into account the characteristics of the product, we would like you to consider the adoption of this Draft Decision. The State is looking very closely at this project. We are a State member of this *Convention* and are highly interested in protecting World Heritage. We can send you any other information on Casa Milà if you require or anything else you may require in terms of technical clarification. Since I do not have much time, I am going to kindly ask the Director of the Northwest Line to continue providing some technical information before you.”

Spain; Director of Northwest Line :

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. We will try to explain to the Committee the idea behind our project and the measures taken to protect the heritage. We find this tunnelling method to be the safest in terms of a high-speed train line. We are in line with ICOMOS rules on this. Since 1995, we have carried out some 320 kilometres of tunnelling in Barcelona, Gerona and Seville and they have been working quite well. Now we have a whole range of safety measures in place when it comes to making tunnels. We have built walls and I can tell you that the tunnel will be some 30 metres below, so it is important to point out that the tunnel will never go under the Sagrada Familia, it will go in front of the Sagrada Familia at a distance of some 45 metres.

Now, in line with the ICOMOS report, we set up an Independent Expert Committee and the first report has already been sent to the World Heritage Committee, and this Committee will be made aware of all the mitigation measures being taken based on the UNESCO definition. I can tell you that we have a monitoring system up. It is a modern approach and we have a threshold that we are respecting, and, of course, in line with the ICOMOS report we will provide you with even more information once we have completed the actual tunnelling in front of the Sagrada Familia. For the first kilometre of the tunnelling, we have been within a 2 millimetre range in terms of the accuracy of our tunnelling. This is well in line with European tunnelling standards and I can tell you this will have no damaging effect on this World Heritage property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you. Sweden would like to echo the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in underlining the importance of the monitoring process for the project. From our own experience, we know that tunnel projects are technically challenging and that continued monitoring during and after the construction phase is necessary to avoid damage. We would also like to emphasize the necessity of clearly establishing roles and responsibilities, and to ensure communication between all parties involved.

There should be a possibility to immediately stop the work if a problem occurs. We would also like to stress the importance of thorough documentation of building infrastructures before construction work begins in cases such as this. This facilitates the monitoring process and discussions about what could be caused by the tunnel project and what can be avoided. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais en premier lieu remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives. Je ne l'ai peut-être pas fait suffisamment auparavant et je voudrais le faire en ce moment de façon générale, pour la qualité des travaux et des expertises qu'ils nous donnent. Je crois que l'ingénieur espagnol, de l'État partie, nous a apporté des éléments extrêmement précis qui sont capables de dissiper le moindre doute.

Je voudrais souligner notamment quatre de ces éléments : l'expérience du tunnelier qui a été citée, c'est très important ; la distance entre le bien et le tunnel, c'est aussi un élément essentiel ; l'expertise qui a été mobilisée au sein du Comité qui est très étendue ; l'importance qu'ont les simulations de vibrations qui sont en deçà des seuils établis. Je crois que l'ingénieur espagnol de l'État partie nous a montré qu'il n'y avait aucun effet préjudiciable sur ce bien et je voudrais ajouter tous ces éléments qui rassurent beaucoup ma Délégation ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. L'Égypte vous avez la parole ».

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte est tout à fait d'accord, soutient l'avis du distingué représentant de la France et remercie également le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que les Organisations consultatives pour le rôle qu'ils ont joué dans ce projet, tout en espérant la même coopération avec l'Égypte pour la ligne 4 du métro. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte. Le Mali vous avez la parole. »

Mali :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie l'État partie par rapport aux mesures prises pour la protection du site. J'aurais souhaité savoir si du point de vue institutionnel il existe d'autres mesures qui ont été prises en termes de règlement d'urbanisme ou alors l'existence d'outils, de manuels de conservation de site par rapport à ce problème. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Le représentant de l'Espagne, souhaitez-vous reprendre la parole ? »

Spain:

“Yes. In fact, we have taken all necessary measures and we have a very detailed urban plan in place. We have a technical unit which is in charge of ensuring that there is no damage to the sites, both Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà. It all runs through the expert Committee, and we are going to be forecasting if and when there might possibly be any effects on this cultural property when it comes to the construction of the tunnel. Thank you, Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, would you like to add something?”

ICOMOS:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'apprends donc en direct une mesure en faveur de la Casa Milà. Je voulais en effet attirer l'attention du Comité au nom de l'ICOMOS, sur le fait qu'en effet la situation n'y est pas exactement la même qu'à la Sagrada Familia. Le bien inscrit est à une certaine distance de la rue, car le porche de l'église au-dessus de la rue n'est pas dans le bien, mais dans la zone tampon. C'est d'ailleurs une oeuvre architecturale qui n'est pas achevée.

La situation est différente à la Casa Milà, car le bien lui-même vient en limite de la rue, il est donc un peu plus proche. Jusqu'à l'information que vient de nous donner l'ingénieur de l'État partie, il n'y avait pas à notre connaissance de protection des fondations prévues et c'est effectivement une disposition que nous recommandons fortement, car elle semble avoir fait ses preuves à la Sagrada Familia. Notamment, elle semble avoir renforcé l'état des fondations de ce bâtiment. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'ICOMOS. S'il n'y a pas d'autres demandes de parole, je souhaiterais passer à l'examen du projet de Décision 34 COM 7B.98. Je donne la parole à notre rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.98 can be found on page 179 of the English and 188 of the French versions of document 7B.ad. I have received amendments from two Delegations, Egypt and Estonia, which concern paragraphs 3 and 5a. I will briefly introduce these two amendments.

Egypt suggests deleting the existing paragraph 3 and replacing it with the following text:

3. Notes that the suggestion of re-routing the fast train AVE's underground path, in the area of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà, has been the subject of real studies, and acknowledges that the selected routing was the most feasible.

I have received a second amendment by Estonia on paragraph 5a, where the State Party suggests deleting the last part of the paragraph. 5a would then read:

- a) *Put the Construction Monitoring Committee in place and extend its formation in order to guarantee that it includes independent experts.*

All other paragraphs, that is 1, 2, 4, 5 b, c, d, e, 6 and 7, remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to proceed to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.98, paragraph by paragraph. Regarding the first two paragraphs, 1 and 2, are there any objections? I see none, they are adopted.

Now we move to paragraph 3 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Paragraph 3, at the proposal of Egypt, is deleted and replaced by the following text:

3. Notes that the suggestion of re-routing the fast train AVE's underground path, in the area of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà, has been the subject of real studies, and acknowledges that the selected routing was the most feasible.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding paragraph 3, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 4 remains unchanged. Any objections regarding its adoption? I see none. It is adopted.

Let's move to paragraph 5 where the umbrella remains unchanged, but there is a modification to a.”

Rapporteur:

“On paragraph 5a, the last part of paragraph 5a has been deleted at the suggestion of Estonia. It would then read:

Put the Construction Monitoring Committee in place and extend its formation in order to guarantee that it includes independent experts.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding paragraph 5a, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

The remaining of the Draft Decision, including paragraphs 5b, c, d, e and paragraphs 6 and 7 remain unchanged. Any objections regarding their adoption? I see none. They are adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.98** has been adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

We are moving to the next site concerning the **Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias, in Seville (Spain)**. I give the floor to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you, we are going back to Seville, where we went last year. On 7 July, we received a letter from the Mayor of Seville informing us that the Cajasol Tower will have no impact on the World Heritage properties, on the urban and natural landscape of Seville and its environment. He promised permanent contact with UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Decision are now obsolete. You will also find in document 8B a minor boundary modification for this site. And in document 8E, you have the statement of Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party has complied with these two requests, so 6 and 7 are now redundant. I believe ICOMOS would like to make a comment. Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Expert Committee set up by the State Party to consider the proposal of the Tower reported that, although the proposed tower cannot be said to impact visually on the three components of the property, it nevertheless has an essential negative impact on what they call “transitional territory demanding dialogue with the Historic city”.

Although at the time of inscription only three buildings were inscribed, the outstanding urban complex, that reflects the power and influence of Seville in American colonisation, also includes a number of buildings that make up a complex along the River which are linked to the period of Spanish expansion in the Indies. This was acknowledged in the 2006 State Party periodic report that recommended extending the nominated area towards the River.

To realize fully the value of the property there is a need to understand the way the three monuments were linked to the City, and particularly to the River, and the way they dominated their surroundings. The State Party acknowledges these links and has put forward a buffer zone that encompasses an area around the three monuments that is linked through

historical, heritage and visual reasons with the three components of the property and also includes parts of the River that have shaped the development of the City. It is an area within which the Giralda Tower will stand out as a vertical landmark.

However, the proposed buffer zone does not extend to cover the site of the tower that is proposed. ICOMOS considers that the proposed buffer zone will protect the area around the three monuments which give them their context and are in effect their immediate settings. Given the configuration of the City, the setting of the monuments does well extend beyond the proposed buffer zone in relation to tall buildings. There is a need to protect this wider setting to make sure these three main monuments maintain their relationship with, and to a degree dominance over, their wider surroundings. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you ICOMOS and Mrs. Rössler. The floor is now open for the member States of the Committee for comments. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. First and foremost, I would like to note the comments made by the previous speaker, which are of interest for the Delegation of Mexico. We would like to hear from the Spanish Delegation and see what their position is on this case. Thank you very much Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. Are there any further requests for the floor? I see none. The floor is to the representative of the State Party.”

Spain:

“Thank you very much Chair. I would also like to thank the Committee for giving my Delegation the opportunity to comment on the case of Seville. Since the Draft Decision was prepared, a number of new things have come up, and Spain, as a member, has proposed several amendments. The Committee of Experts that is assessing the impact of the tower on the World Heritage monuments concluded that, even though it was adapted to the environment, the project would have an impact on the transitional territory to the historic City, as was mentioned earlier.

What we are looking at, is assessing possible alternatives to avoid any negative impacts whatsoever on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We are committed to prepare an exhaustive report on this matter and we would ask the Committee to conduct an international mission before June 2011, which would assess the measures required to achieve this objective. The local authorities are committed to doing what is required regarding the buffer zone.

As regards ICOMOS' comments, the protection plan for the Alcázar was put in place, and also for the Cathedral. This plan provides for the protection for the entire historical Centre of Seville. Furthermore, the State Party feels that one priority is to include the area of the Alcázar and the Archives, as the World Heritage Committee accepted to do in 2006. We are also looking at extending to several areas, taking into account the role played by Seville in the discovery of Americas.

We would ask the World heritage Committee to take into account all the new developments that have come up. I believe that significant steps have been taken towards protecting the heritage in Seville. I would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that this project is two kilometres away from the property, so it is outside of the buffer area. Thank you very much Chair for giving us the opportunity to speak again on the matter of Seville.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to ICOMOS to add further information.”

ICOMOS:

“Just to say that I think ICOMOS would welcome the idea of a joint mission to consider the procedures and processes that have just been outlined by the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. State Party, would you like to add more information?”

Spain:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. We would welcome a mission from ICOMOS, if possible around June 2011. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are moving to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.100 and I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM. 7B.100 is on page 187 of the English and 197 of the French versions of document 7B. I have received a draft amendment from the Delegation of Mexico and also heard the Secretariat, which during the presentation requested the deletion of 2 paragraphs.

Since we have amendments in literally all paragraphs of this Decision apart from 1 and 2, I would suggest if we could, perhaps, put it on the screen. Could the technician assist us to put the Draft Decision on the screen?

Thank you to the technical team which just put up the decision on screen. We have no amendments for paragraphs 1 and 2.

In paragraph 3, the Mexican Delegation requests the deletion of the word *negative* towards the end of the text. Mexico then further requests to delete the existing paragraph 4 and to replace it by:

takes note that the State Party has started preliminary works on this project.

Then the Delegation of Mexico amends paragraph 5 as such:

5. Requests the State Party to reconsider the current project in order to avoid any possible adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Then the Secretariat requests deleting paragraphs 6 and 7. The Mexican Delegation requested to amend paragraph 8, which would then read:

8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by June 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken in order to avoid any possible adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to proceed to the adoption paragraph by paragraph. Are there any objections to the unchanged first two paragraphs? I see none. They are adopted.

Moving to paragraph 3 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The amendment to paragraph 3 is to delete the word *negative* in relation with impact. I read the end:

and that this tower will have an impact on the 'transitional' area of the historic city.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding adoption of paragraph 3? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous aimerions maintenir le terme *négatif* dans ce paragraphe, au regard des termes exprimés dans leurs rapports par le Centre et ICOMOS, puisque l'impact est considéré comme négatif dans cette zone, donc autant le dire dans le paragraphe. De plus, dans le paragraphe 5 on parle aussi d'un possible impact négatif donc il vaudrait mieux le conserver ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. La Barbade vous avez la parole. »

Barbados:

“We share the position taken by Switzerland.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico, would you like to comment?”

Mexico:

“In reference to the comment by the Swiss delegate, maybe we could end up by saying *possible adverse impact* so that it would be in line with the next paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you clarify exactly what you are proposing? I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“I am not clear on the proposal: is it to replace the wording by just *adverse impact* or *possible adverse impact*?”

Mexico:

“It is: *possible adverse impact*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Moi, j'étais pour la suppression du terme *néгатif*, mais si on le formule comme proposé, ceci reste acceptable ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. La Suisse ? »

Switzerland:

« Nous souhaiterions garder le *néгатif* seul, car il faut être conscient que l'on parle de l'impact sur la zone de transition avec la ville historique et le rapport est clair sur le fait que ce projet aura un impact négatif sur cette zone. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Est-ce que l'ICOMOS souhaite ajouter des informations ? »

ICOMOS:

“Just to say, Chair, that it would be helpful to use the words *potential negative impact*, because these were the words use by the Expert Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would this wording, *Potential negative impact*, be acceptable for Egypt, Mexico and Switzerland? Yes, thank you very much.

Je donne donc la parole à notre rapporteur pour lecture de ce paragraphe ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I will only read the last part of the paragraph as the beginning does not change:

and that this tower will have a potential adverse impact on the 'transitional' area of the historic city.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 3? I see none. It is adopted.

Now I give the floor to the rapporteur to read paragraph 4.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The Delegation of Mexico proposes to delete paragraph 4 and replace it by the following text:

takes note that the State Party has started preliminary works on this project.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? I see none. I apologise, I did not see you. Estonia you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Estonia would like to support the original version.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“We are in the view that our amendment apprehends the current situation on the site and we would call for that wording to be accepted as proposed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, we have a compromised text and I would like to ask the rapporteur to read it.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. We propose to you a combination of the original and of the new text which would then read:

4. Regrets that the State Party did not halt the construction works on this project and takes note that the State Party has started preliminary works on this project.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Estonia, do you agree with this wording? Yes, thank you very much. Mexico, do you also agree? Yes, thank you very much. Now the floor is to the rapporteur to read it again.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson:

4. Regrets that the State Party did not halt the construction works on this project and takes note that the State Party has started preliminary works on this project.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? I see none, it is adopted.

Now I give the floor to the rapporteur to read paragraph 5.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 as amended by Mexico:

5. Requests the State Party to reconsider the current project in order to avoid any possible adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5? I see none, it is adopted.

Now I give the floor to the rapporteur to read paragraph 6.”

Rapporteur:

“Former paragraphs 6 and 7 have been deleted at the request of the Secretariat, paragraph 8 becomes 6, and, at the request of Mexico, there is an amendment which reads as follows:

Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by June 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken in order to avoid any possible adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of the new paragraph 6? I see none. It is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.100 is adopted in its entirety, including paragraphs 1 to 6.

We are now moving to the next site, concerning the **Historic Areas of Istanbul in Turkey**. I give the floor to Ms. Rössler.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Could we please have the slide so that we can see the historic peninsula? On 2 July 2010, the State Party officially submitted two technical evaluations on the architecture and engineering aspect of the Golden Horn metro- crossing bridge project and its impact on the surrounding areas. They provided an overview of the legal procedures, court decisions and technical evaluation which have been taken with regard to this project.

They assert that the designed bridge will stay below 35 metres to protect key monuments of Istanbul. We were also sent the reviewed statement of Outstanding Universal Value on 6 July. Finally, on 13 July we received a letter from the permanent Delegation reporting that the State Party has decided to undertake an independent environmental impact assessment on the potential impact of the metro bridge across the Golden Horn. This was also discussed at meetings at the World Heritage Centre and is a major step forward.

The State Party considers that it is fulfilling the obligations of the *Convention* and reports that the bridge construction work will not continue, until the conclusions of this assessment have been communicated to the relevant Turkish authorities, in order to review the current project. On 13 July we received a list of international experts recommended for the assessment of the Golden Horn Bridge by ICOMOS. This list was transmitted to the permanent Delegation of Turkey for consideration and potential involvement of these experts.

On 20 July, the World Heritage Centre received another letter from the Delegation acknowledging receipt of the ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessment, which this Committee has also seen. This has been shared with the Turkish authorities and the independent experts commissioned with the independent environmental impact assessment on the metro bridge.

On 21 July, we received new information including:

- A note on the composition, functions and responsibilities of a newly established World Heritage site and site management directorate of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism;
- An announcement of a Management Plan of the historic areas of Istanbul for 1 February 2011; information on the high-level legal protection of immovable culture property which led to the Court decision stopping the Four Seasons hotel annex construction;
- Information on additional funds allocated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism for the excavation of archaeological remains;
- Information on the commissioning of an environmental impact assessment to be completed by October 2010.

On the resumed discussion on the metro bridge project, the stakeholders gave information on: The design stage of the Eurasia Road Tunnel which has not yet been approved by the relevant bodies; photographs and maps on the protection of the visual integrity of the monuments and finally information on the emergency archaeological excavation being conducted on the site of the Marmaray Metro Tunnel project.

This is all I have to say at this stage, and ICOMOS would like to make a comment.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS is concerned, since the last Committee, as there has been comparatively little progress in addressing the urgent issue of the impact of the proposed bridge that the Committee made clear last year, would, as designed, have a potentially severe impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. As you have heard, only very recently have we been sent information on the process for undertaking an impact assessment and also background information on options that have been considered over the years.

We are now in a difficult situation, as preliminary work has started on the bridge with the construction of piles, in advance of a thorough assessment of its impact. The State Party has submitted a draft of the Outstanding Universal Value and ICOMOS has reviewed this and returned it to the State Party. This document, although not yet formally approved by the Committee, will need to underpin the heritage impact assessment. We are pleased to know that the State Party intends to follow the new guidance on impact assessment that has been produced by ICOMOS.

At this moment, ICOMOS considers that we are in a similar situation to that of the Committee last year, in that we have a proposal for a large tow bridge close to the Historic Centre. We have not agreed on its heritage impact assessment and no alternative options have been fully explored by the Centre or the Advisory Bodies. It is for this reason that ICOMOS considers that the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger were relevant in terms for potential danger from threatening planned projects. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I would like to open the floor to the Committee members to comment. I have 13 Committee members out of 21 who want to take the floor: Russian Federation, Sweden, Iraq, Brazil, Jordan, China, Australia, Nigeria, Mexico, France, South Africa, Estonia, Thailand and Ethiopia. Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you. I would like the floor to be given to Turkey.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Turkey, you have the floor.”

Turkey:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson for giving me the floor. As mentioned by the Secretariat in detail, since the working document was distributed, we have provided comprehensive updated information and remarks on these issues. We think that these new remarks and this information constitute substantial and new developments. The present design of the Golden Horn Metro Bridge project has been the most significant issue. The views of the Advisory Bodies and of the Turkish authorities on the design of the bridge project differ, despite various design alternatives studied in the past years, and several changes made in the current design.

Therefore, the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in Seville requested that an independent impact assessment be carried out. After comprehensive discussions among all stakeholders, the Turkish authorities have decided to commission an environmental impact assessment to a group of independent experts. The assessment is expected to be finalised by October 2010 and will be given due respect by the Turkish authorities. Besides, I am available to answer any other questions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The next speaker is Sweden, sorry, rather the Russian Federation. I would just like to ask the member States to respect the time allocation for each intervention, and if possible, please do not repeat what has been said by other Delegations.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. based on the updated information the Committee has received from the State Party, the Draft Decision was distributed and also after the explanation given by Turkey today, we are fully convinced that the Draft Decision needs to be amended to reflect the present state of the safeguarding of the historic areas of Istanbul. The State Party has provided information requested by the Committee through the UNESCO Unit established in its Ministry of Culture and Tourism. It has stated that the Management Plan being developed will be completed on 1 February 2011. It has further stated that the Management Plan will address issues raised in the Draft Decision.

Most important of all, the Draft Decision sanctions the placing of the historic areas of Istanbul on the World Heritage List in Danger, due to deep concerns for the potential impact of the present project design of the Golden Horn Metro Bridge. However, we know that the State Party is initiating an independent environmental assessment requested by the Committee on this issue and has stopped the construction of the project, except for the ground work needed for this kind of design. We understand that there is an ongoing, comprehensive discussion on this issue among stakeholders.

In view of this new and substantial development, we are convinced that placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not necessary. We have prepared a Draft Decision taking into consideration the updated information. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I give the floor to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. In several World Heritage properties, there have been discussions on how planned or ongoing constructions of new bridges would affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the sites. Sweden is of the general opinion that in many cases the question is not if a bridge should be accepted, but how it should be designed. The Committee has had several examples, where, we, through several requests for alternatives design and visual impact studies, have directed the bridge project towards more acceptable solutions.

Sweden believes that we should apply this method of dialogue on the historic area of Istanbul. We are pleased to see that an independent environmental assessment will be carried out and that the project now will not continue and has been stopped. That is new information we received here today. The information that the construction has stopped is most welcome and new to us. We will consider withdrawing our proposed amendment to the Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. Iraq, you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I have a statement and a question. We note with appreciation the efforts made by the State Party and their response to the Decision of the Committee. We think that the Draft Decision distributed in June needs significant amendments to reflect the new and important developments presented by the State Party. I fully support the amendments introduced by the Russian Federation in this regard.

My question is: what will be the methodology of the independent environmental impact assessment? Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Representative of the State Party, would you like to comment on the question of Iraq?”

Turkey:

“Thank you very much Sir. I would like to inform the State Parties that the independent environmental impact assessment will be carried out using the methodology and design of the document entitled: ‘ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessment for Cultural World Heritage Properties.’ Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next speaker is Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Chair. The Brazilian Delegation would like to congratulate the Centre and also the information given by the State Party. Brazil is very satisfied with the recent effort made by the State Party. Our Delegation would like to take this opportunity to ask the State Party a specific question about the Management Plan of the site.

The report presents some suggestions that can be seen in the Draft Decision, which mentions the need to include awareness-raising efforts with the local community in the management plan, and also preservation measures for Ottoman wooden houses. Brazil would like to ask the State Party to clarify these and other issues about the Management Plan of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. The floor is to the State Party concerned to reply.”

Turkey:

“Thank you Chairperson. I can confirm that the first phase of the development of the Management Plan has already been completed and that all the plans will be completed on 1 February 2011. The management Plan will incorporate many elements included in the Draft Decision, among them awareness raising activities on heritage sites, and these will be carried out in a realistic manner. The plan will also include a rehabilitation strategy for traditional timber houses. It will, in addition, contain the details of the transportation and traffic dimensions regarding the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“Thank you Sir. Jordan welcomes the effort made by the State Party and for the following guiding remarks of the Advisory Bodies and other professional agencies. The State Party has responded positively to all the suggestions and recommendations and Jordan endorses the Russian Federation’s suggestions, supported by Iraq and other State Parties.

We have also just heard very encouraging remarks by the State Party and we also support that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. China agrees with the concerns expressed in the ICOMOS evaluation report despite the latest information provided by the State Party. We would like to join the other Delegations to welcome the progress being made by the State Party and also to welcome the commitment on the completion of a Management Plan and the commissioning of an independent environmental impact assessment for the bridge. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you. I think it is quite an interesting type of issue here, with the problem of development in cities and how visual impact affects value, which is an area where I think there is genuine methodological difference. I think in this case that the bridge may indeed have some visual impacts, but certainly from an Australian point of view, we consider that the current proposal is actually a sympathetic modern addition rather than something that would have, indeed, a negative impact.

It is also interesting in this case, in our view, that the bridge would have potential to release some of the other stresses that are actually impacting on the property. To that extent it could be a significant benefit. We would like to recognize the State Party’s action to adjust the design in recognition of some of the issues that have been raised and certainly very much support the process that it has initiated on the independent expert assessment and to halt the development other than the foundation for a period.

We would be certainly happy for that process to conclude, and, presuming its results were consistent with the information we have been seeing today for the bridge, to proceed. We do not include here the other issues related to the site that we are very happy the State Party has indicated to us and that it is very happy to follow those up as well. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. On my list I still have Nigeria, Estonia, Thailand, France, Ethiopia, South Africa, Barbados and Egypt, and I would like to close the list; thank you very much. Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Nigeria also shares the concerns of ICOMOS regarding the threats this site is facing, but given the information provided by the State Party and the efforts they have been making

in the past few years and the information provided by ICOMOS that an independent assessment is going to be undertaken and provided by the State Party, we would like to share the position of Russia; that there should be no hurry in taking decisions of significant circumstance without receiving the results of this independent assessment. Therefore, I would think, that, in the Draft Decision, the paragraph in relation to placing this current site on the in Danger List should wait for the assessment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you Chair. We commend the State Party on its latest effort stated in the letter dated of 21 July. However, we would like to note that the analysis and documentation are still in progress and we do not know the results. We should keep this in mind while we are making the amendments to the Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Thailand, you have the floor.”

Thailand:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Thailand also would like to thank the State Party for the new information given on the Management Plan and the environmental impact assessment. We would like to associate ourselves with the previous speaker who commended the efforts made and would like to support the suggestion of the Russian Federation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Thailand. France you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Délégation française souhaiterait tout d’abord rendre hommage à l’État partie pour les efforts qu’il a entrepris dans le cadre *d’Istanbul, capitale européenne de la culture* qui mobilise, nous le savons, des fonds très importants. Le projet de décision, nous le pensons, doit prendre en compte toutes les mises à jour, les informations qui nous ont été transmises par l’État partie et qui sont extrêmement importantes. Nous souhaitons accorder à ce titre notre soutien aux propositions apportées par la Fédération de Russie.

Je souhaiterais aborder un point qui ne l’a pas encore été en particulier. Le rapport de l’ICOMOS se réfère à deux projets de transport d’envergure. Le projet du Tunnel de Marmaray et celui du Tunnel du Bosphore pour le passage de véhicules motorisés. Je souhaiterais que vous puissiez, Monsieur le Président par votre truchement, céder la parole à l’État partie afin qu’il nous indique l’état actuel de ces deux projets qui sont mentionnés dans le projet de Décision. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. L'État partie vous avez la parole ».

Turkey:

“Thank you Chairperson. The other two big infrastructure projects: one of them, the Bosphorus Eurasia Road Tunnel, is at the very early design stage. As it is, its implementation has been refused by the Regional Board of Conservation of Cultural Properties. Therefore its impact evaluation will be carried out, if this project is reconsidered and represented to the Board.

The second project, Marmaray, is proceeding with utmost care for the preservation of cultural heritage, as already known by the Secretariat and many of the members. One of the largest sites is the emergency archaeological excavation which is being conducted on the projected sites of the main station and has resulted in the discovery of tens of thousands of archaeological objects, which are being duly conserved. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Ethiopia, you have the floor”.

Ethiopia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I fully support the Russian Federation’s proposal and Ethiopia believes that enough time should be given to complete the assessment before coming to any decisions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. South Africa you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you, Chair. In order not to repeat too much of what others have already contributed, we support also the very practical position of our Russian colleague which concentrates strongly on the idea of a heritage impact assessment and sets out carefully and stringently what it should cover, and adequately examine the problems and fully inform the Committee, so that it can consider a full and objective set of information in the project concerning the bridge. We would also like to endorse the idea proposed by Australia and hope that impact assessment will ascertain whether what they have said is, indeed, the case.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. Barbados would like to be associated with comments from the distinguished colleagues that complemented the State Party for the work carried out so far. We would particularly associate with comments made by Australia, and we look forward to the information received on the preservation of the wooden heritage of this particular site, as we have similar properties that we are looking at and follow technology transfer. We are looking forward to the days when we will probably recognise that all interventions into historical sites will not impact negatively. All impacts are not necessarily negative impacts. There may be modern intervention that may in actual fact enhance the historic sense. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. Egypt you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Tout d’abord l’Égypte voudrait féliciter l’État partie en ce qui concerne l’effort entrepris sur les zones historiques d’Istanbul, surtout que nous sommes tout à fait conscients du volume de travail déployé et des efforts. Il y a beaucoup de similarités avec Le Caire historique, donc nous sommes vraiment conscients de la complexité de la chose. Le deuxième point, c’est que nous soutenons la proposition de la Fédération de Russie en ce qui concerne le site. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Egypt. I do not have any further requests for the floor. ICOMOS, would you like to take the floor? No, the State Party would like to add something? Yes, you have the floor.”

Turkey:

“I thank the committee members for their comments and I would like to once more confirm and reply to the statement of the Swedish Delegation. I would like to confirm that the construction work of the structure of the bridge has not started. It will not be started until the conclusion of the evaluation by the relevant parties of the environmental impact assessment which has been commissioned. The present work is only about soil improvement and work on the sea bottom at underwater level. One of the purposes of this work is to test the sliding possibilities of the soil and its bearing capacity. This preliminary work is necessary because it is a first degree earthquake zone and is covered with 35 metres of risky seismic strata. This is standard work which has to be necessary for any kind of any design of a future bridge. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS, would you like to make a comment.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Chair. We note that the State Party has indicated that the work would be halted until the outcome of the heritage impact assessment. ICOMOS would just like to clarify the process of reviewing that heritage impact assessment. The normal process is for the heritage impact assessment to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, who submits it to ICOMOS for evaluation. It is our role to advise the Committee. This heritage impact assessment will come in after 15 October, when it is completed. I would just like to have a clear understanding of what follows thereafter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you ICOMOS. Maybe the State Party can reply to the ICOMOS question.”

Turkey:

“I do not think it was a question, more a statement, and I took note of it.”

The Chairperson:

“Would you like to reply or give further information?”

Turkey:

“My Delegation took note of the statement made by the ICOMOS representative.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, you have anything to add?”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Chair. I wonder if I may clarify and perhaps turn into a question what was said before. ICOMOS would like an understanding of, whether the State Party is happy for the ICOMOS assessment of the heritage impact assessment, which is forwarded to the Centre, to be presented at the next session?”

The Chairperson:

“Turkey, you have the floor.”

Turkey:

“Turkey will proceed with the recommendation of the Committee and of the World Heritage Centre.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to move on, with the examination of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.102 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We have distributed to you two revised Draft Decisions, 34 COM 7B.102, which have a cover page with options 1, 2 and 3 printed on it. The reasons for this are that we have draft amendments from three State Parties of a fundamentally different nature.

The Draft Decision proposed by the Russian Federation implies to delete the references to in Danger listing and to a potential deletion of the property.

The Draft Decision of Switzerland has proposed deleting the reference to potential inscription on the List of the World Heritage in Danger, but foresees the consideration of in Danger listing as soon as the impact assessment has been received during the next session of the Committee.

Finally, the Draft Decision of Sweden foresees deleting reference to a potential deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

We have therefore decided to present to you all three options. The decision further removed from the original Draft Decision would be option 1, proposed by the Russian Federation, which would need to be examined first.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Sweden withdraws its proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. In this case I would suggest starting examining option number 1, and we will proceed on the adoption paragraph by paragraph and then examine the Australian amendment.

I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could suggest that you may wish to examine paragraph 14 first, which is the deletion of the reference to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, because in case this paragraph should not be accepted, as it is deleted at the moment, we may move to another option of the Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the legal advisor for further information and clarification regarding the proposal from the rapporteur.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. You have a situation here where you have a Draft Decision and a consequent number of amendments. In accordance with the rules, when two or more amendments for a proposal are moved, you first have to vote on the amendment that The Chairpersonman deems the furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the other proposal and so on.

So, he has determined that the amendment from the Russian Federation is the furthest removed. What the rapporteur is proposing and we recommend that you adopt it, if you so wish, is that you first determine whether paragraph 14, on whether the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, be a “Yes” or a “No”. Then, depending on the answer to that question you should vote on the other amendments, proceeding paragraph by paragraph. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you legal advisor. It is past 6pm and I have just been informed by the Secretariat that we do not have interpretation, so I am going to suggest adjourning our session and we will be back at 7pm sharp. During this hour I would like to ask Switzerland and the Russian Federation if they could meet and return at 7pm with a compromised draft. Thank you very much. Are there any objections regarding this proposal? I see none. Session adjourned.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 29 July, 2010

Thursday, 29 July 2010

TENTH SESSION

Evening session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
M. Mohamed El Zahaby (Vice-Chairperson)**

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

CULTURAL HERITAGE

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The Chairperson:

“I would like to request that the Delegations take their seats. I am asking the Secretariat if we have reached the quorum. I would like to start with the examination of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.102.REV 3. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.102.Rev.3 has been distributed in the room and I have been asked to announce that there is a mistake on the French version because it does not indicate the State Party of Switzerland, as in the English version, but it is a text submitted by two parties: the Russian Federation and Switzerland.

The Draft Decision in front of you combines elements of the previous options 1 and 2 previously submitted. In fact paragraphs 1 to 13 are from the former option 1, the Russian proposition and paragraphs 14 and 15 from the previous option 2, the Swiss proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am going to suggest that we adopt the first 13 paragraphs from the Russian Federation amendment. Are there any objections regarding the first 13 paragraphs of the Russian Federation’s option 1 proposal? I see none. So paragraphs 1 to 13 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.102 REV.3 are adopted. Thank you.

The next two paragraphs 14 and 15 have been taken from the Swiss amendment. Any objections regarding the last two paragraphs 14 and 15? I see none. They are adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.102 REV.3 is adopted in its entirety from paragraphs 1 to 15. Thank you very much.

I am now going to leave my place to our Chair.”

ASIA –PACIFIC

[Temple of Preah Vihear]

The Chairperson:

“Good evening everyone. I think that we have now finished handing out the documentation. I should like, first of all, to congratulate the State Parties of Thailand and Cambodia for their willingness to dialogue and the understanding that they came to for the Draft Decision that will be submitted to the Plenary. I am pleased to be able to tell you that the presidency has received two declarations from the State Party and has always hoped for a neutrally acceptable understanding.

The Draft Decision that is now tabled is the result of these negotiations. I feel privileged to have conducted these negotiations and I call on all members of the Committee to support the text without having to resort to a vote and without a discussion. I will now give the floor to the rapporteur so that she can read out the Draft Decision and submit it to your approval. Thank you.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I will read out to you the compromised Draft Decision submitted by The Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.66:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having received Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.3,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 31 COM 8B.24, 32 COM 8B.102, and 33 COM 7B.65, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), and 33rd session (Seville, 2009) respectively,*
3. *Takes note that the World Heritage Centre has the documents submitted by the State Party;*
4. *Further welcomes the steps taken by the State Party towards the establishment of an international co-ordinating committee for the sustainable conservation of the Temple of Preah Vihear;*
5. *Decides to consider the documents submitted by the State Party at its 35th session in 2011.”*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now open the floor to the Committee to ask if you are in agreement with this Draft Decision. No objections? The **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.66** is approved.

I would like to once more congratulate the Delegations of Thailand and Cambodia who, through discussions, managed to reach an agreement. It was a joint effort of all the members of the Committee and especially for those who today worked along my side to reach the agreement. I am convinced that we have found a solution which is in the spirit of the 1972 Convention and above all the Funding acts of UNESCO. Thank you very much.

I give the floor to each of the parties for a comment. Thailand please you have the floor.”

Thailand:

“Thank you. On behalf of the Thai Delegation, I would like to sincerely thank His Excellency the Minister of Culture and the Brazilian Delegation, especially Ambassador Joao Carlos Gomes and all distinguished Committee members for recognising the sensitivity of the issue and facilitating bilateral dialogue between Thailand and Cambodia. The Thai Delegation would also like to thank the members of the Committee for the Decision that leaves the matter to be resolved amicably, and allow more time for both countries to study in detail the documents and avoid any legal implications and to arrive at a mutually beneficial solution.

I do hope that the future bilateral consultation will continue and that we will come to a mutual agreement between the two countries to make successful the work of the Committee and of the *Convention*. I would like to express once more our thanks to His Excellency the Minister for Culture and distinguished members of the Committee. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The representative of Cambodia, you have the floor.”

Cambodia:

“I first would like to express my deep thanks to His Excellency The Chairperson and I would like to also express our thanks to all other Committee members and participants to this very important meeting. I express my thanks to The Chairperson in particular for having organized and prevented all kind of complications that may have occurred. This is much appreciated and we hope that your Committee will become more and more important and efficient in fulfilling its noble task. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“May I apologise, but I have to leave, as I have a meeting with my President, Luiz Inácio da Silva. The Chairpersonmanship is handed over to our very competent vice chair. Thank you very much.”

The Vice Chair (hereafter called The Chairperson):

“Thank you. We are going to proceed further with the last site in this region, **Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine)**. The floor is to the representative of the Secretariat. Mrs. Rössler, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much, Mr. President. I also take the opportunity to present our apologies for some of the problems we had with the power point presentations this afternoon. Can we please have the photo of Kiev displayed?”

On 1 June, the Delegation of Ukraine informed the World Heritage Centre that steps are being taken at the highest level to ensure adequate conservation of the property and, in particular, concerning illegal constructions. On the same day, the Deputy Minister of Culture informed the Centre that construction works in the buffer zone were under the special control of the Ministry of Culture and Regional development. On 4 June the State Party informed the Centre, that the Ministry of Culture had prepared a detailed analysis of the situation in Kiev, including proposals concerning conservation and restoration works on the property. I now give the floor to ICOMOS. Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. ICOMOS has no more to say other than that we remain deeply concerned about the lack of planning and development control in the vicinity of the property, which we consider as a direct and adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to invite the members of the Committee to comment. Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you Chair. On the request of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the country presented in May this year additional information on the state of conservation of this site. This information demonstrates the progress made in resolving several issues with regard to the conservation of the site. It contains concrete facts on measures initiated by the country that were implemented after the presentation of the report on the state of conservation. This information was not taken into account in the Draft Decision and we think it is necessary to amend the text.

Particular attention should be drawn to the importance of maintaining the genuine format of the document. We should avoid mentioning specific addresses and contacts of construction works in the buffer zone of the site, as the recommendation shall concern the whole of the buffer zone.

Also, taking into account the active effort to resolve the issues mentioned, we propose not to mention the possibility to include the site into the List of World Heritage in Danger next years, as there are no evident threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Russian Federation. More members would like to take the floor? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'aimerais à nouveau demander des précisions à

l'ICOMOS parce que si j'ai bien compris, il y a effectivement une menace contre la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien, même si l'on doit saluer les grands efforts de l'État partie pour remédier à cette situation. Si tel est le cas, je souhaiterais maintenir la phrase finale du dernier paragraphe *en vue d'envisager le bien...*, merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. La parole est à l'ICOMOS ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. ICOMOS has evaluated a number of development projects in the buffer zone of this property. Thereby, the comments made on this state of conservation report are based on some rather detailed information about this project and the potential impact they have on the setting of the World Heritage site. One of the reasons for mentioning them in paragraph 5 was to indicate that we have looked into this in considerable detail. What paragraph 5 also says is that the recommendation of the Committee to put a moratorium in place until a master plan has been developed was something that we strongly support.

We recognise the efforts of the State Party, but there are some quite severe and difficult problems facing this site and we fear that structural changes need to be made, so there is a Master Plan into which development projects can be fitted and fix the clear planning and guidelines for how and where development is appropriate.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Chair. We just wanted, in the spirit of this Committee, to hear the position of the State Party itself. We should like to suggest hearing from the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Is the representative of Ukraine in the room? You have the floor.”

Ukraine:

“Thank you, Chair. Distinguished members of the Committee; as the site is located in the centre of a *megapolis* which is now rapidly developing, it has become more and more difficult to protect its Outstanding Universal Value. Regarding the recommendations made by two monitoring missions of the World heritage Centre and ICOMOS to Kiev in 2009, a proposal to extend the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral has been included in the draft conception of a general plan for development of the capital until 2025, while other propositions of the experts are, as well, being considered.

The Prime Minister of Ukraine gave an instruction to all public institutions and government agencies to take appropriate measures with a view to protecting the Outstanding

Universal Value of this site, as well as all the other Ukrainian monuments of Universal Importance. In addition, the Mayor of Kiev was ordered to take measures for the immediate prevention of violation of the law in the sphere of cultural city protection regarding Kiev-Pechersk and Saint Sophia Cathedral, and to declare a temporary moratorium on the land allocation and building in the buffer zone.

Noting that the building on a specified named and numbered street is the only precise address included in the text of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.103, we consider it more reasonable that the Decision should contain general recommendations for the entire buffer zone of the site, such as Saint Sophia Cathedral, and not mention specific details and addresses. More detailed information concerning the actions undertaken was submitted by Ukraine to the World heritage Centre in May this year. Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the Delegation of Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The Delegation of Brazil would like to state that it is satisfied with the information given by the State Party and we would also like to add that we support the proposal of the Russian Federation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I cannot see any request for further interventions. We will, then, proceed to examine Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.103 and I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I have received an amendment from one Delegation on Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.103 by the Russian Federation, and it concerns paragraphs 3, 5d and 11.

For paragraph 3, the Russian Federation proposes deletion of the current paragraph and suggests replacing it with the following wording:

Notes reparation works and monitoring activities of the key monuments of the National Conservation Area "Saint Sophia of Kyiv" as well as catacombs at the Lavra site.

Further the Russian Federation suggests the deletion of paragraph 5d and a replacement with the following wording:

d) Buildings in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral,

In addition, the Russian federation suggests a deletion at the end of paragraph 11; deleted would be:

with a view to considering in the absence of substantial progress the potential inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Then paragraph 11 would stop after, *for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. We are going to proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.103. Are there any objections regarding paragraphs 1 and 2 unchanged? I see none. They are adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraph 3 and I am going to ask our rapporteur to read it again."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The Russian Federation proposes the deletion of the current paragraph and suggests replacing it with the following wording:

Notes reparation works and monitoring activities of the key monuments of the National Conservation Area "Saint Sophia of Kyiv" as well as catacombs at the Lavra site."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any objections regarding paragraph 3 as amended by the Russian Federation? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Paragraphs 4 and 5, a, b and c remain unchanged. Any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. They are adopted.

I am going to ask our rapporteur to read paragraph 5d."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you, chairperson. I am just going back to the original document and I have to correct my earlier announcement, as on the document I have received the paragraphs are mislettered. The Russian Federation does not suggest deleting paragraph d, but e, so I apologise for incorrect information, so you can adopt e first."

Russian Federation (interrupting the rapporteur):

"Excuse me, but you are absolutely right. It is 5d which we would like to replace."

Rapporteur:

"Then I repeat what I said initially: the Russian Federation suggests the deletion of paragraph 5d and replacing it with the following wording:

d) Buildings in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral."

The Chairperson:

“Can you confirm Russian Federation? Yes, thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5d? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Moving to paragraphs 5e, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 which remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. They are adopted.

Now I give the floor to our reporter to read out paragraph 11.”

Rapporteur:

“Keeping in mind that the last part of the paragraph is proposed to be deleted, it would then read:

11. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 11 as amended by the Russian Federation? I see none. It is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM7B.103 is adopted in its entirety, paragraphs 1 to 11. Thank you very much.

ASIA-PACIFIC

We have finished with Europe and North America. I would suggest returning to the Asia-Pacific region with the site of the **Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan)**. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chairman. This is a report that the Advisory Bodies and the Centre have included, although the Committee in its previous sessions did not request it. We decided to present a state of conservation report because we received information on this property that raised some concerns. It should be noted that this property has never been reported on to the committee since its inscription nearly 20 years ago.

In the framework of an ongoing project undertaken by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent for the documentation of the Historic Centre of Bukhara, a technical report was prepared in January 2010 which pointed to a number of issues, including the lack of a proper conservation plan; building activities that have not been in line with international standards of urban conservation including inappropriate typologies, materials, replacing traditional fabric and etc. and problems with sanitation.

The World Heritage Centre wrote a letter to the State Party requesting its comments on the specific issues raised by the report. A report from the State Party was indeed received on 12 March 2010. It contained extensive information on ongoing activities for the

conservation and preservation of the property. Notably, a major State Programme extended until 2020 for the 'Conservation, Restoration and Reutilisation of Cultural Heritage of Bukhara.'

However, the State Party report did not specifically address the issues raised in our letter. For this reason we suggested, and that is reflected in the Decision in front of you, that a reactive monitoring mission could be carried out that would look into the issues raised in the mentioned technical report, but also would review the above mentioned State Programme and advise the State Party on an appropriate conservation policy for this property. The Draft Decision is on page 146 of document 7B. However, I believe that ICOMOS has further comments."

ICOMOS:

"The report by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent highlighted threats to vulnerabilities of the fabric of the property that links the major monuments. At the time of its inscription, ICOMOS' evaluation stated that 'the real importance of Bukhara lies not in its individual buildings, but rather in its overall townscape, demonstrating the high and consistent level of urban planning and architecture' and it talked about the fabric of the medieval city remaining largely intact.

These urban buildings reflect distinctive local traditions based on earthen architecture with particularly elaborate timber work and a foreground courtyard opening up onto narrow alleys. This urban area is highly vulnerable to lack of maintenance or to a change of materials. ICOMOS considers that the request for a mission, to assess the state of conservation considering the major plans being prepared and to offer advice on the creation of a management plan, is strongly supported in order to put in place processes to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"I open the floor for comments from members of the Committee. I see none, is the representative of the State Party in the room? No. We are then going to submit the Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.74 for approval. The floor is to our rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you, Chair. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.74 is on page 146 of the English and 154 of the French versions of document 7B. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Barbados, which concerns paragraphs 3 and 4.

In paragraph 3, the Delegation of Barbados suggests deleting part of the paragraph starting from *commissioned* up to *in close concertation with*. The remainder of the paragraph, starting with the addition of one word, will then read:

3. Considering the need to assess the full extent of the conservation issues referred to in a technical report submitted by the State Party.

In paragraph 4, the Delegation of Barbados suggests deleting the wording: *Commissioned by the Delegation of UNESCO in Tashkent*, and the remaining paragraph would accordingly read:

4. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, review the

recommendations of the technical report, the scope and contents of the ongoing “State Programme for the conservation, restoration and utilization of cultural heritage of the city of Bukhara” and advise the State Party on the appropriate form and contents for an effective conservation and management plan of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going to proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.74, paragraph by paragraph. The Secretariat would like to comment. You have the floor Sir.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair and apologies for taking the floor. In fact, the issues that basically triggered this report, and for which we are recommending the mission, were not contained in the report submitted by the State Party, but in the report that was commissioned by the UNESCO office in Tashkent, which was prepared by an independent expert. I do not know if there was some confusion and if Barbados had taken this into account and wants to carry its amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Barbados, would you like to sustain your amendment?”

Barbados:

“Yes, Sir. I do not find that the terms used are necessary. There are actually rather superfluous to the decision making process, so, while I understand the point, it is a technical report which has been referred to in detail and includes the commissioning process, and I do not think it is necessary to have it in the Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We will proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.74. The first two paragraphs remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these first two paragraphs? I see none, they are adopted.

For paragraph 3, I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Paragraph 3 with the amendment of Barbados would read:

3. Considering the need to assess the full extent of the conservation issues referred to in a technical report submitted by the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this paragraph? I see none. It is adopted.

For paragraph 4, I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chair; I will try to save time by reading the words that are deleted instead of reading the whole paragraph again. Deleted are the words:

Commissioned by the Delegation of UNESCO in Tashkent.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4 as amended? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 5 remains unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5? I see none, it is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.74 is adopted in its entirety as amended.

Now, we are moving to the last site regarding cultural property in the Latin American region, the **Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama)**. I give the floor to the Secretariat.”

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. This item concerns the state of conservation of the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo. As members of the Committee recall, this property has been suffering from lack of attention for a long-time. The discontinuity in the implementation of planning and conservation projects has compromised the attributes of the property. Serious conservation issues have been faced by the property: significant decay of the fabric; some structures are at risk of collapse at significant blows.

A reactive monitoring mission report expressed concerns on the severity of deterioration and identified critical areas of intervention. There is very little maintenance work being conducted at the property and no assessment of the rate of decay exists. Sea air is yet another of the critical threats. Macro-vegetation has contributed to further decaying the buildings and uncontrolled constructions pose a threat to the original structures. There are houses resting on the fortification, developing urban pressures and spontaneous growth and uncontrolled constructions, coupled with a lack of a legally defined buffer zone, of course, have contributed to an increase of the amount of informal housing at the property.

The initial revised working plan included preservation of the monumental component, including implementing emergency actions and control of touristic activities. But the mission stated that no resources were identified for the implementation of the plan. On 27 June, the State Party sent a communication to the World heritage Centre to inform on the urgent actions being taken, subsequent to the reception of the mission report, consisting of:

- Implementing the emergency priority actions identified by the mission;
- Starting the realisation of the management plan;
- The identification of the types of ownership;
- Starting the regulatory measures of the executive decree for the territorial planning.

The president of Panama has allocated US\$2 millions to start conservation action at the site. I would like to refer to the Draft Decision, as the Outstanding Universal Value was submitted yesterday to the World Heritage Centre. The paragraph number 7 of the Decision should be deleted, the State Party is in the room. The Draft Decision can be viewed on pages 192 of the English and 202 of the French versions of the 7B.ad document and ICOMOS would like to add further comments.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS has expressed its strong concerns about the state of conservation of this property and highlighted its vulnerability for the past nine years. The reactive monitoring mission, carried out in 2010, confirmed the series of deteriorations of the historic fabric and the absence of an effective system in place to implement conservation and management actions to address deterioration and other issues, including uncontrolled urban expansion and encroachment. These situations have impacted on the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

ICOMOS takes note of the information provided by the State Party on 17 June and the immediate activities proposed for implementation. It fully welcomes these as a first step to address long standing issues. Nevertheless, ICOMOS considers that the fabric of the site has deteriorated to such an extent that it constitutes an ascertained danger to the property. Recalling the decision taken by the Committee at its 33rd session in Seville, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the Committee might wish to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to address the significant threats to the property and to garner the support that is needed at the local, national and international levels for the conservation of the property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is open to members of the Committee. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. We would like to express our thanks for the reports presented. We think they provide a full, thorough cover of the issues that are concerning this Committee. We have a series of questions to put to the State Party and would be interested in hearing more details on the issues.

Concerning the Patronato of Portobelo-San Lorenzo and the working plan established with regard to it, we would like to hear more about these items, and we would like to know if there are any new developments in regard to this along the lines described in the report. We would also like to hear further details on how the funds approved by the president of the Republic are going to be used to solve the various problems highlighted. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. Is the representative of the State Party in the room? Yes, you have the floor?”

Panama:

“Thank you very much. On behalf of Panama we would like to say that all the bases for developing a World Heritage policy are in place. We are aware of the need to build technical capacity and to immediately increase attention being paid to the qualification of the Patronato of Portobelo-San Lorenzo. We are grateful for the mission and we are taking into account the recommendations made.

We would like to inform you and confirm that the highest authorities of our government have called a meeting to deal with this specific issue and the results of this meeting have been passed on to the World Heritage Committee. For that reason, we can confirm that US\$2 millions have been allocated for immediate use in implementing the emergency plan. We are aware of the state of deterioration of the site. We call the Committee to place its trust in us. We have progress planned under the emergency plan with regard to the state of affairs. Thank you very much for the reports that have been presented.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any further request for intervention? No.

So, we are examining the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.112 and the floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 192 of the English and 202 of the French versions of document 7B.ad. I have not received any written amendments from any members of the Committee. However, I have noted the request of the Secretariat to delete paragraph 7 and the former paragraph 8 would accordingly become new paragraph 7. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the **adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.112** including paragraphs 1 to 7? I see none, it is adopted.

Now, we have finished with the cultural property. There are still 50 reports that could be discussed and I am turning to members of the Committee to know if any of these sites attached with a Draft Decision need to be read and discussed? Or, can we consider them as adopted Draft Decisions?

Je répète en français, il reste environ 50 sites non débattus par le Comité. Chacun de ces sites est concerné par un projet de Décision. Devons-nous procéder à la lecture de ceux-ci ou pouvons-nous les considérer comme adoptés ? Vous êtes d'accord, pas d'objection?

Then, they are adopted. Thank you.

MIXED HERITAGE

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Let's now move on to mixed properties. We have two sites, the first one from the Europe/North-America region and the second one from the Latin-America and Caribbean region. We are going to proceed with the first site: **Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture in Spain**. The floor is to the Secretariat."

The Secretariat:

"Briefly, on 3 May the document indicating the start of the work at the Port of Ibiza was sent to the Centre through the Ministry of Culture of Spain, though we had heard about this already from individuals and NGOs. We asked the State Party to confirm that work has been started and then on 23 June 2010, a letter sent by the Ministry of Culture from Spain confirmed that work started on 3 May 2010 applying the necessary safety measures. Later on, we received a phone call stating that only archaeological excavations were undertaken until October 2010.

We also received a letter on 15 July transmitting a technical report on the preservation of the *posidonia* fish of Ibiza and Formentera, compiled by the Balearic island government, and this report points out that the responsibility for protecting the marine area of Spain lies with the State Party authorities and not the Peninsular Council. Now, I turn over to IUCN and ICOMOS. Thank you."

IUCN:

"Thank you Chair. In relation to natural values in this mixed site, it is crucial that the intended work should be carried out in strict accordance with the mitigation measures recommended in the 2009 report and that detailed monitoring is undertaken both during and after construction in order to assess their effectiveness and to adapt them if necessary. IUCN notes it received concerns about the likely impact of the port's development on the natural environment. IUCN wishes to highlight that although the work will directly affect important natural areas, including sea grass prairies, these are not the areas that are included in the property's boundaries. Thus, safe and adequate mitigation measures are strictly adhered to and rigorous monitoring is carried out. IUCN considers that the impact of this development on the natural value of the property should not impact on its Outstanding Universal value. Thank you."

ICOMOS:

"Chair, ICOMOS would just like to add that the potential impact of the port relates to the cultural attributes of this property in terms of underwater archaeology and visual integrity, as highlighted by the mission. Although the State Party has indicated that modifications have been made to the plans, these have not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by an Advisory Body before work commences. The extra information provided on mitigation measures does not relate to cultural matters and so far we have no information on how underwater archaeology will be dealt with, although we note that the State Party has indicated that underwater archaeological research is now under way. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you; I now open the floor for discussion. Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Étant donné le rapport et les différentes informations qui sont arrivés sur le tard, ainsi que les recommandations des Organisations consultatives au vu du projet de Décision, nous souhaiterions donner la parole à l'État partie pour qu'il s'exprime sur les travaux initiés et les mesures entreprises pour garantir la valeur exceptionnelle suivant les recommandations de la mission sur le suivi réactif. À cette fin, peut-être qu'il y a d'autres questions que l'on pourrait rassembler afin que l'État partie réponde en une seule fois. Merci. »

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. La parole est à la Suède. »

Sweden:

“Thank you. I shall be brief because the Advisory Bodies have made their point, actually. Sweden would like to underline the necessity of the monitoring process for the project expansion in line with the technical challenges of the dredging and construction work and the potential threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. This is a technically difficult development project, with complex and multiple potential impacts on cultural and natural values. Mitigation measures and thorough monitoring are extremely important. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the State Party. Is there any representative of Italy in the room? Sorry, Spain.”

Spain:

“Thank you Chair. Firstly, we would like to thank the Committee for giving a chance to Spain to clarify a few points. We would like to say that the Spanish government is very involved in all of this. I am delighted that we are able to point out that we do coincide with the Advisory Bodies' reports, which state that until now conservation of the property has been satisfactory.

The port area requires upgrading work and we feel that this work will improve the security and integrity of the area. Remember that for this island the port area has a very important strategic nature. When we look at the process, until now there have been many discussions and alternatives and the reduction of the original size, with 30 percent less dredging and 10 000 square meters less of platform area.

In other words, this project has done everything possible to comply with the World Heritage Committee's recommendations. We have complied with European norms and the necessary environmental guarantees, and this project has the utmost support of the Spanish Government.”

Spain:

“Yes, the most important aspect is to remove the dapping zone of the dredging zone 17 kilometres away from the natural Park. Besides, the construction is on pylons, which means that water will be able to circulate freely. Furthermore, we are offering a reduced platform size, so that we do not have any storage for industrial activity. This also minimises the overall dredging. Moreover, we are using GPS management tools to ensure that the dredging will not lead to any overflow.

There are several recommendations that we feel we have complied with. Firstly, we have established a Technical Committee which liaises with the relevant authorities to ensure that all the different elements of the property are going to be respected. We are going to submit a report in the course of 2011. Furthermore, looking at part 4 of the Draft Decision, we can say that we need to clarify the fact that reorganising the port is necessary in order to guarantee the security of the facilities and to eliminate any current impacts that we are seeing on the cultural aspects of the property.

In other words, these preliminary activities are strictly complying with the recommendations contained in the report, and that is why we should like to see the second part of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision removed. We have absolutely no doubt and we would like to rest assured, dear members of the Committee, that the Spanish authorities are the first people to defend the property and we need to keep you perfectly up to date as work progresses. Besides, we will come up with a monitoring report which will be submitted to the Committee, at least one month prior to the start of any dredging work.

To conclude, there are two actions we would like to report on. On the one hand, we have important information days and the Committee will be informed of this, and on the other hand we will have real time updates giving environmental updates looking at the amount of energy that is impacting on each of the columns of water and etc. We feel we are doing everything to comply. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not see any further requests for the floor, so I would like to go further with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.41 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 109 of the English and 115 of the French versions of document 7B. I have received an amendment from the Delegation of Mexico which concerns paragraphs 3 and 4. I will accordingly read out the two paragraphs to you.

In paragraph 3, the Mexican Delegation proposes to delete the second part of the paragraph starting at *urges* and replaces it by new text. The full paragraph would then read:

3. Notes the results and recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property carried out in November 2009 and encourages the national and local authorities to keep taking the appropriate management measures for the benefit of the property.

In paragraph 4, the Delegation of Mexico suggests deleting the second part of the paragraph, so that the paragraph would end on *monitoring mission report* and the full paragraph will accordingly read:

4. Also notes the State Party report and the detailed comments from the Balearic Port Authority on the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission report.

Other paragraphs, 1, 2, 5 and 6, remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Let’s move on to the adoption of the first two paragraphs, 1 and 2. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.41? I see none. They are adopted

Now paragraph 3 and the floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 3 remains unchanged until *November 2009* and then changes to the following wording:

and encourages the national and local authorities to keep taking the appropriate management measures for the benefit of the property.

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 3? I see none, it is adopted

Now paragraph 4 and the floor is to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. For paragraph 4 the Delegation of Mexico suggests deleting the second part of the paragraph starting from *deeply regrets*. The remaining part of the paragraph will accordingly read:

4. Also notes the State Party report and the detailed comments from the Balearic Port Authority on the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission report.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these two paragraphs? I see none, they are adopted

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.41 is adopted in its totality, from paragraph 1 to 6.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

We are moving on to the next site of the mixed property category, from the Latin-America Caribbean region: the **Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**. I give the floor to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. The next item is the state of conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. As the Committee recalls, the state of conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu sustains the conservation to the value by which it has been inscribed on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies sent an emergency urgent plan to the State Party in May 2009 to effectively address immediate issues that could potentially threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property focused mainly on governance, risk preparedness, development at Machu Picchu and public use at the western access to the sanctuary. Since May 2009, unfortunately, no substantial actions have been implemented.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned for the lack of implementation of the legal framework and regulatory measures, as foreseen by the emergency Action Plan for risk reduction and disaster recovery requested by the Committee in Seville. The severity of the impact on the property and human fatalities from torrential rain in January and February this year accelerated existing problems and highlighted the overall vulnerability of the property and the call for securing a greater level of support at the international and national level.

Heavy rainfall at the property caused numerous landslides and rockslides damaging the existing infrastructures and altering the natural landscape. In Aguas Calientes, 4,000 tourists were stranded for four days and evacuated by air forces in a military operation. A spectrum of present concerns continues unresolved. There are not, yet, effective and adequate measures in place to systematically and holistically address the threats of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. An emergency decree was officially approved by the President of the Republic, but unfortunately did not address the main concerns identified by the previous missions.

Should the emergency Action Plan submitted in May 2009 having been put into practice, clear technical answers could have been found on how to organise the accessibility to the sanctuary in the website, initiating the organisation of the Management Plan, the need for restructuring of the management unit and the necessity to implement comprehensive study to make possible secure access for resident and visitors consistent with the safeguarding of the cultural and natural values of the sanctuary. The Citadel was reopened on 1 April 2010, and since then 1,500 tourists a day have visited the sanctuary. The Outstanding Universal Value declaration was officially submitted to the World Heritage Centre in June 2010. The State Party is in the room. ICOMOS and IUCN wish to make further comments. The Draft Decision is in document 7B.ad on page 75 of the English version and page 78 of the French version.”

ICOMOS:

“The Advisory Bodies remain strongly concern about the limited progress made on the priority actions that were identified in the detailed custody emergency Action Plan that was agreed upon with the State Party during the reinforced monitoring mission of 2009. The lack of implementation constitutes a clear and present danger both to residents and visitors at the property, as was clearly demonstrated by the tragic events of early 2010. The potential

exists for even further loss of human life and adverse impacts to the attributes that sustain the Universal Outstanding Value of the property.

The Advisory Bodies would like to reiterate that these conditions have been highlighted in eight monitoring missions in the last decade and have only been partially addressed by the State Party. The torrential rains and floods of early 2010 further exacerbated the situation which now poses a threat to the property, visitors and residents. Given the above, the Advisory Bodies consider that the Committee might wish to create an international support panel to better focus international support and to assist the State Party in addressing the long list of unresolved issues. In the absence of progress in this matter, the Advisory Bodies consider that to provide further support, the Committee might wish to consider inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 35th session in 2011. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“IUCN would you like to add something? No, thank you. I now open the floor to Committee members for comments and questions. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you very much. In this case the reinforced monitoring mechanism is proposed for Machu Picchu. Although there are severe threats to the site we would prefer the normal monitoring practices until or if Machu Picchu is inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thereby we have proposed an amendment in that direction. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you chair. The Brazilian Delegation would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its report and that of the Advisory Bodies. I would like to follow on with Sweden’s position. Before inscribing this property on the World Heritage List in Danger, barring any act of God, we feel that it is not the appropriate time to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. China you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Sir. China agrees with the comments made on the concerns indicated in the state of conservation report, and at the same time we welcome the progress that the State Party has made on reinforcing legal protection, implementing the Master Plan and various measures on the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We also notice the will of the Peruvian Government to request the application of the reinforced monitoring mechanism for international assistance.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse est prête à soutenir l’amendement de la Suède et les arguments de la Délégation du Brésil ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse, Mali vous avez la parole. »

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous avons écouté avec attention le brillant exposé des Organisations consultatives et du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Nous les remercions pour ce travail extrêmement intéressant. Par ailleurs nous sommes inquiets de l’état de dégradation du site, mais avant de proposer son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, il faudrait quand même écouter l’État partie par rapport à ce qui a été fait face à cette situation qui, quelque part, met en danger ou menace la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site. merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Le représentant de l’État partie est-il dans la salle ? Oui. Vous avez la parole ».

Peru :

“Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to state that the Draft Decision has not sufficiently reported on the progress made by the Peruvian State. For example, the Ministry of the Environment created a Commission specializing in environmental damage, and in March of this year a supreme decree established that there is an obligation to seek technical advice of a binding nature for these strategic outlines of the Peruvian government on protecting heritage. We feel that this does coincide with the severity of the climatic and environmental threats that we are facing. That's why we have the Master Plan and the Plan for public use. Moreover, we had the creation of a Technical Committee to study conflict issues in the Machu Picchu town centre.

These are matters of significant progress that have not been borne in mind in the Draft Decision, and we would like to underline the fact that the disaster that occurred and the torrential rains were very unusual in January and February of this year. They were unforeseeable events and the results have been exponentially high. But, as was mentioned by the secretariat, there were 4,000 people isolated there, and in just four days, thanks to the efforts of the government, most of the tourists and locals were airlifted out. All of this meant that the lives of 4,000 people were saved: This attests to the competence of the government when it comes to this type of situation and we should be grateful. If the Committee could bear this in mind and please understand that the government does as much as it can to ensure safety. Coming back to torrential rain, the property was not affected by the torrential rain, it

was one part of the access to the property where the railway is, but the property itself was not affected. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Iraq you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“We are on par with Sweden and Brazil not to consider the inscription of the site on the World Heritage in Danger List, due to the progress and efforts undertaken by the State Party, which were reinforced protection and management of the sanctuary.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Iraq. Egypt, you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Effectivement, l'Égypte soutient l'amendement présenté par la Suède, ainsi que les interventions de la Chine et du Brésil. Je voudrais aussi signaler le fait que l'augmentation du budget du mécanisme renforcé ne pourrait qu'être bénéfique pour le site de Machu Picchu ainsi que davantage d'expertises et de supervisions appuyées ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'Égypte. La parole est à la Jordanie ».

Jordan:

“Jordan would like to second what was just said by Egypt, China, Sweden and Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Jordanie. L'Australie vous avez la parole ».

Australia:

“Thank you, Chair. I would like to join Brazil, Iraq, Egypt and others for this property not be inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List, but also pick up the point, I think raised by Sweden, that the reinforced monitoring mechanism in that case is not necessary and we do congratulate, as others have, the State Party on progress and urge them to continue these efforts. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. I cannot see any further requests for the floor. The Advisory Bodies, would you like to comment? No, we will pass on to the submission of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.42 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 79 of the English and 83 of the French versions of document 7B.ad. I have received written amendments from three member States of the Committee (Brazil, Mexico and Sweden). Those amendments concern paragraph 5, 6 and 7.

Paragraphs 1 to 4 with all sub-paragraphs remain unchanged. In paragraph 5, Sweden, as it has stated, requests the deletion of the last part of the paragraph and requests the reapplication of the reinforced monitoring mechanism. Mexico proposes to reformulate the remaining part of the paragraph as follows:

5. Notes that unresolved issues as well as the new natural risk conditions constitute a danger to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and also notes that the State Party requests the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism;

This proposal includes the deletion of part of the initial paragraph.

In paragraph 6, Mexico suggests deleting the second half of the paragraph and replacing it by new wording. The revised paragraph would read:

6. Recommends that, given the major natural and structural threats facing the property, the State Party shall request international support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and evaluate the progress made in the process of updating the management plan, implementation of the risk plan and governance of the site.

Finally in paragraph 7, Brazil proposes to delete the last part of the paragraph after: *World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.42, are there any objections? I see none. They are adopted.

Moving on to paragraph 5, I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“In paragraph 5, including the deletion proposed by Mexico and Sweden and the new replacement text integrated by Mexico, the paragraph reads as follows:

5. Notes that unresolved issues as well as the new natural risk conditions constitute a danger to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and also notes that the State Party requests the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding the adoption of paragraph 5, are there any objections? Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“We made an amendment to this paragraph where we took out the *application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism* and this was also the content of our comment in this case, so we would like this to be deleted. I believe in the room we have many followers.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Your amendment has been taken to account. The request to apply reinforced monitoring mechanism has been deleted, but according to the suggestion of the Mexican Delegation, we note that the State Party requested to apply monitoring reinforced mechanism, we do not request to apply it. Thank you.”

Sweden:

“It is ok for Sweden. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraph 5? I see none. It is adopted.

Je donne la parole au rapporteur pour la relecture du paragraphe 6. »

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Chair. In paragraph 6, the last part has been proposed to be deleted by the Delegation of Mexico and replaced by an alternative text and it reads:

6. Recommends that, given the major natural and structural threats facing the property, the State Party shall request international support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and evaluate the progress made in the process of updating the management plan, implementation of the risk plan and governance of the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Regarding paragraph 6, are there any objections? Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much. I am not quite sure what it means: I wonder if we could clarify through the proposing Party what is the intent. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Chairman. We consider that the proposal that we are making is more appropriate if it calls on the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to carry out those actions. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, are you satisfied with the explanation given by Mexico? You have the floor.”

Australia:

“I am not objecting to it, but Australia would prefer the paragraph as it currently stands.”

The Chairperson:

“As it was before the amendment of Mexico? Yes, thank you. The State Party, would you like to have the floor for further comment?”

Peru:

“First of all, I would like to thank and go with the position of Sweden, Australia and many other countries who said regarding which direction we should follow in the Draft.”

The Chairperson:

“Advisory Bodies, do you have any further comments?”

IUCN:

“Chair, in relation to this paragraph, as proposed to be amended, what Australia is proposing to retain indicates what we already do, in the sense of providing support when State Parties request it, and I am sure that is the position of the Centre as well. We are not particularly clear, I think, among us, on what the request and intent of Mexico are, but we are clear on the intent of the paragraph and if the intervention of the State Party supports the position articulated by Australia, then perhaps there is a consensus on the original text.”

The Chairperson:

“Mexico, would you like to have the floor?”

Mexico :

“Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, and taking into account comments made by IUCN and the Australian Delegation, we will join the consensus that was formed. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to our rapporteur for reading the original paragraph 6.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We would then adapt paragraph 6 as it is included in your Draft Decision on page 79 of the English and 83 of the French versions of document 7B.ad.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 6, as originally proposed in the document? I see none, paragraph 6 is adopted.

Paragraph 7 remains as it is, apart from the deletion of the end. The sentence would stop after *2011*. Are there any objections regarding adoption of paragraph 7 as amended by Brazil? Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you. We would like to have the full paragraph 7 as it is. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse, vous avez la parole ».

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour la cohérence de toute la Décision, nous soutenons la proposition de la Suède d'aller avec le projet original de Décision. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Brazil, are you satisfied with the explanation given by State Parties and the Advisory Bodies and would you like to go without deleting the last sentence of paragraph 7?”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. Given the explanation and in order to reach a consensus, Brazil agrees.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I will give you the floor after the adoption of the Decision.”

Peru (interrupting The Chairperson):

“It is a point of order Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“You do not have the right to have a point of order. Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption as written originally in the document? I see none, it is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.42 is adopted, as amended, from paragraphs 1 to 7. Thank you very much.

State Party if you would like, the floor is yours.”

Peru:

“No thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We have two further reports that have not been discussed. The floor is to Mr. Bandarin.”

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you. The two reports not discussed are the **7B.39 Mont Perdu (France/Spain)** and **7B.40 Mount Athos (Greece)**, and like we did earlier these two Draft Decisions are therefore adopted.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup, y-a-t-il des objections concernant les deux rapports qui n'ont pas été examinés par le Comité ? Je n'en vois pas, ils sont adoptés, merci beaucoup.

NATURAL HERITAGE

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

We are going to examine the items regarding natural property and I have a request from Saint Lucia to be put forward, as the representative will have to leave soon. So, if the members have no objections, we start with the site in **Saint Lucia, the Pitons Management Area**, and after we proceed following the agenda as agreed with the Bureau. The floor is to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“*Merci Monsieur le Président.* This property was inscribed in 2003 under criteria (vii) for exceptional natural beauty and 8 for significant geomorphic features. What is at stake here is related to criteria (vii) of the beauty. A mission took place at the property at the end of March, during which time the property was extensively visited and discussions took place with a variety of stakeholders (land owners, resort developers and senior government representatives). I would like to take you on a brief flyover of the seaside portion of the property, so that you may familiarise yourself with the situation as seen by the mission’s participants.

On this slide, we are arriving at the property from the southeast. In the foreground Petit Piton is framed to the north by extensive private lands on which a small resort, *Stonefield Estate*, is located, along with a few dozen homes hidden underneath the forest canopy. This is also the location for the proposed *Malgré Tout Estate*, to which the government of Saint Lucia agreed to sell private land.

As we move further south and turn eastwards, we get a complete view of the land located between the two Pitons. Existing development is easily visible. Plenty of vacant lands remain for development. Some of these lands have already been divided into small lots and are available for sale. Looking north east, we see the *Jalousie Enclave* proposed development, having received approval in principle by the Cabinet. *Hotel Chocolat*, an upscale chocolatier based in the UK, is now contemplating the construction of a hotel here. The *Ladera Resort* has existed for many years. More development is planned in the *Sugar Beach Resort* close to the shoreline.

As evidenced by these pictures, the property is at a crossroads; any further development, if not strictly considered in light of the impacts on the property Outstanding Universal Value, will likely lead to the irreversible loss of the attributes under criteria (vii). Unfortunately, current planning policy guidelines, available to the planning and development approval body within the government of Saint Lucia, do not provide sufficient instructions in this regard. Until such tools exist to the satisfaction of the centre and IUCN, the concern is that the attributes of the property’s Outstanding Universal Values will be eroded to the point of irreversible loss.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received new information on this property. Discussions with representatives of the State Party yesterday and today revealed that the government of Saint Lucia placed a moratorium on activities in the property just last Wednesday, the 21st of July. It has also requested that necessary measures be taken with the objective of developing a planning instrument, specifically designed to protect attributes under criteria (vii). These contribute significantly to meeting the concerns raised by the Centre and IUCN. IUCN has further comments.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. IUCN welcomes the new information received from the State Party concerning the moratorium on the new and unapproved developments, which was legally adopted on 21 July 2010. In view of this moratorium, IUCN considers that the property should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, IUCN notes that impacts of inappropriate hotel and housing development within the property have already seriously affected the property’s Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (vii), and that World Heritage status appears to have contributed to increasingly damaging pressure on the property.

IUCN considers that the challenges faced by this property illustrate why effective protection management is an integral part of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and therefore should be of the utmost consideration of the World heritage Committee when taking the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you to the Centre and IUCN for a very detailed report and for compiling it at short notice. The mission occurred in March and we are here for the report in front of the Committee. This property is one that is special to us in the Caribbean and the pictures you see on the screen were taken during the rainy season and the resulting lushness shows the complexity sometimes present in maintaining natural landscapes.

The same water that inundated the land will be responsible for vegetation regeneration, which will enhance the beauty as it moves along. Therefore, if you capture this site in the dry season, you can have a very different and distinct picture than if you capture it just after a very rainy and lush season. However, we note that the State Party has been cooperating with the Centre on this particular property and we would like, therefore, through you Mr. Chair, to ask the State Party to provide us with that information and guidance on this report.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the State Party.”

Saint Lucia:

“Thank you for lending me an opportunity to speak to you. I wish to thank IUCN for their report, which has invoked an immediate reaction from my government. The situation, members of the Committee, Chair, is viewed with such seriousness by the government, that the report was received on 1 July this year and by 23 July a memo was tabled and approved by the Cabinet of Ministers for immediate directive action.

My presence here today as Minister of Physical Development and the Environment, among others, bears testimony and shows our commitment in ensuring that we play our part in the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Mr. Chairman,

members of the Committee, I say without fear of contradiction, unequivocally and for purposes of the record that we are neither an apathetic nor recalcitrant government. 68 percent of just over 2,000 hectares are privately owned; in any small country, a government would come under immense pressure from landowners.

We are indeed small, Mr. Chairman, and it is for this reason, that the government commissioned several studies at its own expense, making a great effort at finding the right balance between ensuring we will not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, whilst minimizing the economic strangulation of private citizens. Among the studies was the integrated development plan for the property, which resulted in the production of the Heider report. This report, which was adopted by the Cabinet of ministers and which guides us in dealing with applications for development, tells us what can be done, where it can be done and how it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is my government's desire to abide by any single condition under which the status was bestowed, so that our children, grandchildren and even great grandchildren will live in an era where they still enjoy the status. It is for this reason that, duly dispatched, we embarked upon corrective mechanisms and undertook to work with the World Heritage Centre and the IUCN in ensuring that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is preserved. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to Brazil."

Brazil :

"Thank you. The Brazilian Delegation would like to express its opinion. We feel that the explanations and the comments made by the Minister of the State Party are entirely satisfactory. I would also like to salute the cooperation between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre and also commend the cooperation between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that the Outstanding Universal value of the site has not been affected and in particular that the corrective measures are being taken in close collaboration with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Given these conditions, the Delegation of Brazil supports the Draft Decision presented by the Delegation of Barbados.

We would like to add that given the explanation provided by the State Party, we would suggest that paragraph 8 and part of the 9 of the Draft Decision of the original version be deleted. And we would like, Mr. Chairman, to hear the opinion of the World Heritage Centre on this. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Secretariat, would you like the floor?"

IUCN:

"With your permission we can address the question of Brazil. It refers, if I understand, to paragraph 8 of Barbados' amendment and it relates to developing corrective measures and the desired state of conservation for the removal of the List in Danger. Clearly there is some logic that if the deletion is made of the inscription of the List in Danger, then there is a

deletion of the following paragraph as it relates to the List in Danger. In terms of the organisation of this Decision, we would support the observation made by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any further requests for the floor? I see none. We are moving to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.37.REV and I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson; Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.37.REV has been distributed around the room, and compared to the initial Draft Decision, it contains the deletion of the last part of paragraph 3, paragraph 7 and now, following the suggestion of Brazil and the recommendation of the Advisory Bodies, paragraph 8 and the last segment of paragraph 9, as indicated in the Draft Decision on front of you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, are there any objections to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.37.REV, including paragraphs 1 to 8 after deletion of paragraph former 8 and former 9 becomes a new 8? I see none. It is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.37.REV has been adopted in its entirety.

I would like to adjourn today's session and we meet again tomorrow at 10am. The secretariat has no announcement to make. *Bonne nuit.*”

Conclusion of proceedings for the evening session of 29 July, 2010

Friday,30 July 2010
ELEVENTH SESSION
Morning session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

The Chairperson:

“Good morning to all, could you please take your seat so that we can start our work? I would like to congratulate our Vice-Chair for his work when covering in my absence during the sessions. I now give the floor to Mr. Rao and then we will start with the agenda.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Just a few points of information in relation to the works of the working groups and some side events. As in the previous days, the Working Group on the operational Guideline had already its meeting at 8:30am and we also had a meeting of the Working Group on Tourism.

Today from 1:15pm until 1:45pm, there will be a presentation on Training Opportunities in World Heritage at the IUCN meeting area, in the main reception lobby of the Royal Tulip Hotel. There will be a side event on earthen architecture from 1:30pm until 2:45pm in this very room, in the plenary meeting room.

The Budget Working Group will continue its work from 1pm until 2pm in room E which is opposite the Bureau room. The Working Group on the Future of the *Convention* will meet from 2pm until 3pm in the Bureau room. There is also a meeting of the Latin-American and Caribbean Group from 3pm until 4:30pm.

Mr. President, I would like to mention that it was discussed in the Bureau meeting this morning that we will have to have a night session from 7pm until 10pm. It will be a full night session. We will have the afternoon session from 3pm until 6pm, there will be a break of one hour from 6pm until 7pm, then the night session will go from 7pm until 10pm. Thank you Mr. President.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Rao. We have a demand from the representative of the Centre *Cruz de Malta* to make a brief presentation and after we will proceed with the natural property of the Everglades (USA), as the order has been changed upon request of the State Party. The floor is now to the representative of the Sovereign Order of Malta to make his presentation.”

Representative of the Sovereign Order of Malta:

“Thank you Mr. Chair for giving me the opportunity to address such a high level and qualified audience. It is a great privilege and pleasure for me to participate for the first time in this great meeting of the World Heritage Committee as a permanent observer of the Sovereign Order of Malta. As you know, the Order in its 900 years has marked its action with

impressive religious and military monuments. Therefore, our interest in a close collaboration with UNESCO in the protection of World Heritage is high and justified.

One important Branch of the Sovereign Orders of Malta's activities is the assistance given by Malteser International when natural disaster occurs all over the world. Just as a few recent examples, we may mention Haiti where, not only immediate first aid was given, but also reconstruction. The same happened in Chile and in L'Aquila, in Italy. Help was also sent to Indonesia, South Sudan, South India, Kenya, Sumatra, Vietnam, Pakistan and East Congo: This all happened during the last two years. In 2004-2005, Malteser International was able to provide great emergency relief when the Tsunami occurred in South Asia.

Also, in the fields of Education and Culture, UNESCO initiatives have been extremely relevant for Brazil, where, albeit having a large artistic heritage and cultural tradition, and with support by the contribution of several ethnic groups, there is still a long path to this patrimony to be accessible to all.

The conviction that we have to assume our responsibility, so that society has harmonious development has had a great influence on the activity carried out by our Sao Paulo and southern Brazil association of the Order of Malta. More so, at the onset of this action, we were fortunate to have the guidance of Professor Doutor, my father in law, and distinguished professor at the Sao Paulo University Medicine College. This Professor took a major part in the creation of EBEC UNESCO, the Brazilian Institute of Education Science and culture in Sao Paulo. It is worth mentioning that Doutor Jaime Calorcanti inception was in the office of the Department of Biological Chemistry chaired by him.

I would like to inform you on this occasion, Mr. Chairperson and all distinguished delegates, that the Order of Malta is preparing an important international conference on humanitarian diplomacy facing new crisis, scheduled to take place at UNESCO in Paris on 27-28 January 2011. We believe, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre, that significant components of the conference will be devoted to the protection of cultural heritage in conflict and post-conflict situations, obviously taking into due account the 1954 Hague Convention. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

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

NATURAL HERITAGE

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is now to Mr. Rao, who will introduce the next item, **Everglades National Park (United States of America)**."

Mr. Rao:

"Thank you Mr. President. This property is being reported upon because of the proposal to inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee will recall that the property was previously added to the List of World heritage in Danger in 1993 due to the reduced fresh water flow as the result of five decades of water diversion projects in Florida (USA). However, in 2007, the Committee decided to remove it from the in Danger List, acknowledging the effort made by the State Party to restore the Park's ecosystem.

Yet, 8 of the 9 corrective measures have not been completed and the desired restoration goals for increased water flow and improved water quality have not been realized. Consequently, threats to the value and integrity of the property continue to be a serious concern. Therefore the State Party has requested the World Heritage Committee to consider putting the property back on the in Danger List.

The State Party has also requested, a joint IUCN, UNESCO mission to visit the property in 2010 to review its state of conservation and help develop a desired state of conservation with specific indicators to measure the progress of the implementation of the corrective measures.

We have also received new information from the State Party with regard to the oil spill which took place in the State of Mexico. The State Party informed on 12 July that there has been no direct impact on World Heritage sites in the region and that they are closely monitoring the spill. Mr. Chair, I think the committee should compliment the State Party for using the mechanism of the in Danger listing in the spirit that it was intended under the *Convention* and the Operational Guidelines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mr. Rao. I give the floor to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. IUCN also considers that the Everglades National Park meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World heritage in Danger and we concur with the State Party analysis presented in its state of conservation report. Threats to this property continue to be serious. We recall our view expressed at the 30th session in 2007 that the property remains in certain danger of losing the value for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List and we endorse the comment of the centre on the re-inscription of the property.

This is a good example of using the List in Danger in the positive way intended in the *Convention*. We would also like to recall that the last session of the Committee approved a compendium of the past decisions on the in Danger List, which was circulated yesterday, which also drew the conclusion that a positive use of the in Danger List is something that we should be encouraging more and more.

We would also just like to note that the proposal of the State Party proposing the feasibility of an additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail in order to restore historical water flows and pathways within this property is welcomed and that this would be a critical step towards restoring the wetland ecosystem function of the Everglades. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to give the floor to the State Party to comment.”

USA:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to discuss the state of conservation of the Everglades Park. The United States is fully committed to the protection of this World heritage site. The US Federal and Florida State governments have dedicated

immense financial and other resources to what is now the world's largest environmental restoration project.

Significant achievements have already occurred in this restoration effort, including the acquisition of thousands of hectares of crippled agricultural land in the watershed; construction of sea beach management features; ongoing work to restore water flow under Tamiami Trail highway and others. However, despite this effort, it is clear to us that the Park and the wider ecosystem continue to face significant threats. Threats which if not addressed, and soon, and with sufficient effort, will likely result in the irreversible loss of some of the values to which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Therefore, the United States respectfully requests that the Committee re-lists the property on the in Danger List at this session. As part of this re-inscription on the in Danger List, we believe it is critical that a desired state of conservation along with appropriate indicators be developed, as soon as possible, in order for the Committee to better assess the effort made towards restoration in a manner that is grounded in scientific information. For this reason the United States is also inviting the World heritage Centre-IUCN mission to visit the Everglades National Park and the Greater Everglades this fall to assist the National Park service and others to develop this desired state of conservation framework for review by the Committee at the next year's session.

As a general point, we also hope that this action will make the case that the in Danger List is not a sanction against the Party, but rather should be viewed as it was originally intended, as a tool to draw international attention to threats facing sites of global significance and to galvanise worldwide support for the protection of these sites for the benefit of humanity. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now open the floor for comments from the Delegations. I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse félicite l'État Partie des États-Unis pour sa sagesse et son utilisation exemplaire de l'instrument de la Liste des biens en péril. Nous ne pouvons que soutenir l'argumentaire qui définit la Liste en péril comme un mécanisme d'aide et surtout pas une punition. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

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

Nigeria:

“Thank you Chair. We would like to echo the position taken by the last speaker and wish to congratulate the State Party of the United States of America for the position they have taken in accepting the decision of the Advisory Bodies and of the World Heritage Centre to inscribe this important Park on the World heritage List in Danger. I call on the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to extend their assistance and support to get this site in a state of conservation which is acceptable to the Centre.”

The Chairperson:

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

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. I would like to echo the words of the delegates who have spoken before me, and I would like to congratulate the State party of the United States, which, in a very wise and constructive manner, requests the cooperation, support and assistance of the World Heritage Centre, as well as of the Advisory Bodies to help them in the conservation of the National Park of Everglades.

I also believe and I share the opinion expressed by the former delegate that the placement on the in Danger List is neither a punishment, nor a sanction and often rather assists the State Party. The Brazilian Delegation would like to congratulate the State Party for its decision. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the Delegate of Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to congratulate the United States for their hard work in that beautiful piece of land and I endorse fully what has been said by my great friends from Brazil and Switzerland.”

The Chairperson:

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

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je joins ma voix à ceux qui m'ont précédé, tout d'abord pour magnifier le courage et le volontarisme de l'État partie à accepter de mettre son site dans la Liste en péril. C'est l'une des toutes premières fois dans l'histoire de la conservation d'un site que j'admire un pays qui accepte volontairement de le faire. Par rapport au processus de sortie, je joins ma voix à celle de l'honorable représentant du Brésil, pour dire que ce travail doit être fait de concert avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Jordan.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. Jordan would like to congratulate the delegate of the United States for its constructive position.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Cambodia.”

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Délégation cambodgienne vient se joindre aux voix précédentes, à savoir la Suisse et le Brésil, pour soutenir également et féliciter les États-Unis de leur décision. En effet, Monsieur le Président, le fait de mettre en péril un bien n'est pas une punition, au contraire c'est un grand appel à la communauté internationale et en même temps une prise de conscience que le bien peut être aidé.

Pour illustrer mon propos, je prendrai l'exemple du Cambodge où il y a le même élément qui s'est passé depuis une dizaine d'années ce qui a conduit au succès que l'on connaît pour le bien ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would anyone else like to take the floor? I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.29 is on page 82 of the English and page 87 of the French versions of document 7B. I have not received any written amendments to the Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“I am asking the Committee, if you agree with the Draft Decision? The Decision **34 COM 7B.29** is approved.

ASIA-PACIFIC

The next item is the **Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia)**. I give the floor to Mr Rao for the presentation.”

Mr Rao:

“Thank you chair. This property, the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) is also being reported upon at the Committee, because it is also proposed to be put on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee may recall that the recommendation for in Danger listing has been made by IUCN not only at the time of

inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 2004, but also repeatedly in 2006, 2007 and 2009.

The Secretariat and IUCN are of the view that the conditions to inscribe the property on the in Danger List are clearly met in terms of paragraph 182 of the Operational Guidelines, as it continues to face several clearly established, ascertained and potential dangers. Although the State Party has taken and continues to take steps to deal with the various management challenges of this property, it is evident from the specific examples given in paragraph b, c and d of the state of conservation report, that illegal road construction, encroachment and poaching activities are still continuing.

IUCN and the Secretariat feel that in Danger listing of the property will help to strengthen international cooperation efforts and promote rapid conservation actions to safeguard the threatened property. We have also received new information from the State Party on 23 July in which they outline the various measures that they are taking to safeguard the property and they do not agree with the proposal for in Danger listing. IUCN has also a comment to make. Thank you President.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. IUCN endorses the comments made by the World Heritage Centre. We know that there was a consensus shared at the last committee meeting that, from a technical point of view, the criteria for the property being inscribed on the World heritage in Danger List are met, but we understand the State Party has continuing concerns regarding this proposal.

We reiterate that one of the key conclusions of the analysis approved by the Committee at its last session, regarding the use of the in Danger List, was, that greater efforts were needed to communicate the positive nature that is intended by the list of the World Heritage in Danger as a means of signalling the need for support for a property and motivating action. We also note the willingness of IUCN to work with the State Party on the conservation measures that are required in relation to continuing challenges and we value the exchange that has been possible with the State Party during the present meeting.

We noted the potential for greater access to conservation finance through growing international measures for forest conservation as one potential opportunity to strengthen conservation measures. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“I open the floor to the Committee members who would like to take it. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I wonder if through you we could give the floor to the State Party? I would particularly ask of them two questions. Firstly, we have heard from the Centre and IUCN about the challenges and problems the property has faced in terms of illegal logging, encroachment and poaching, but we have also heard that the State Party has

undertaken measures. The question is if the measures, in the view of the State Party, have actually stopped these threats at the moment.

The second question, through you Mr. Chairman, is in relation to the use of the in Danger List. We just had, I think, a fulsome support given to the United States in relation to the Everglades for its volunteering of the Everglades being inscribed on the in Danger List and I wonder if we could hear form the State Party in relation to its attitude on that matter. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the State Party, Indonesia, to clarify these points.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you Chair. The government of Indonesia is of the view that inclusion of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra into the in Danger List is a drastic response to the current productive national programme and international cooperation. Therefore, Indonesia requests the Committee not to inscribe it into the in Danger List.

Following the decisions of the last session of the committee, the government of Indonesia has implemented numerous and concrete measures as well as integrated policies in order to protect the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra against activities such as illegal logging, poaching, road construction and encroachment. At the national level the policies and actions have been implemented, for example the government has committed itself to reduce emissions by 26 percent as part of the REDD+ measures.

On 23 May 2010, the Coordination Minister of Social Welfare instructed all the governments and regions in the island of Sumatra to immediately cope with encroachment in this property, halting all road construction by issuing the Ministry of Forestry a letter on 1 February 2010. The National Committee has conducted a full-scale operation from May until June 2010 which integrated law enforcement and intelligent activities for combating illegal logging. This operation arrested 47 suspects. For concerned Ministries related to the Forest preservation a Road Map was issued concerning the Sumatra ecosystem called Sumatra Vision 2020 on 11 May 2010.

Last but not least, the President of Indonesia has declared a deforestation moratorium on 1 May 2010. On the ground the government has implemented a monitoring system for the protected areas including the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra through remote sensing and activities involving all stakeholders including the civil society. We got help from the UNESCO Office in Jakarta.

Indeed, Indonesia still faces challenges and technical difficulties such as remote sensing tools, rapid response forces on encroachment as well as the settlement of illegal settlers. In this regard, we work in cooperation with the international community through regional and bilateral cooperation to cope with this issue. Indonesia expresses its will, with the assistance of the UNESCO World heritage Centre and IUCN, to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We actually wanted to call on the State party to provide additional information in terms of what efforts they have been putting for the protection of the site. The delegate of Australia has graciously asked them this question already. As the information was provided by the State Party perhaps it would be encouraging if the in Danger listing is deferred until next year, and in case the provided information is not adequate then we can start the in Danger listing. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

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

Iraq:

“Thank you. I commend the State Party’s efforts and endorse the statement of the distinguished representative of Australia. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, dans le cas de l’Indonésie nous faisons face à un problème extrêmement délicat, car nous avons là à faire face à la préservation d’un patrimoine naturel et il y a aussi un problème de développement en jeu. Dans ce cadre, nous devons donc maintenir un certain équilibre entre le désir des populations de se développer, mais aussi le devoir de conserver ce patrimoine naturel pour les générations futures.

Je voudrais savoir au sujet des routes qui ont été construites à l’intérieur du Parc et qui entachent la valeur exceptionnelle du site. Quelles sont les mesures prises par l’État partie pour mieux contrôler ces routes et pour qu’il n’y ait pas d’impact visuel et d’impacts négatifs tout court sur le site. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to UICN and after if the State Party wishes to make a statement, I will give him the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. The short way to answer this is to refer to the conservation report which details the road construction that has previously occurred. One example reports some super large roads crossing and you will find all in-depth information in the state of conservation report. The answer is that it is not a future threat but a present threat. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Indonesia for additional information.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Regarding road construction, this has been halted. We have stopped any proposal of road construction in the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra Park. There will be no more threats from road construction. We have stopped them. This is a national policy to stop road construction and proposed ones in this property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. I would like, first of all, to commend the report that we received, as always it is a very complete and detailed report. The Brazilian Delegation heard about the effort that is being carried out by the State Party and also with the same attention the Brazilian Delegation heard Nigeria’s suggestion, in this sense taking into account the State Party’s efforts. This could be the case for us giving them a bit more time to implement, improve and adopt further measures besides those that were exposed here. Perhaps, the decision of listing the property into the in Danger List could be taken at the next session.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Thailand.”

Thailand:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. After learning the explanation of the State Party on what has been done to maintain the integrity of the site, Thailand is of the view that the State Party should be given more chances and thinks that the site should not be inscribed into the List in Danger this year. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Thailand. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, une fois de plus Monsieur le Président nous sommes dans une situation très délicate. Il faut reconnaître qu’il y a des menaces qui pèsent sur le site et dans ce cadre-là, nous serions contraints d’imposer à l’État partie un certain nombre de mesures correctives. Donc, au lieu de proposer une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, je joins ma voix à celle du Brésil, pour proposer cette fois-ci un suivi renforcé à l’État partie afin de mieux corriger et d’apporter des mesures correctives ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. It is quite an interesting discussion reflecting on this and the one we had on the Everglades. Clearly, there are real threats on this property, but also clearly, the State Party has taken a number of very significant measures. One of the challenges we have is to precisely assess the effects of these measures. In this respect, we have introduced some amendments to the Draft Decision and one of the paragraphs calls the State Party to the extent possible use of satellite imaging and to provide the Committee with clear evidence to demonstrate that the measure underway has taken effect. But, given that the State Party has outlined a series of effective measures and that the State Party is opposed to an in Danger listing, this has been a difficult decision for us, but we should strike a balance where the decision should take the form of what it did last year, which is to postpone, but with a view of in Danger listing next year unless we have clear evidence of the effective measures and the very considerable reduction in threats. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Délégation française voudrait faire écho aux propos tenus pas les Délégations du Mali et Brésil. Nous sommes très sensibles à la complexité de ce dossier et aux efforts et informations indiqués par l'État partie. Nous estimons qu'il faut donner un petit peu de temps et entendre la demande de l'État partie pour que ce bien ne soit pas inscrit d'ores et déjà sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Jordan.”

Jordan:

“Thank you Chair. Jordan would also like to propose the postponement of the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, c'est tout simplement pour soutenir ce qui est proposé de la part de pays comme la France ou la Jordanie. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of China.”

China:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. After listening to the explanation of the representative of Indonesia, we think that we should allow more time to the State Party to improve the property. More importantly we think that the situation stated in the state of conservation is not sufficient. A special professional team should be sent and provided to the State Party to help them as to how they may improve their conservation situation. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. Cambodia you have the floor.”

Cambodge :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le Cambodge remercie le Secrétariat et les Organisations consultatives pour l'excellent dossier présenté. Le Cambodge soutient la position du Brésil, de la France et de la Chine, à savoir de donner un délai supplémentaire avant l'inscription de ce bien en tant que patrimoine en péril. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Mr. Rao.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Mr. President. I would like to respond to comments made by Mali and China. Mali has proposed that we use the reinforced monitoring mechanism, and the distinguished delegate of China has proposed that we field a technical expert mission to the site. I would just like to clarify that in the case of reinforced monitoring mechanism, the Committee had very clearly decided last year, that the mechanism should be used only for sites which are on the in Danger List and that it should not be seen as a substitute for in Danger listing mechanisms.

In relation to monitoring the site, I would like to clarify that the site has had many missions since its inscription in 2004. There was a joint IUCN-UNESCO mission in 2006, another in 2007, a third one in 2009 and in the Draft Decision you will read that we are requesting an additional one in 2011, prior to the 2012 Committee Session. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would anyone else like to take the floor? No, then the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.14 is on page 54 of the English version and 57 of the French version of document 7B. I have received written amendments by the Delegation of Australia affecting paragraphs 5, 7, 11 and 12, and I would like to introduce those to you.

The Delegation of Australia suggests deleting paragraph 5 in its entirety. Former paragraph 6 would then become 5, apart from the number change, it remains unchanged. Former paragraph 7, which would become new paragraph 6, is shortened according to the Australian proposal by deleting a part in the middle of the paragraph. It would afterwards read:

6. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

Former paragraph 8 would remain unchanged and just renumbered as former paragraph 7, the same for paragraph 9 which would become 8 and for the former 10 which would be renumbered 9.

Former paragraphs 11 and 12 would be deleted following the Australian proposal and would be replaced by two new paragraphs. The paragraph replacing paragraph 11, would be then 10 and would read as follows:

10. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report, including periodic satellite imagery over the period 2006-2010, which demonstrates that concerns raised in previous monitoring missions such as illegal logging, agricultural encroachment, mining and illegal road construction, have ceased impacting the World Heritage Value of the property.

And the new paragraph 11 replacing former paragraph 12, would read:

11. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2011 to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations of the 2009 mission and the progression of the threats, notably the logging and illegal activities including poaching, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, with a view, in the absence of substantial progress, to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Would anyone like to make a comment? No; then do you approve the Draft Decision including the amendments proposed by Australia? Yes; the Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.14** is approved.

Before continuing, I would like to invite you to an event at 2:50pm right before the beginning of the afternoon session in the main room. Together with the Ambassador of

Benin, I will sign a bilateral protocol between Brazil and Benin in the heritage area. The initiative is a conclusion to our commitment in the heritage cooperation area, and especially with promoting the heritage of the African continent.

I would now like to invite Mr. Guy Debonnet to present the State of conservation report of the African region.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. President. The first property we are going to discuss is the **Dja Wildlife reserve (Cameroon)**. A World heritage Centre-IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited this property from 28 November until 5 December 2009. The mission observed serious threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for several reasons:

1) Due to the imminent start of cobalt mining in the immediate vicinity of the property without any consideration on the immediate impact on its Outstanding Universal Value. The map on the slide shows the location of the mining area in red, close to the property.

2) An important increase in poaching, including almost all wildlife species (elephants, primates but also small ungulates).

3) The encroachment of the Reserve by forest exploitation and agriculture.

Finally, deficiencies in the management of the property: With ineffective patrolling and law enforcement; lack of participation of local communities in the management and the poor implementation of the Management Plan.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and in particular its biodiversity has been seriously eroded, with important decreases of wildlife since its inscription on the World Heritage List. Moreover, the launching of the cobalt mining project in the periphery constitutes an important threat to its integrity. However, the tendency of degradation of the Outstanding Universal Value could still be reversed, if the environmental and social impact study is reviewed to mitigate direct and indirect negative impacts of the mining project, and even emergency plans to strengthen its management developed and implemented in the short term.

The World heritage Centre and IUCN consider that if these measures are not taken quickly, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would have to be considered in the near future. The World Heritage Centre also notes the letter that was received on 30 July addressed by the Minister for the Environment of Cameroon to the director general of UNESCO and providing some information on the additional biodiversity components for the impact assessments and on efforts to strengthen the management.

However, this information was already made available to the mission and considered in the mission report. We were also informed yesterday by the Delegation of Cameroon, that the Minister for Environment on 14 July created a new framework for coordination of interventions in the periphery of the property, in particular mining, agriculture and forestry with representatives of the respective ministries, IUCN, the site management and the Mining Company. Mr. President IUCN has a comment to make.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. IUCN is concerned that the property currently faces a number of threats from poaching, encroachment and the need for strengthened management. It is also threatened by future impacts of cobalt mining on its periphery. IUCN emphasises that the

property is likely to meet the criteria for the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future, if no urgent action is taken to revise the social management study, including effective measures to minimise the impact of mining and if an emergency action plan to strengthen management is not rapidly developed and implemented. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now open the floor for comments. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense que la situation de la Réserve du Dja est assez similaire à celle que nous venons de vivre en Indonésie. Il s'agit d'un problème de développement à côté d'un site inscrit au patrimoine mondial. Je me réfère à ce qu'a dit le représentant de l'UICN, si dans un avenir proche aucune mesure n'est prise, la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien sera entachée et dans un proche avenir il sera souhaitable d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Maintenant, par rapport aux mesures proposées ou envisagées par l'Organe consultatif, je souhaiterais entendre la voix de l'État partie en ce qui concerne l'élaboration d'une étude d'impact environnemental, mais aussi d'une stratégie ou alors d'un plan d'urgence qui a été proposé ou n'importe quelles mesures pour aider le site à sortir de cette situation de menace. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Cameroon, the State Party of the property at hand.”

Cameroon:

« Merci de l'opportunité que vous m'offrez pour clarifier certains points importants. Le Cameroun est essentiellement interpellé sur deux points. Tout d'abord le projet d'exploitation minière qui n'a pas encore commencé. En effet, l'étude d'impact environnemental et social de 2007 proposée par la société GEOVIC et élaborée avec l'implication de la population locale a été soumise par validation au gouvernement camerounais. Après examen de cette première étude, le gouvernement camerounais ne l'a pas validée en raison d'insuffisances constatées dans la composante biodiversité contrairement aux premières recommandations du patrimoine mondial. Cette première étude incluant le plan biodiversité sera à nouveau soumise au mois d'août 2010, une copie sera transmise à l'UICN et au Comité du patrimoine mondial pour commentaire et avis.

C'est l'occasion pour le Cameroun d'attirer l'attention du Comité du patrimoine mondial sur les difficultés financières à mener le cas échéant une nouvelle étude complémentaire à l'étude sur l'impact environnemental et social. Depuis le 14 juillet 2010, le Comité de concertation interministériel a été créé pour une nouvelle synergie et cohérence des interventions sur le site.

En ce qui concerne le plan de gestion de réserve du Dja, il est à souligner que le plan de gestion de la réserve de faune existe depuis 2007, et a été rendu exécutoire en 2009. Ce plan a bénéficié d'un financement de près de 2 milliards de francs CFA pour trois ans. Un financement conjoint Programme Ecofar et budget de l'État. Par ailleurs, la réserve de faune du Dja va bénéficier de plus de financement au cours de l'exercice budgétaire 2011, de

manière à atteindre une autonomie financière, conformément aux recommandations du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

Cette année les activités suivantes ont été déterminantes :

-Recrutement d'un cabinet d'avocats indépendants qui cette année a réussi en moins de six mois à étudier 17 contentieux dont plusieurs condamnations allant de six mois à trois ans ferme ;

-Un total de 82 millions de francs CFA a été affecté à la lutte antibraconnage ;

-Le suivi écologique qui nous a permis d'intensifier les recherches sur les densités d'espèces de valeur est en évolution sensible.

Ainsi, on a constaté 2,08 individus au kilomètre carré pour les gorilles, 0,67 pour les chimpanzés, 6 individus pour les éléphants et 3,6 pour les céphalophes. Ce rapport sera transmis à l'UICN après finalisation, je vous remercie de votre attention ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Thank you. We would like to align ourselves with the sentiment expressed by Mali, and in addition to the presentation that has been made by the State Party who would also like to call upon the international community to assist the State Party in addressing their many challenges. Finally, we have made some amendments to the Draft Decision in this regard. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We have judiciously studied the content of the report and we would like to congratulate the Advisory Bodies on the informative nature of the reports. They have proved very instrumental in providing guidance to the relevant countries and we have with equal attention heard the remarks made by the State Party.

We are more incline to support the proposal made by Mali and South Africa in that we could perhaps revisit and postpone the Draft Decision to give the State Party enough time to put in place and duly implement the measures in greater time. We, above all, regret the lack of financial resources and of funding which could prove a determining factor in the efforts to preserve and reclaim the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Nigeria has the floor.”

Nigeria:

“We notice the serious threats that this property faces, and the likelihood of being inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List in a near future, given its state of conservation and threats to the Outstanding Universal Value. We also noticed that a joint mission between the World Heritage Centre and IUCN has been proposed by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for the State Party.

Given the explanation that has been provided by the State Party, we would like to join the other speakers (South Africa, Mali, Brazil) in congratulating the State Party for the efforts they have been making to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to call on the international community to support this effort and support the position and recommendations proposed by South Africa on the Draft Decision. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to take the floor? No, then I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.1 is on page 16 of the English version and on page 15 of document 7B. I have received one written amendment by the Delegation of South Africa, which proposes the introduction of a new paragraph between current paragraphs 5 and 6, which would then be a new paragraph 5bis, which would read:

Calls upon the international community to assist the State Party with the review of the Environmental and Social Impact Study.

The Delegation of South Africa further suggests deleting the first word of paragraph 6 *strongly*, so that the paragraph starts with *Urges the State Party to suspend the implantation work*. The remaining paragraphs 1 to 5 and 7, including all sub-paragraphs remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am asking the floor if anyone has any comments. Regarding approval of the Draft Decision, does the Committee agree with it including the amendments proposed by South Africa? The Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.1** is then approved.

I would like to invite Mr. Guy Debonnet to make a presentation of the next item, the **Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar)**.”

The Secretariat:

“The Committee may recall that at the last session, an important increase of illegal logging was reported in two components of the serial property Masoala and Marojejy National Parks, following the political crisis in the country, as described in detail in the working document. All information received indicates that illegal logging is still ongoing and has taken catastrophic proportions, in particular in Masoala.

The pictures on the slide show illegally logged rosewood in Masoala. A new report has just been received which was issued in March by the NGOs Madagascar Wildlife Conservation and the Jingulu Institute showing that in 2009, 52,000 tons of rosewood and ebony were logged, representing between 75,000 and 100,000 fallen trees. More than half of this volume is originated from the two areas that are part of the World Heritage property.

In addition, an estimated 500,000 trees have been cut from other species to be used to float the rosewood and ebony down the rivers, as these species have too high a density to float and therefore it is necessary to make makeshift rafts from other, lighter wood species.

Also, according to the report, 36,700 tons of rosewood were exported in 2009, representing a commercial value of US\$220 millions. The report notes that almost all benefits are going to the traders and almost nothing to the people cutting and extracting the logs from the forest.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN notes that the secondary effects of illegal logging are documented to be far more serious than the direct effects of stem reductions and habitat disturbance. Cumulatively, these effects are likely to cause serious long-term and sometimes irreversible ecological damage. Therefore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the current situation could lead to a loss of the Outstanding Universal Value for which the site was inscribed.

It is further noticed that in spite of a recent decree barring all export and exploitation of rosewood and ebony, this has not yet slowed down illegal logging. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN receive credible reports which indicate export permits continue to be granted contrary to the decree. Therefore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider this is a clear case of ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that the property meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN also has a comment.”

IUCN:

“IUCN is also greatly concerned about the illegal logging of precious woods associated with lemur poaching, the developing bush meat trade affecting the Masoala and Marojejy components of this serial property. IUCN recommends inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and considers that this inscription will act as a positive tool to foster international cooperation to address the severe threats affecting this property.

IUCN wishes to draw the Committee's attention to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision which requests all State Parties to the *Convention* to take action to ensure all illegally logged woods from Madagascar do not enter their national markets. IUCN emphasises this action is part of the critical response to address illegal logging within the property.

We recall that the published reports regarding this trade relate to the report by Global Witness and the EIA report, which was commissioned by Madagascar National Parks. It documented that 7,000 tons of rosewood worth Euros 67 millions left the port of Vohemar, exclusively bound for China. The recently received report from the NGO NWC, published in the journal *Madagascar Conservation and Development*, indicates that 95 percent of illegally felled rosewood in 2009 and 2010 was exported to China with the remaining 5 percent to Germany. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now opened to members of the Committee, Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous nous trouvons ici malheureusement en face de très graves atteintes au bien qui mettent substantiellement en danger la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle et sans perspective positive de réduction de l'abattage interdit de bois précieux et de la réduction massive d'espèces menacées, ce sont ces deux valeurs qui contribuent essentiellement à la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle selon les critères (ix) et (x).

C'est à notre avis un cas d'urgence de mettre ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril afin d'aider dans cette situation très en péril où même le gouvernement de l'État partie de Madagascar continue d'accorder des autorisations d'exploitation illégale de bois abattu. La mise sur la liste ouvrira des perspectives d'action au niveau international aussi sur le marché du bois. Nous soutenons entièrement le projet de décision dans sa présentation. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chair. Sweden is very concerned about the apparent threat to this important property. We look at this as a clear case for in Danger Listing and support the Draft Decision including the proposal of a reactive monitoring mission that should take place as soon as possible. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to South Africa.”

South Africa:

“South Africa does not believe that placing the property on the in Danger list is the proper way of dealing with the challenge faced by Madagascar. Our view of the solution lies with an urgent meeting with the affected State Parties facilitated by the World Heritage Centre to agree on a proper Plan of Action regarding the implementation of the decisions of the 33rd session. This could entail exploring further to make use of the site Convention listing option for rosewood, as well as scaling up enforcement efforts, and we have submitted proposed amendments to this effect.

We also agree with the recommendations that the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO should further recommend an urgent monitoring mission to the property to develop the corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation and to raise awareness of the authorities on their obligations within the framework of the *Convention*. On this note Mr. Chair, we would like to request the State Party to make further inputs in terms of the effort they have undertaken to address the issue. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the State Party, Madagascar, to reply to the observations made.”

Madagascar:

« Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. Les mesures ci-après ont été prises par les autorités de Madagascar : un décret publié en mars 2010 interdisant l'exploitation et l'exportation de bois de rose et d'ébène et aussi la création d'une *task force* qui a pour mission d'empêcher l'abattage de bois. Cette *task force* est composée d'agents de service des forêts et des éléments de la police et de l'armée. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madagascar, I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil :

“Thank you very much Mr Chairman. The Brazilian Delegation sees with great concern the situation at hand, which can only be described as very complex in nature. And we would like to receive from the State Party some clarifications regarding the measures that have been put in place in order to reduce illegal logging of precious wood and the consequent export of such wood. We would also like to know up to which extent illegal logging has affected the property and what corrective actions, if any, have been put in place by the State Party with regard to this serious and emergent threat.

One should also keep in mind that Madagascar has undergone a serious political crisis in the recent past of which we are too aware and that too should be taken into account given the huge difficulties the country has faced. It is also my view that, taking into account the comments made by my colleague from South Africa, the various collaborations from the Advisory Bodies and the Centre have always proved very important and instrumental in developing a Plan of Action reflecting the circumstances and the much needed solidarity and donation assistance. Such a Plan of Action is required.

We also agree with the proposal of a monitoring mission which would certainly prove extremely useful. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, can I request that the State Party provides more information on the steps put in place in order to reduce the case of illegal logging? Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. The State Party representative has now the floor for clarifications as requested.”

Madagascar:

« Monsieur le Président. Comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure une *task force* a été créée pour empêcher l'abattage de bois. Comme l'a dit le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN, l'abattage et l'exportation de bois précieux ne sont pas encore arrêtés. Cela dit pour l'information des membres du Comité, il n'y a pas eu encore d'évaluation véritable de ce site, donc je pense que ce serait une bonne chose d'en effectuer une ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you very much Chair. We have listened attentively to the information provided by the State Party. We appreciate the efforts so far adopted by the government of Madagascar. The Task force is a serious development and I also noticed that no serious assessment of the illegal trade or logging has been done. I, by then, share with previous speakers that international support and cooperation is badly needed in this aspect. I also support the proposal made by South Africa. We should give more time and enough technical support to the State Party so that they can organise an efficient mechanism to give full evaluation and assessment.

I would also like to point out that illegal trade does exist not only in Madagascar but in other parts of the World as well. It does not only relate to logging but also in other areas as well. China, like all other governments of the member States is strongly against any illegal trade in any part of the world in any field of economic area. China will join the international effort to deal with this problem. If needed, China is ready to cooperate with the State Party to overcome these difficulties. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next speaker is Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. We have listened carefully to the information provided by the State Party and we certainly welcome the information they have engaged. Clearly, we understand that task forces are important but they are not the total solution and in our view this may be the case when in Danger listing may greatly help with the problem and the case.

That may be less the case inside the country itself. We all recognise the very difficult situation in the country and sympathise with the situation. In Danger listing may help in relation to this issue of export of logs to other countries, it does help identify to the international community that this source of logs should be unacceptable in trade, as our colleague from China so eloquently outlined. Mr Chairman, in our view, we would support the Decision as it is currently drafted.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Ethiopia you have the floor.”

Ethiopia :

“Thank you. Other delegates think that putting the property in the in Danger list will likely solve the problem, but only efficient management could solve the problem, although we agree with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN that this property is facing immense danger

as far as its Outstanding Universal Value is concerned. We are of the view that it is necessary to carry out real evaluation of the property before making any decision as to the inscription on the in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

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

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Nigeria is very appreciative of the grave situation this property is in. We share the view of South Africa that inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger will not solve the problem for two important reasons: The general awareness of heritage preservation in the country and the political situation there, which is also very serious. We will support the position taken by South Africa, that international support group is raised for this property. This is also in view of what China and other countries have already pledged. I would like to support the position of South Africa, that this site should not be inscribed in the in Danger List just yet, until after these efforts are exhausted. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

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

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Après avoir écouté les différents rapports et les explications de l'État partie, et au vu des difficultés de la mise en œuvre de certaines dispositions par l'État partie, je m'appuie sur ces informations et je remercie les éminents collègues de la Suède et de l'Australie. Toutefois, le Cambodge recommande qu'il y ait une évaluation d'une mission internationale avant de prendre toute décision. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie au passage l'État partie pour les nombreux efforts consentis, car on nous a parlé de mesures constitutionnelles comme des décrets, mais aussi de la mise en place d'une *task force* pour combattre l'abattage. Je voudrais approcher un sujet sensible. Nous sommes sur un site classé naturel où vivent également des populations locales. C'est aussi un site de la *Convention*. Qu'allons-nous faire de l'avenir de ces populations locales qui vivent d'un patrimoine ? Du point de vue culturel et économique ils vivent de ce patrimoine naturel. Le patrimoine ici est aussi une valeur économique pour ces populations, donc qu'allons-nous faire des ces populations.

J'aimerais ainsi, dans ce sens, appuyer la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud qui consiste à organiser une réunion de haut niveau pour voir dans quelle mesure les recettes de l'exploitation de ce bien pourraient en quelque sorte aussi bénéficier à la population

locale. Dans l'exposé qui nous a été donné, les bénéfices ne profitent qu'à d'autres partenaires, des partenaires étrangers.

En ce qui concerne l'inscription au patrimoine mondial en péril, Monsieur le Président, je reviens à la situation politique que connaît Madagascar depuis un certain temps. Cette situation est instable et je pense que nous devons donner la chance à ce pays de vivre d'abord une période politique stable, ce qui permettrait au pays d'apporter des mesures et ainsi de lui éviter l'inscription au patrimoine mondial en péril. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I am actually very pleased with the efforts of the State Party and I fully endorse China, South Africa and other distinguished colleagues not to put the property on the in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Egypt you have the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. À mon avis c'est un site qui présente vraiment des questions de fond par rapport aux travaux de notre Comité. Je poserai une question sur le rôle exact des Organisations consultatives. L'UICN, avant l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine, a signalé les menaces présentes et malgré cela le site a été inscrit en 2007. Depuis 2007 jusqu'à aujourd'hui, les Organisations consultatives n'ont fait aucun effort pour évaluer la situation actuelle. Je rejoins la Délégation du Brésil et je pose la question à l'UICN, quel est l'impact réel sur la dégradation actuelle pour le site dans sa totalité ?

Je voudrais ensuite rejoindre la question soulevée par le Mali sur le programme pour les communautés locales, apprentissage, développement durable. Quel est le rôle de l'UICN dans ce secteur ? Nous soutenons la proposition présentée par l'Afrique du Sud et nous nous opposons à l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et nous encourageons l'État partie à prendre les mesures adéquates afin d'empêcher la dégradation de ce site. Merci Monsieur le Président. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of IUCN for further explanations.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. Perhaps, with your permission I can also clarify other points raised in other interventions, as well as answering the questions asked by the distinguished delegate of Egypt. Firstly, to turn to those questions on the level of threats: Certainly, at the time the site was inscribed, this was a large site and there were some known threats, but they were not at the scale in any way that we are facing now. What has happened during the

period of instability is a steep change in the degree of threats through illegal logging and we are also seeing that it is leading to additional threats, including to some of the key wildlife species that are in the property. Those values connect, as the delegate of Switzerland said, directly to the reasons why this site was included in the World Heritage List.

If I can now turn to the point on benefits to the local population: In fact, the evidence that we see is an enormous drop in tourism, due to the instability, which was something which benefited local population. But the illegal trade that has been conducted is not really making any contribution to the local population, so the results of that trade are going elsewhere and that is well documented.

In terms of not following the situation, that is not the case. We are well in touch with our members. The World heritage Centre had a certain number of activities, but I think it is also important to note the Global Witness Report which was commissioned by the Madagascar government itself and which is a major source of evidence to the points that have been presented to you.

In terms of the other interventions that were made, if I can make three other points. Firstly, it is certainly true that there have been measures taken we recognise that and I think the point made by the delegate of Brazil regarding an already complicated situation is correct. The point that is being made is that those measures, including the task force, which was in place a year ago, and discussed at that time, are not making progress in the issue on the ground.

Secondly, a point about time-scale: We consider that this is an urgent issue. This cannot be seen as something that is a future problem, and that is relevant to the proposition from the distinguished delegate from South Africa, I certainly think that is appropriate, but for dealing with this issue, it will not deal with it for several years. The next COP is not for two years, so we might not anticipate action through that route for a period of perhaps three or four years.

And then, lastly, just in terms of the analysis of the value of the inscription on the in Danger List, I was struck by the intervention from the delegate of Australia that it is important to note that, whilst the situation is complex on the ground, there is an international dimension to this trade and that is a point that is relevant to a *Convention* which is speaking to the international duties to a site which is included on the World Heritage List.

In that regard, I would like to close with appreciation for the intervention by the delegate from China. I think that point to a level of potential for international cooperation which is extremely important in addressing this issue and we will be pleased to be part of a discussion about the operational aspects of what could be put in place as a result of that very clear statement of commitment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I believe that the debate is very interesting, rich and with a lot of information. I would especially like to thank the Egyptian Delegation for the question they asked, as I think it is a very relevant question which goes to the point that the Brazilian Delegation wanted more clarification about. We also wanted to thank our colleagues, especially China, saying that logging is a problem that is not restricted to certain areas. In many countries in the international community including Brazil, we are aligned in halting

these practices in order to preserve our heritage and also encourage international cooperation.

I would also like to mention once more what I said in my first intervention. I would like to ask for your patience Mr. Chair, having asked for the floor for the second time. There is a severe situation of political instability in the country and this does not allow the State Party to put in place the corrective measures that are necessary. We therefore need to have a certain degree of understanding for specific situations such as these. In this sense Mr. Chair the Brazilian Delegation supports the proposition made by South Africa. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are now beginning the process of examining the Draft Decision. We have many amendments, so I would like the rapporteur to explain the process because it is more complex due to the number of amendments we have received.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The original Draft Decision is on page 9 of the English and 8 of the French versions of document 7B.ad. We have received amendments from two State Parties (South Africa and Mali) and since these two amendments concern seven paragraphs of the Draft Decision, I would prefer to put these amendments on the screen so you know exactly what you are adopting. Could the technical team put our Draft Decision on the screen? Thank you. The English version is already there and the French version is on its way.

I will then start introducing to you the Draft amendments. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remain unchanged. In paragraph 4 the Delegation of South Africa suggested the deletion of one word which is *ministerial* in reference to the decree number 2010-141.

Paragraph 5 remains unchanged. In paragraph 6, the Delegation of South Africa suggests deleting the second part of the paragraph, so that the remaining part of the paragraph reads:

Calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to act urgently to assist protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by restoring conservation funding and support.

Following this paragraph, South Africa suggests the introduction of a new paragraph 6bis, which would read:

Further calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to assist in developing alternative subsistence means for the communities living around the parks as well as to help them to find other resources of energy but wood.

Following this paragraph, the Delegation of South Africa and Mali suggest the introduction of a new paragraph 6ter:

*Requests the Director General of UNESCO to convene a High Level Meeting of States Parties concerned in order to implement Decision **33 COM 7B.147** taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).*

And the Delegation of South Africa suggests that the paragraph continues:

Which invites the States Parties to ensure that illegal timber originating from Madagascar is both banned and prevented from entering their national markets.

Paragraph 7 remains unchanged. In paragraph 8 South Africa suggests an editorial comment change in the English version which we do not consider a change in content and I will not introduce that to you.

In paragraph 9, the Delegation of South Africa proposes to delete the entire paragraph. Former paragraph 10 would accordingly turn paragraph 9 and here South Africa suggests deleting the last part of the paragraph and I will just read to you the part that is deleted:

And a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Former paragraph 11 remains unchanged and would turn paragraph 10, if paragraph 9 is deleted. Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Did you all understand? The floor is now opened for comments. I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, j'ai juste une question à poser au Secrétariat concernant *rencontre à haut niveau*, est-ce que vous pourriez mettre l'écran sur 6 ter ? L'Afrique du Sud et le Mali demandent à la directrice générale cette réunion de haut niveau des États. Est-ce que le Secrétariat pourrait se prononcer pour savoir si c'est possible, oui ou non ? Et si cela ne l'est pas, qu'y a-t-il donc comme autres mesures pour aider au niveau international le bien dans les circonstances politiques actuelles à Madagascar ? »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the Secretariat and Mr. Rao, who will answer the Delegation.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you president. The distinguished delegate of Switzerland is quite correct, because as for the existing practice, the common United Nations system cannot engage at the political level with the political leadership of Madagascar. We can have interaction at the technical level but not at the political level. Obviously, it means that the leadership of the concerned ministries will not be able to participate in such a meeting. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone else would like to comment? We are checking the position of the Committee on this matter; meanwhile the Swiss Delegation would like to take the floor again.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Dans le cas très clair qu'une possibilité de rencontre à haut niveau ne soit pas possible, la Suisse demande que l'on conserve le paragraphe 9, concernant la mise de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I give the floor to IUCN for clarification."

IUCN:

"Just a comment on the amendment from South Africa which calls on State Parties and *alternative subsistence means for the communities living around the parks as well as to help them to find other resources of energy but wood*. I just want to note that there may be a misunderstanding here because we are talking about international trade in precious wood. The issue that we are talking about is not driven in any ways by wood for fuel by local communities and we just want to make sure that the point of view to that issue is understood in relation with the proposed amendment. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Mali you have the floor."

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je reviens à mon ancienne proposition. J'avais proposé que ce soit le Centre du patrimoine mondial qui organise cette réunion. Donc, remplacer *directeur général* par *Centre du patrimoine mondial*. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Egypt you have the floor."

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Avec votre permission je souhaiterais demander une relecture du paragraphe amendé par l'Afrique du Sud pour avoir une vision plus globale sur le texte qui était proposé pour ensuite revenir sur le paragraphe 6 ter si c'est possible ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I give the floor to the rapporteur for reading."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chair. May I ask clarification from Egypt, whether you would like the added paragraph to be re-read or all changes to be re-read?"

Egypt:

« Juste le paragraphe 6 concernant la mission ».

Rapporteur:

“Ok, so just re-read paragraph 6, 6bis and 6ter. On paragraph 6, the Delegation of South Africa suggests deleting the second part of the paragraph. The remaining part would read:

Calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to act urgently to assist protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by restoring conservation funding and support.

Paragraph 6bis as proposed by South Africa reads:

Further calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to assist in developing alternative subsistence means for the communities living around the parks as well as to help them to find other resources of energy but wood.

Paragraph 6ter, according to the suggestions by South Africa and Mali, I note an amendment that has been voiced by Mali and it actually corresponds to the initial submission that we have merged with the South African submission and we would now have two slightly varying options in this paragraph. The South African proposal would read:

*Requests the Director General of UNESCO to convene a High Level Meeting of States Parties concerned in order to implement Decision **33 COM 7B.147** taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) which invites the States Parties to ensure that illegal timber originating from Madagascar is both banned and prevented from entering their national markets.*

The Delegation of Mali would like their original version to be recognised which have a different entity the request is addressed to. Mali would like to *Requests the World Heritage Centre to convene a High Level Meeting of States Parties concerned in order to implement Decision **33 COM 7B.147** taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009)...* and I stop here. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Representative of Egypt, you can take the floor if you wish to make any comments.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense à la clarification qui nous a été apportée par le Secrétariat, M. Rao en l'occurrence, en ce qui concerne la demande d'organisation de la conférence. Que l'on demande celle-ci au Centre du patrimoine mondial ou au directeur général, on part de la même structure. En fait, je voudrais que l'on se limite à l'évaluation de mission d'évaluation pour les impacts actuels sur le site, c'est le point de vue de l'Égypte. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“It seems that the representative of Mali has corrected his proposition during the clarification from Egypt and it would be the Committee that would organise this meeting. I would like the representative of Mali to clarify who should organise this meeting. Mali, you have the floor.”

Mali :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour nous l'essentiel est que l'idée de réunion de haut niveau soit maintenue ».

The Chairperson:

“I am sorry; could you please repeat your proposal?”

Mali:

« Monsieur le Président, j'ai dit que j'ai demandé au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'organiser cette réunion de haut niveau. L'essentiel c'est que cette réunion de haut niveau se tienne. Maintenant, si ce n'est pas possible au niveau du Centre du patrimoine mondial, que le conseiller juridique nous indique alors quel est l'organe ou la structure qu'il faut pour organiser cette réunion de haut niveau, merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mr. Rao will take the floor and after the rapporteur.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Like I clarified, the World Heritage Centre is very much part of UNESCO, so if UNESCO cannot do it, the World Heritage Centre cannot engage with a political leadership, and I might also add that to the best of my knowledge this is the same position that has been adopted by the African Union.”

The Chairperson:

“Before I give the floor to the rapporteur, I give the floor to the Delegation of Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Sweden would like to keep with its earlier position and demand that the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The representative of Mali asked for the Legal advisor to give some clarifications on who has the ability to organise the meeting.”

Legal advisor:

“I cannot add anything to what Mr. Rao was saying. It is not a lack of willingness to be helpful on the part of the Secretariat. These are political and practical problems that UNESCO for the moment cannot overcome, as Mr. Rao said, within the UN system, it is possible to have certain contacts and not others and he has summarised the situation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme je l'ai dit dans mon propos, l'essentiel pour nous est que la réunion se tienne. À défaut de l'UNESCO ou du Centre du patrimoine mondial, est-ce que l'on peut demander à l'État partie d'organiser cette rencontre ? »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Clarification from IUCN which has the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. This is IUCN matter related to the legal process within UN Bodies. Our role here is as Advisory Body to the Committee and I do not think we can make any real comment which is helpful, other than those heard from the legal advisor and the deputy director of the World heritage Centre. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor back to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“In some circumstances, sometimes, a mediator or an intermediary volunteers to play the role of go-between if some personalities wish to take on this role outside of the UN system, it is possible. But we would need to find such a personality, and the matter would have to be done outside of the UN and UNESCO. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Based on the legal advisor opinion we have no comments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Estonia.”

Estonia:

“Estonia wishes to express our support for the original paragraph 9, as in Danger listing is a proper method to draw international attention to this problem in front of us.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Peut-on mettre le paragraphe 6 ter à l'écran ? Je souhaiterais remplacer le mot *demander* par *encourager* et je voudrais bien savoir l'avis de la part du conseiller juridique : *Encourager l'État partie à convoquer une réunion de haut niveau des États parties pour mettre en œuvre la Décision 33COM7B.147...* Je souhaiterais avoir le point de vue du conseiller juridique sur cette nouvelle formulation ».

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“The wording does not represent a problem. The question is whether the State party is in a position to do so. The question should be probably addressed more to the State Party. It does not present a legal problem from the State Party, it would be something that takes place outside the UN system and it is for them to decide whether they wish to do this and have the means. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to ask the State Party if they could organise this meeting as requested.”

Madagascar:

« Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. Dans la mesure où le terme utilisé par l'Égypte était *encourager l'État partie à convoquer*, je crois que dans ce cas, je peux prendre la responsabilité de dire oui. »

The Chairperson :

“The proponents of the amendment, do you agree that it is now ready for review by the Committee? If so, I give the floor to the rapporteur; she will be leading the consultation process.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I would then suggest going through the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph starting from the beginning of the Draft Decision. I suggest we can consider paragraphs 1 to 3 as a packet, as they remain unchanged, and see if we have an agreement on these three paragraphs.”

The Chairperson:

“I now ask if the Committee approves paragraphs 1 to 3 of the Draft Decision. Approved, the floor is back to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We can then consider paragraph 4 in which one word has been proposed for deletion: the word *ministerial* in reference to decree N° 2010-141.”

The Chairperson:

“South Africa would like to take the floor.”

South Africa:

“I just want to get some clarification from the legal advisor, based on the information about the UNESCO and etc. and their position on Madagascar. Will we reach a pronouncement on the inscription to the List in Danger, whether that discussion is allowed in that context?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“These are separate issues. The previously discussed issues, the political problems, are separate from the inscription on the in Danger List. They are criteria and procedures for inscription and in this case there are no problems for the Committee doing so.”

The Chairperson:

“Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense que nous sommes en train de faire deux choses. Dans un premier temps, il y a eu une tendance favorable à la non-inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. On était en train de discuter le paragraphe proposé par le Mali et l'Afrique du Sud, pour savoir qui devait organiser la réunion de haut niveau. Puis, il y a eu une autre proposition de maintenir le paragraphe 9. Il y a donc lieu de se prononcer là-dessus, nous ne devons pas tout de suite voir article par article et arriver à un article qui ne convient pas, notamment celui sur le patrimoine mondial en péril que nous avons combattu dans les propos. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“It seems that after the intervention of the representative of Mali, I need to confirm the methodology that we have embraced, which is to study paragraph by paragraph. Is it what you are asking?”

Mali:

« Monsieur le Président, je ne me suis pas fait comprendre. Dans le projet de Décision, le paragraphe 9 était supprimé et c'est quand nous sommes revenus au paragraphe 7, pour des explications, que l'on nous a dit que la directrice de l'UNESCO ne pouvait pas organiser la réunion de haut niveau et le Centre non plus. À ce moment-là, j'ai posé la question de savoir si l'État partie pouvait organiser cette réunion et c'est profitant de ce moment de débat qu'il y a eu une autre ou contre-proposition de maintenir le paragraphe 9. Si maintenant on veut aller paragraphe par paragraphe, cela veut dire qu'au niveau du paragraphe 9, l'on va retrouver le maintien du site en péril. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the rapporteur for clarification.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that we have discussed the Draft Decision, that we have started to adopt the Draft Decision and that the paragraphs adopted at this moment are 1, 2 and 3 and we have not yet decided on paragraph 9. As we have decided to adopt paragraph by paragraph, we would first consider 5 and 6 with the amendments, then 7 and 8 before coming to 9. If the Delegation of Mali wishes to propose paragraph 9 first, this could be done, but you would need to make the proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the Delegation of Mali.”

Mali :

« Monsieur le Président, je propose que l'on réexamine le paragraphe 9 qui avait été proposé d'être supprimé et qui est revenu, merci ».

The Chairperson :

“Re-examine in the eyes of the representative of Mali means re-opening the discussion or does that mean that we shall examine all paragraphs? What do you exactly mean by re-examine?”

Mali:

« Je pense qu'il y a déjà eu un débat et la tendance générale qui s'en dégage est de soutenir la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud qui consiste à supprimer l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Merci. »

The Chairperson :

“I am asking the Committee as to whether they agree to change the order, in other words to first consider the Committee Decision on paragraph 9 and then we would resume the normal sequential order which would be the natural result after having heard Mali. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman I am happy to follow your proposal on this. If we do go to paragraph 9 now, we would like to clearly put on the record that our wish is for it to stay. The reason for that is that there is no question that the site fulfils the criteria to be put on the List in Danger and also in addition there will be positive benefits arising from the inscription on the List in Danger that relates to the international trade of illegally logged wood. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Any other Delegation would like to take the floor regarding the suggestion? Representative of Egypt I give you the floor.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Égypte s'oppose au maintien de ce paragraphe et donc souhaite le supprimer ».

The Chairperson:

“It seems that paragraph 9 is pivotal for the Decision, so The Chairperson is tempted to accept the suggestion to examine paragraph 9 first and then to revert to normal sequence. Do you all agree? Representative of Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. It really does not matter how you go on adopting this Decision, but Nigeria would like to associate with Mali and Egypt to have this paragraph 9 removed.”

The Chairperson:

“I think we will have to resort to a vote on paragraph 9. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“At this point, Brazil would like to echo the voices of Nigeria, Mali, South Africa and Egypt.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am going to announce that we are joining Nigeria, Mali, South Africa, Brazil and Egypt. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse demande le vote secret sur ce paragraphe ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Sweden is in the same opinion of Switzerland on this case and agrees with a ballot vote.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. je n'ai pas grand-chose à ajouter. Vous avez annoncé le vote, il faut y aller et pour économiser du temps, je suggère de passer tout de suite au vote ».

The Chairperson:

“I agree with the proposal from the representative of Egypt, but there are Delegations who asked for the floor, and I have to give it to them. May I ask you to start the consultation once we have heard the two last Delegations that requested the floor? I have a point of order from Australia.”

Australia:

“I understand that the Rules of Procedure provide that when two countries have asked for a secret vote, we should start the proceedings and not have further discussions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Representative of Mali.”

Mali :

« Monsieur le Président, je voudrais poser une question au conseiller juridique, pour savoir dans quelles conditions l'on peut aller au vote secret, merci ».

The Chairperson:

“A point of order from Australia.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman, I refer again to the Rules of Procedure and this is a question on how the vote may proceed and I think we should move straight to the vote and not entertain any further substance. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. A point of order from Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Je comprends tout à fait l'intervention de l'équipe d'Australie, mais moi je n'ai pas entendu les termes vote secret de la part d'aucune Délégation. Je voudrais bien savoir quel vote nous allons utiliser, je souhaiterais que le conseiller juridique confirme ».

The Chairperson:

“We have been asked several questions on the procedure. I will then give the floor to the legal advisor in order to explain and clarify the methodology of the vote requested.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe that there has been a request for a vote of secret ballot. The request was put forward by Switzerland and supported by Sweden and Australia I believe. So, under the rules, as they are two States, Sweden and Switzerland; the Decision should be voted by secret ballot when two or more request it or if The Chairpersonman decides. Thereby the requirement of the rules has been fulfilled. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the rapporteur to explain the voting procedures.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We are currently preparing the ballot for the vote. It will be a traditional ballot paper vote. The question of voting will be: *whether members of the Committee agree to the deletion of paragraph 9*. With your permission Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should ask the legal advisors as to results; whether we need a simple majority or a two-thirds majority and how the votes will be counted. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Legal advisor you have the floor.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Matters that concern the *Convention* require a two-thirds majority vote. Thank you. In this case, it definitely concerns the *Convention* because the *Convention* defines these matters, so it requires a two-thirds majority vote.”

The Chairperson:

“Two-thirds majority. Thank you. A point of order from Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Avec votre permission, je voudrais demander au rapporteur relecture sur le texte pour lequel nous allons voter. »

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The text you will be voting for will be printed on your ballot papers in both English and French. The meaning of the text, and I cannot give to you the exact wording because I do not have the final text in front of me, will be whether you agree to delete paragraph 9 of the current Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The discussion is now over and we gather all the materials to proceed to the voting. The Committee has to designate two vote tellers that will be telling the vote. We have a point of order from Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Je souhaiterais avoir une précision de la part du conseiller juridique, car la demande qui a été proposée de la part de l’Australie, de la Suisse et de la Suède est de maintenir ce paragraphe 9 et non de l’enlever. Je voudrais donc que la question posée aille dans ce sens, c’est-à-dire que l’on accepte de maintenir le paragraphe 9 ».

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the legal advisor for clarification.”

Legal Advisor:

“The original text on the screen was the inscription on the in Danger List. The proposal has been to delete it, so this is the decision that it is being voted on. If there had been no objection to this paragraph there would be no vote, so the reason for the vote is to remove it: That is what the matter is being voted on. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“The Committee needs to designate two delegates acting as vote tellers during the voting process. Egypt has the floor.”

Egypt:

« Je suggère que le Cambodge soit un des deux *teller* et la Thaïlande le deuxième. Ce n’est qu’une suggestion et cela nécessite l’accord du Comité. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Switzerland I give you the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je soutiens la proposition égyptienne que je trouve très bonne, merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Mr. Chairman, Brazil supports the proposal made by Egypt. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson :

“I would like to consult the Nigerian representative. Do you have to make any proposals at this point?”

Nigeria:

“I support the proposal of Egypt which I find very interesting and in the spirit of the *Convention*. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“There is agreement, so I ask Cambodia and Thailand if they agree with the suggestion. Thailand and Cambodia approve, so we now have our two tellers. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have in the meantime received the final text of the vote. I will read it to you in both English and French languages. The papers have started being distributed to you and each Delegation has to sign when receiving the ballot paper, so please try to stay at your Delegation desk, as the papers will be distributed shortly.

The question in the English language is:

Should paragraph 9 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.2 be deleted? The choices are “Yes”, “No” and “abstention”.

En français:

Le projet de Décision 34 COM 7B.2 doit-il être supprimé ? Vous pouvez cocher la case « Oui », « Non » ou « Abstention », merci. »

The Chairperson:

“From now on, no interventions or comments are allowed, only points of order.

We are now starting the voting proceeding. I ask the Delegation of Australia to vote. Thank you; I now ask Bahrain to deposit his ballot in the urn. Barbados it is now your turn. Brazil is next, then Cambodia. Thank you, Delegation of China now followed by Egypt. Representative of Estonia it is now your turn. Russian Federation now and Nigeria please proceed to the vote. Mexico then Mali and followed by the representative of Jordan. Iraq is next, France, thank you. Ethiopia now followed by South Africa then Sweden. Switzerland you may vote followed by Thailand and the United Arab Emirates.

Thank you very much. All Delegations have completed the voting procedure. May the teller representatives of Cambodia and Thailand come to overview the counting process.

We now have the results of the vote. Please, pay attention. The results of the voting are: 11 in favour of deleting the paragraph and 9 are against its deletion. The two-thirds majority was not reached, which necessitated 14 votes. Thereby, the paragraph is not removed. Let's continue with the following paragraphs and the floor is to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chair. The amendment from South Africa on paragraph 4 is to delete one word *ministerial* in reference to decree N° 2010-141."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to Mexico."

Mexico :

"Thank you very much chair. Our desire is to ensure full transparency. My understanding is that someone abstained or this is not the case?"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to the legal advisor."

Legal advisor :

"Thank you Mr. Chair. There was one abstention, but the abstentions are not counted towards the total. When you have 20 votes either for or against, one divides them by three and multiplies by two to obtain the majority required. As it happens, 21 votes are cast and the majority is 14 in that case."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Paragraph 4, can we approve the amendment presented by the rapporteur? Approved, the floor is to the rapporteur for paragraph 5."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Paragraph 5 remains unchanged."

The Chairperson:

"Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraph 5? Yes, approved. Paragraph 6 now."

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. On paragraph 6, South Africa proposes an amendment in deleting the second half of the paragraph so that the remaining of the paragraph would read:

Calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to act urgently to assist protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by restoring conservation funding and support.”

The Chairperson:

“Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraph 6? Yes, approved. Paragraph 6bis now.”

Rapporteur:

“The paragraph newly inserted at the proposal of South Africa would read:

Further calls upon all State Parties to the Convention to assist in developing alternative subsistence means for the communities living around the parks, as well as to help them to find other sources of energy but wood.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Étant donné l'explication de l'UICN, si l'on inclut cet article il n'apporte rien car il ne correspond pas à la réalité. On aimerait supprimer ce paragraphe ».

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Egypt.”

Egypt:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaite m'adresser à mes collègues de la Suisse. Je pense que l'esprit de ce paragraphe est tout à fait positif et encourage à déjà commencer à développer les communautés locales, donc je ne vois pas pourquoi on devrait supprimer un paragraphe qui est positif dans un projet de Décision. C'est mon point de vue ».

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Mr. Chairman, I think that is exactly what I wanted to say, what was just said by Egypt, although the explanation given by the Advisory Body is that the problem is not the people using wood for energy but the export of wood. Taken into account that this paragraph has a good impact for the community, I believe it is better if we retain it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Just to follow up on the intervention of the delegate from Nigeria. I think the issue perhaps could be resolved and I suggest this to the Committee, that the last part of the paragraph is what we regarded as a confusion: *as well as to help them to find other sources of energy but wood* because it implies an analysis of the problem which is not the one we are facing. Maybe in line with what Nigeria just explained quite correctly, that might address the issue but also find a compromise. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense que c'est une réponse à une des initiatives que nous avons faites. On avait parlé de l'avenir des communautés locales, celles-ci ne vivent que de cette nature, de cette forêt donc si on les empêche de vivre de celle-ci, il faut trouver des solutions alternatives pour leur permettre de survivre. Nous sommes donc favorables au maintien de ce paragraphe ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of Switzerland.”

Suisse :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. L'amendement initial a été modifié et nous souhaiterions que ce paragraphe reste comme il est car il est positif, mais sans la dernière phrase ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“My point joins what has been said by the last speaker, to keep the first part of the additional paragraph and to delete the last sentence. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Nobody requested the floor, so I give it to the rapporteur who will include the latest suggestions.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Yes, I understood that Switzerland and China following the recommendation of IUCN have suggested an amendment to this paragraph, which would then read

Further calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to assist in developing alternative subsistence means for the communities living around the parks.”

The Chairperson:

“Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraph 6bis with this deletion? Yes, it is approved. Paragraph 6ter now.”

Rapporteur:

“In item 6ter I have still two options in the text as to who requested the High-level meeting. Following South Africa the request is addressed to the UNESCO Director General and following the proposal for Mali, the request is addressed at the World Heritage Centre. I will now read the sentence with the first option. It has been requested that the word *requests* is changed to *encourages* by the Egyptian Delegation and also to replace the *UNESCO Director General* by the *State Party*. The final version with all these amendments would then be:

Encourages the State Party to convene a High Level Meeting of the States Parties concerned in order to implement Decision 33 COM 7B.147 taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), which invites the States Parties to ensure that illegal timber originating from Madagascar is both banned and prevented from entering their national markets.

Just in case I cause confusion, the latest amendment was *Encourages the State Party to convene a High Level Meeting* and so on.”

The Chairperson :

“There are three proposals which are very close to one another: The first two it would seem to me have been deemed unfeasible. I would like to know whether the two State Parties that have proposed this amendment would like to migrate to the third proposal in order to harmonise.”

Mali :

« Je pense que l'on avait demandé à l'État partie s'il était consentant pour organiser cette réunion et il a donné son accord. C'est donc le dernier paragraphe : *Encourage l'État partie à organiser une réunion*, c'est donc l'État partie pas les États parties, merci ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to the representative of South Africa."

South Africa:

"South Africa supports the suggestion from Egypt."

The Chairperson:

"I am sorry, there was a problem and I did not hear the position of South Africa."

South Africa:

"South Africa withdraws its earlier revision and support the latest revision from Egypt supported by Mali."

The Chairperson:

"The floor is to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"I will just read the beginning of the paragraph again to make sure the Draft Decision is on the same formulation. It will then incorporate the Egyptian proposal:

Encourages the State Party to convene a High Level Meeting of the States Parties concerned and so on, as was originally proposed by South Africa."

The Chairperson:

"Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraph 6ter with this amendment? Yes, approved. Paragraph 7 now."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I think we can consider paragraphs 7 and 8 together, as there are no changes to the initial Draft Decision."

The Chairperson:

“Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraphs 7 and 8? Yes, approved. Next paragraph please.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Note that we have decided earlier to retain paragraph 9. In paragraph 10 the South African Delegation proposes deleting the end of the paragraph: *and that the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the list of World Heritage in Danger*. I am not sure that the South African Delegation would like to retain this proposal, as we have retained paragraph 9 in the Draft Decision.”

South Africa:

“South Africa would like to withdraw in light of the decision in paragraph 9.”

The Chairperson:

“Then we are going to study paragraph 10 in its original version. I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I would suggest that we can adopt the two remaining paragraphs 10 and 11, as in this case they will remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson :

“Does the Committee agree to the approval of paragraphs 10 and 11? Yes. They are approved.

We have now closed our agenda for the day. I am now adjourning this session for lunch. I reiterate my invite for the ceremony that will take place at 3pm in the ground floor in the Bureau meeting room: The signing of an agreement between Brazil and Benin of a proposal of partnership about the World Heritage of Benin. Brazil wants to put in practice the cooperation in preserving African heritage”

Rapporteur:

“Mr. Chairperson, if we could adopt the entire Draft Decision before we leave to lunch: Just as a matter of formality we have to adopt the complete Decision after we went through it, paragraph by paragraph. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“Let’s then proceed to this matter. Does the Committee agree with **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.2** including all amendments voted? Approved, thank you very much.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 30 July, 2010

Friday, 30 July 2010

TWELFTH SESSION

Afternoon session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

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

NATURAL HERITAGE

AFRICA

The Chairperson:

“We have reached the quorum. We will start this afternoon’s session with the next item to be discussed from the African region, the **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)**. I give the floor to Mr. Debonnet.”

Mr. Debonnet:

“Thank you; the next area is Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania). Whilst certain positive measures have been taken by the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned about the limited progress on the implementation of key corrective measures and recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 missions. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received complaints that in response to the decision of the World Heritage Committee the State Party would plan to forcibly evict residents from the property. However, the State Party has confirmed to the World Heritage Centre that no forced evictions have taken place or are planned in the future.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, while the growing impacts of the resident population on the values and integrity of the property are of concern, the issue of human population impacts are complex and conflicting in that they can only be addressed through a dialogue with the local community. This would require a long-term approach. They know that any relocations raise important issues including prior free and informed consent, the exact interaction between new, used and natural values in a dynamic ecosystem, the appropriateness of alternative land and facilities offered, possible competition and conflict with other resource users in the new areas.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the impact of human population presence and tourism needs to be addressed as soon as possible. If current degradation patterns are not stopped, the current Outstanding Universal Value of this property would be jeopardised. The World Heritage Centre notes that the State Party submitted a re-nomination of this natural property under cultural criteria. This will be discussed later under item 8. As the ICOMOS evaluation proposes an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger under cultural criteria, the Committee might wish to postpone the discussion on the Draft Decision and view it together with the Draft Decision proposed under item 8. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“No comments from IUCN, so I open the floor to the members of the Committee for discussion. Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Je souhaiterais poser une question à Monsieur le Conseiller juridique et une question à l’Organisation consultative. Est-il possible d’inscrire sur la même décision au registre de l’UNESCO, un site au patrimoine mondial et de le mettre immédiatement sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril, autrement dit un site mort-né. Le même site a été proposé sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et une autre décision suit qui le met sur celle du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Ma deuxième question serait de nous éclairer sur les éléments qui ont conclu aux menaces sur le site, parce que dans le document présenté, l’on parle de la construction de monuments et de musées autour du site qui présenteraient un danger pour le site. Je souhaiterais entendre la voix de l’État Partie, ne serait-ce que pour vérifier ces deux éléments. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. La parole est au conseiller juridique ».

Legal advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am not aware of any obstacles as to why this cannot be done, there is no legal impediment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. The question was first directed to the legal advisor and then to an Advisory Body. We are happy to respond, but I think it is important to be clear about the decisions in front of this Committee on Ngorongoro and I have the feeling that the delegate from Mali is opening questions that are actually not relevant to the Decision that has been opened now, but to a Decision that is going to be discussed under item 8 as earlier mentioned. Just to clarify: this is a site which is already on the World Heritage list as a natural site. Item 7B is just about the site that has been already described. There is no consideration of the re-nomination on this item, nor of consideration of inscription on the List in Danger on this item, unless the Committee will open that.

Under item 8B, there is a re-nomination that will be considered at another part of the meeting and not now. That’s where the issues about development and the in Danger List will be discussed. The proposal that the Secretariat sees is as practical as it might be useful to suspend this decision to consider the re-nomination, but that is a matter of the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“I was just checking the re-nomination and the type of property, it is a cultural property, that’s it. So, the State Party has asked to extend the site under cultural nomination. Are there any objections regarding the suspension of this item after the eventual nomination and extension of the cultural site? Barbados you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. While there might be efficiencies in some way, I tend to think that because our focus is with respect to the natural aspect while we are discussing the extension of the site, we would primarily engaged in studying the cultural aspect. My preference is to deal with it now and with the extension when that occurs during the re-nomination process.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. Ethiopia you have the floor.”

Ethiopia:

“Thank you. The Ethiopian Delegation also prefers to discuss the part which deals with the natural site now and the nomination when we get to it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Ethiopia. IUCN, do you have any further comments?”

IUCN:

“We are in your hands. We just take the item as you wish. I would just note to be precise that it is a re-nomination that will be considered under 8B, not an extension. It is the same area and there are numbers of aspects that are referred to in the ICOMOS evaluation that are also relevant to the natural values, so there are no overlapping issues. We are entirely in your hands. You can take the item as you wish and comment. It is a matter of how the Committee wishes to proceed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. According to the demand of several members of the Committee, we should discuss the issue and I open the floor for further comments. Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Monsieur le Président, je retire ma question et propose qu’elle soit discutée au cours de la nomination. Cela concerne effectivement la partie culturelle ».

The Chairperson:

« Pouvez-vous répéter ce que vous désirez s'il vous plaît ? »

Mali:

« Je disais que je retire ma question qui sera discutée au moment de la nomination de Ngorongoro, lors de la partie culturelle ».

The Chairperson:

« D'accord, très bien, merci beaucoup. Y-a-t-il d'autres commentaires ? Je n'en vois pas, nous procédons donc à l'examen du projet de Décision 34 COM.7B.4. La parole est au rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.4 is on page 27 of the English and of the French version of document 7B and I have not received any written amendments."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.4 including paragraphs 1 to 8? I see none. The Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.4** is adopted.

Let's move to the next site, concerning the **Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)** and I give the floor to the Secretariat."

The Secretariat:

"Thank you very much. The main issues concerning this property regard the proposal to build a road to Mussoma through the northern part of the property which could affect the spectacular annual migration of animals across the Serengeti ecosystem and to Maasai Mara in Kenya. As you can see from the map on the slide, the planned road will divide the wilder natural area of Serengeti for 53 kilometres, a critical habitat of some of the most endangered species in the property, such as the black rhino and the wild hunting dog. It will also have a major impact on migration, as it will cross the major wildlife corridor to the Mara in Kenya. This road is likely to become a major transit route to Rwanda, Burundi and the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, as it will be the shortest and easiest link from Mombassa and will surely attract large amounts of heavy long-haul traffic.

Presently 6 million tons are moved on these roads from Central Africa every year, representing 150,000 truckloads. If built, on average, as much as 416 large trucks a day could potentially travel to Serengeti. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that if built the north road could critically impact the property Outstanding Universal Value and therefore justify its inscription on the List in Danger, if the project were to be approved.

The potential dangers are described in detail in the working documents. It also needs to be stressed that this road project was discussed in 1996 and that at the time, an environmental impact assessment concluded that the road would prejudice the survival of several rare and endemic species and may cause mortality of migratory species. Therefore, at the time, it was decided that it should not be built.

The State Party clarified in February that this road is a National Prioritised Project which will enable the economic development of the lake zone circuit. It noted that so far only a preliminary feasibility study and a preliminary impact assessment have been undertaken, which concluded that the role is feasible. However, the State Party ensured that a final impact assessment will be prepared and provided to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it becomes available. The director general of UNESCO also wrote a letter to the President of Tanzania on 5 July expressing her concern about the road project and appealing to him to re-examine the proposed alignments. In view of this and other conservation concerns, the World heritage Centre and IUCN propose a reactive monitoring mission to the property. IUCN has also some comments.”

IUCN:

“IUCN is seriously concerned by the proposed north road development. We consider that the construction of a road across Serengeti National Park will not only have an unacceptable direct effect including migration disruption and habitat fragmentation but will also open the door to considerable knock on effects such as human activities increasing in the Park. Past assessments, mentioned by the Secretariat, give clear evidence of past conclusions about the nature of those impacts.

This is why it is crucial that the State Party considers all feasible alternatives to the proposed road when undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment for this project. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“I open the floor to the Committee. Nigeria you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“I thank the Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the report. I notice that there are three major issues: The road construction, poaching and the collaboration that needs to be established between Tanzania and Kenya. I would like to invite the State Party, if it is in the room, to give us some details about these three issues so that we can see the extent to which they are working to meet the expectations of the Committee, especially after the letter that has been sent by the director general of UNESCO. Mr. Chairman I would like to invite the State Party to give details on this.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. The State Party thanks The Chairperson for granting it the right to speak and thanks the Advisory Bodies, IUCN and the World Heritage Committee for their

comments on the State of Conservation report on Serengeti National Park. The State Party takes note of a number of concerns expressed therein and would like to address the following:

In respect to the north road, we wish to assure the World Heritage Committee that the decision to construct the road has not yet been taken. The government is currently undertaking an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the Tanzania Environment Act of 2004 and the Wildlife Conservation Act of 2009. After completion of the evaluation of the environmental impact assessment, the stakeholder will hold a public hearing. The government, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage *Convention*, awaits the results of the environmental impact assessment of the World Heritage Centre before the decision to implement the project is taken. We want to emphasise that the decision to construct the road has not yet been made.

With respect to the issue of poaching, we would like to report, while there have been limited isolated elephant poaching incidents, the situation is not particularly threatening enough to warrant an alarm by the international community. The additional law enforcement measures have already been deployed positively. Contrary to what has been reported by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, our records show no rhinoceros poaching in the property. The State Party has in place a strict animal-specific monitoring system for rhino and records indicate on half of the demographic profile an increase in the population. The latest census conducted in 2008 also shown an increased in the elephant population within the property from 1,603 in 2003 to 2,485 in 2008.

With regard to the cooperation with Kenya, we are doing it very well Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Ethiopia you have the floor.”

Ethiopia:

“Thank you Chair. I congratulate the State Party for what they have done and based on the remark of the State Party regarding the question of poaching, my Delegation would like to propose the deletion of paragraph 6 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.5.”

The Chairperson:

“Did you send an amendment to the rapporteur?”

Ethiopia:

“Not an amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“We will come back to this later, thank you. Any further requests for the floor? IUCN would you like to add something. Let’s move on to examine Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.5 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

The rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.5 is on page 31 of the English and of the French versions of document 7B. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Africa concerning paragraph 5 and I think I have also heard from the floor a second amendment which concerns paragraph 6.

With regard to paragraph 5, the Delegation of South Africa suggests deleting approximately the second half of the paragraph, everything that follows *Universal values*, so that the remaining part of the paragraph would read as follows:

Expresses its utmost concern about the proposed North Road which will dissect the northern wilderness area of the Serengeti over 53 km, considers that this proposed alignment could result in irreversible damage to the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The paragraph would end here. I understood that Ethiopia has just proposed to entirely delete paragraph 6. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The other paragraphs remain unchanged?”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraphs 1 to 4 remain unchanged and paragraphs 7 and 8 also.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.5? I see none, they are adopted.

Regarding paragraph 5, with the deletion requested by South Africa after the words *Universal Value*.”

Rapporteur:

“That is correct Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this paragraph? Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia would be a little concerned about removing the second part of the paragraph, because, as it says, the road could result in irreversible damage to the Outstanding Universal Value. That does seem to Australia a clear reason to include it on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it then seems to be of logical consequence. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. The floor is to South Africa.”

South Africa:

“Thank you Chair. In terms of the proposal that we made, it is a bit difficult to explain it, as it is not on the screen. There is a sentence which completes the sentence which may address the concern of Australia. It concludes by saying:

and therefore urges the State Party to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre before a decision to implement the project is taken.

That statement was not considered.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you South Africa. The floor is to the rapporteur for clarification.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman, I have to apologise and confirm the statement by South Africa. Indeed, I omitted part of the sentence that was proposed to you and that has been submitted by South Africa previously, which would follow the current text. I read the whole paragraph again:

Expresses its utmost concern about the proposed North Road which will dissect the northern wilderness area of the Serengeti over 53 km, and considers that this proposed alignment could result in irreversible damage to the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The remaining part would be deleted and replaced by:

and therefore urges the State Party to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre before a decision to implement the project is taken.

I repeat the part that I had previously omitted:

and therefore urges the State Party to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre before a decision to implement the project is taken.

Thank you very much Mr. Chair and my apologies again to the South African Delegation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, does that suit you?”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. With this text, I think it is a very sensible suggestion from South Africa and Australia is happy to support that revised paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5 as amended? I see none. It is adopted.

Regarding paragraph 6 with a deletion request from Ethiopia, are there any objections regarding the deletion of paragraph 6? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Excusez-moi Monsieur le Président, mais je ne vois pas très bien pourquoi l'on devrait enlever ce paragraphe. C'est un paragraphe qui est important, notamment avec les adjonctions que l'on a incluses dans le paragraphe 5, il le complète extrêmement bien. Je propose le maintien de ce paragraphe 6. Merci Monsieur le Président. »

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia would also support maintaining that paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Ethiopia would you like to comment? You have the floor.”

Ethiopia:

“Since the amount of elephant poaching has been minimised and the number of animals has been increasing, and also of white rhino, we need to encourage the State Party for what they have done already, because they have voted a law, and I believe this would bring changes if we would delete the paragraph. Paragraph 5 should somehow be there in this corrected form and we delete paragraph 6.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. South Africa you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you Chair. Earlier the State Party was requested to provide some additional information and to give some information with respect to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision; Unless we want to say that we do not believe the State Party and that the information they have given us is not true. Based on that information, we would support the earlier suggestion that this paragraph is not really necessary and it should be deleted.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think we have something to suggest to members of the Committee and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. We would suggest to you a slightly revised paragraph 6, which then would have a far more positive tone and would recognise that the State Party is already working on the matter in question. It would read:

6. Also notes the reports of the significant increase in rhinoceros and elephant poaching within the property, and requests the State Party to continue improving its anti-poaching strategies and law enforcement activities. The sentence would stop here.

I read it once again:

6. Also notes the reports of the significant increase in rhinoceros and elephant poaching within the property, and requests the State Party to continue improving its anti-poaching strategies and law enforcement activities.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland and Australia would this wording suit you?”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Absolutely. Australia wants to encourage the Party, so we were not looking to include language that would be in any way suggest that we did not trust the Party; of course we do. But we do not want to remove any reference to poaching, because we believe that wherever poaching occurs that is a problem, but Australia is very happy with the proposed text as just suggested.”

The Chairperson:

“*Thank you. la Suisse vous suivez l’Australie? »*

Suisse :

« À 100 %, Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Ethiopia, are you happy with the wording proposed by the rapporteur? Yes, thank you very much. South Africa?”

South Africa:

“We are happy with the latest solution.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections with the adoption of paragraph 6 as proposed and read by the rapporteur? I see none, it is adopted.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 remain unchanged. Are there any objections with the adoption of these two paragraphs? I see none, they are adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM7B.5** has been adopted in its entirety. Thank you very much.

ARAB STATES ASIA-PACIFIC EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

We are moving to the next region, the Arab State with the site of **Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia), then the Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) and the Waterton-Glacier international Peace Park (Canada and United States of America)**. All these sites have been requested for discussed by Barbados. Barbados has a statement to make regarding these three Parks. Are there any objections regarding the examination of these three sites in this order? I see none. The floor is to Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you for indulging me in this way. Chair, I am entirely satisfied with the reports that have been put forward by the Centre and IUCN on these three sites. In fact they demonstrate the success of close cooperation and monitoring of the state of conservation of the sites to the point that the Centre and IUCN have reached the opinion that there is no further need for reporting. I am entirely satisfied if that is the case, however, in terms of being consistent in our approach, for the management of the site beyond the scope of this initial investigation; it appeared to me that the decisions pertaining to these three sites were left hanging rather after the last paragraph in each case.

Therefore, we discussed with the Centre and IUCN a sort of final paragraph to end it on a rather more elegant note. Indicating that, when there is need for further information regarding any further developments to the matter that are indicated in the decision, the State Party will make it their business to report on these, primarily in the context of periodic reporting. It was in the sense of tidying things up, of being consistent in our approach for future reporting that this paragraph has been offered and the Centre and IUCN are in support of it. I have delivered the text to the rapporteur and I ask this matter to be taken into account when we examine the decisions. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Barbados. I would like to suggest giving the floor to our rapporteur to screen this paragraph.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much chairperson. I would indeed like to show members of the Committee this paragraph. If the technical team could help me putting it up on the screen? Thank you very much. I will read the paragraph to you once:

Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regarding significant developments with respect to the above issues, considering the requirements of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and to give particular attention to these issues in their contribution to the periodic reporting processes.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Secretariat, IUCN would you like to comment?”

IUCN:

“Just to confirm that IUCN, the Centre and Barbados have engaged in to address the reasons why Barbados thought that these decisions were really comfortable with this paragraph. If it addresses the concerns of Barbados and the Committee is happy with it, then yes, we are happy to support it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you chair. Just one question. I do think that among some members of the Committee, there are those who do not actually really understand which point of the item of the agenda we are talking about and would like some clarification on this. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the Secretariat for more clarification. We are following the order and examining three sites. Mr. Rao, you have the floor.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Mr. President. With regard to the question of the distinguished delegate of Mexico, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that there are three state of conservation reports pertaining to the Ichkeul national Park, the Gunung Mulu National Park in Malaysia and the Waterton-Glacier international Peace Park (Canada and United States of America). These three state of conservation reports were requested by Barbados to be opened for discussion. After discussion with the Secretariat and IUCN, Barbados determined that circumstances have been addressed, if the paragraph that is in front of you is adopted in relation to each of the conservation reports and there is no need further to discuss that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I am giving the floor to the rapporteur in case she has received any further amendments.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I confirm that apart from the written amendment by Barbados I have not received any further amendments on any of these three properties.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any further requests from the floor? I see none, which means that we are going to adopt these three Draft Decisions with the addition of this paragraph.

Regarding Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.9, as it was drafted in the document and with the paragraph proposed by Barbados: Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.9**? I see none. It is adopted.

Now let's examine the Draft Decision concerning the second site, Gunung Mulu National Park in Malaysia 34 COM 7B.15. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.15**, as it was drafted in the document and with the paragraph proposed by Barbados? I see none. It is adopted.

Let's proceed to the adoption of the Draft Decision regarding the site of Waterton-Glacier international Peace Park (Canada and United States of America), Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.20**. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this Draft Decision, as it was drafted in the document and with the paragraph proposed by Barbados? I see none. It is adopted.

ASIA-PACIFIC

We are going to examine the last site in the Asia and Pacific region. The Secretariat will present the site of **Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand)**. Mr. Rao, you have the floor.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. This site was also requested by a committee member to be opened for discussion. We have not received any other information other than what is contained in the report before you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor for comments. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour une meilleure compréhension du paragraphe 4, nous souhaiterions poser une question à l'Organe consultatif, l'UICN, et éventuellement, cela dépend de la réponse, à l'État partie concerné. Lors de l'inscription en 2005, l'UICN proposait des couloirs pour améliorer la situation des écosystèmes atteints par la route déjà existante. Pour l'extension de la route en projet, l'UICN propose maintenant, dans le rapport, une galerie assez grande pour diminuer les effets négatifs de la route. Est-ce que l'Organe

consultatif peut se prononcer sur cette nouvelle proposition de creuser des tunnels au lieu d'installer des couloirs ? »

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. En fait vous demandez plus d'informations en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 4 du projet de Décision ? »

Switzerland:

« Absolument, c'est le numéro 4, oui ».

The Chairperson:

"I would like to give the floor to the State Party."

Thailand:

"Thailand is willing to conduct an environmental impact assessment study to decide on effective wildlife corridor to mitigate the impact of the proposed highway expansion project. What we are proposing to the Advisory Bodies is implementation of an effective wildlife corridor while maintaining the integrity of the property. And we are trying to develop the best wildlife corridor on ecological bases. Right now, Thailand are conducting the environmental impact assessment and it will be submitting the results to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

IUCN:

"Thank you Chair. Firstly, IUCN would like to commend the Thai government for taking up the challenge of designing and implementing a wildlife corridor across the property. In response to the question raised by the distinguished delegate of Switzerland, I would like to note that IUCN recognises that at the time of inscription in 2004, IUCN comments were that underpasses alone were not an effective option to mitigate the negative impacts of highway 304 on the property's wildlife and that wildlife overpasses should also be considered."

However, we note that we received reports from experts working on site that a wide range of wildlife corridor options would need to be considered, including underpasses, which may be more effective along certain stretches of the road where it is not elevated. As mentioned by the State Party, we very recently received some new information concerning the assessment of wildlife corridor options and this indicates that a significant portion of the new four lane road may be elevated, which in fact would minimise the need for underpasses."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you IUCN. Any further requests for intervention? Switzerland you have the floor."

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Merci à l'État partie et aux Organisations consultatives pour l'évaluation de la situation. En effet, c'est ce qu'on a envisagé, c'est-à-dire une construction avec des piliers qui permet une meilleure diffusion et migration pour l'écosystème, c'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons fait des amendements à l'article 4, 5 et suivants ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. D'autres demandes d'interventions ? Je n'en vois pas donc je propose que l'on passe directement à l'examen du projet de Décision 34 COM.7B.18 et je donne la parole au rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair, Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.18 is on page 61 of the English and on page 64 of the French versions of document 7B. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Switzerland, which concerns paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 10.

In paragraph 4 the proposal is to delete the second part of the paragraph *following the extension of the highway*. The paragraph now reads, and I will read it in French, as it is the original amended text:

Félicite l'Etat partie d'avoir entrepris les nécessaires études d'évaluation d'impact environnemental (EIE) afin d'identifier et de prévoir des couloirs de déplacement de la faune afin d'atténuer les impacts du projet d'extension de l'autoroute.

In paragraph 5, the Swiss Delegation suggests a reformulation towards the end of the paragraph. And I will read again the new paragraph in French as proposed:

Constate que la mise en place de couloirs de déplacement de la faune est indispensable au maintien de l'intégrité du bien sur le long terme, et ce, sans tenir compte du projet d'extension de l'autoroute, et qu'il est essentiel que l'Etat partie identifie et mette en place dans un premier temps le meilleur projet de couloirs de déplacement de la faune, projet choisi essentiellement sur des critères écologiques et en n'accordant pas dans son analyse une importance aussi grande aux facteurs économiques.

Après, la Délégation de la Suisse propose de supprimer le paragraphe 6 et dans le paragraphe 10 d'effectuer un remplacement de date : 2011 remplace 2012 et 35^e session remplace 36^e session ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup, nous allons passer à l'adoption du projet de Décision 34 COM 7B.18 paragraphe par paragraphe. Les trois premiers paragraphes restent inchangés, y a-t-il des objections sur leurs adoptions ? Non, ils sont adoptés.

Passons au paragraphe 4. Le rapporteur va le relire ».

Rapporteur:

“Perhaps, this is not necessary, as the deletion can be very simply explained: Everything that follows the *extension of the highway* in the English version and *d’extension de l’autoroute* in the French version is deleted.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup. Y a-t-il des objections à l’adoption du paragraphe 4 amendé par la Suisse ? Je n’en vois pas, il est adopté.

Passons au paragraphe 5, je donne la parole à notre rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, je vais lire la deuxième partie du paragraphe :

et qu’il est essentiel que l’Etat partie identifie et mette en place dans un premier temps le meilleur projet de couloirs de déplacement de la faune, projet choisi essentiellement sur des critères écologiques et en n’accordant pas dans son analyse une importance aussi grande aux facteurs économiques ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup, y a-t-il des objections sur l’adoption du paragraphe amendé ? Je n’en vois pas, il est adopté.

La Suisse propose de supprimer le paragraphe 6. Des objections sur cet amendement ? Je n’en vois pas.

Paragrapes précédemment 7, 8, 9 et qui maintenant deviennent paragraphes 6, 7, 8. Ils restent inchangés. Êtes-vous d’accord pour adopter ces trois paragraphes ? Oui, ils sont adoptés, merci beaucoup.

Enfin, le dernier paragraphe, anciennement 10 qui devient 9 et je donne la parole au rapporteur pour le changement de date ».

Rapporteur:

“The Delegation of Switzerland proposes to change the current date 2012 to 2011, so that the report would be due on 1 February 2011 and it would be discussed at the 35th instead of the 36th session in 2011.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I seen none, they are adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.18** has been adopted including paragraphs 1 to 9. Thank you very much.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

We are moving to the next region concerning the **Pirin national Park (Bulgaria)** and I give the floor to Mr. Rao.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. This report was also requested by a member of the Committee to be opened for discussion. The main issues affecting the property result from the development of ski facilities and the extension of the tourism zone. The issue is now proposed to be resolved by an extension proposal that excluding the already developed area of about 1,229 hectares, and extending the property by adding 12,126 hectares. The proposal also includes the creation of a buffer zone, which includes the tourism zones of Bansko and Dobrinishte.

The State Party is also being requested to invite a joint IUCN-World Heritage Centre monitoring mission to the property in 2011. This item will also be considered under item 8B because an extension proposal will be decided by the Committee at a later stage in the agenda and we have mentioned that in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN would you like to add something? No, I open the floor for discussion for members of the Committee. The floor is to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme le Secrétariat l’a remarqué, il y a encore sur 8B.5 la question du traitement de ce bien. Nous aimerions traiter maintenant de ce point car c’est l’unité de la matière qui est affectée avec les zones tampons, merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you Chair. Taking into consideration the strong commitment declared by the State Party of Bulgaria dedicated to the future preservation of Pirin national Park, we propose the adoption of the Draft Decision as it is already formulated. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I have two requests. One from Switzerland to suspend the exam of this item, up to the item concerning the extension of the site, and another request from the Russian Federation to examine the Draft Decision now. I give the floor to the legal advisor.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. When there is a motion to adjourn the debate that motion has to be voted on, Switzerland has given a specific time. If there are no objections there is no need for a vote, but if there are which apparently is the case, then there has to be a vote. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are moving to vote on the proposal of Switzerland and I give the floor to the legal advisor to give us more information on the procedure.”

Legal Advisor:

“Mr. Chairman, adjournment is a procedural matter that requires simple majority, you simply need to ask which members of the Committee are in favour of adjourning to the time indicated, which members are against and those who abstain. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to our rapporteur to formulate the proposal from Switzerland.”

Rapporteur:

“We will then ask members of the Committee, if they agree to adjourn the debate up to the consideration of the boundary modification under 8B, if I understand correctly. The question is: Whether you agree after proposal of the Delegation of Switzerland to adjourn the debate of item 34 COM 7B.19.”

The Chairperson:

“I have a point of order from the Russian Federation. You have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Maybe, before we go to voting, I would like to ask Bulgaria to give some explanation, if it is possible.”

The Chairperson:

“No, I am sorry, we are in a voting procedure, but I ask conformation to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“Mr. Chairman, if the objection is maintained, then the vote must take place.”

The Chairperson:

“I am going to ask the rapporteur to re-read. Switzerland, do you have a point of order?”

Switzerland:

« Ce n'est pas un point d'ordre ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup. Je ne peux pas vous donner la parole. La parole est au rapporteur pour reformuler la demande sur laquelle nous allons voter ».

Rapporteur:

“The vote will be on: Whether members of the Committee agree to adjourn the debate of item 34 COM 7B.19 until the boundary modifications have been considered under item 8B.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Member States in favour of the Swiss demand to adjourn the debate until item 8B please raise your hands. Switzerland, are you in favour of your amendment or not?”

Switzerland:

« La Suisse retire sa demande de report ».

The Chairperson:

« *Merci beaucoup. Nous allons discuter ce point.*

The Russian Federation asked for the State Party to be given the floor, I then hand the floor to Bulgaria for further information, if there are any representatives of the State Party in the room.”

Bulgaria:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The State Party understands the concern of the World Heritage Committee and of the Advisory Bodies and accepts their conclusion that the property has really been impacted by the ski development during the years, and any further development of ski facilities on the property might result in the inscription of the property in List of World Heritage in Danger.

Therefore, on behalf of the State Party of Bulgaria, I would like to assure the members of the Committee that we shall provide effective protection of the property and not allow any further constructions of new ski runs and facilities within the property and its buffer

zone. We also state that, in line with the IUCN recommendations and the Draft Decision, in the preparation of the management plan of the property from after 2013, the government will fully comply with the requirements not to allow for skiing developments or the construction of any other ecologically unsustainable facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourist zone inside the property. The State Party also fully agrees to the proposal to accept in 2011 a joint mission with representatives of UNESCO and IUCN to assist the state of conservation of the property.

I would also like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their assistance during the whole nomination process and furthermore for their efforts to find the most appropriate solution which will allow Pirin National Park to become a prestigious and respectful World Heritage property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not have any further requests from the members of the Committee for interventions. IUCN would you like to add something? No. Let’s now move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM7B.19 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.19 is on page 65 of the English version and 68 of the French version of document 7B. I have received one amendment by the Delegation of Switzerland. The Swiss amendment concerns paragraphs 3 and 6.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 remain unchanged. In paragraph 3, Switzerland suggests deleting part of the sentence approximately at the end of the paragraph, which is: *to the extent of the property may be considered for inscription on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.*

The remaining paragraph accordingly reads:

Recalling that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski runs, decides that any further development of ski facilities or ski runs, or associated infrastructure, within the property and its buffer zone would result in the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 remain unchanged. In paragraph 6, the Swiss Delegation proposes an insertion to the existing text of the paragraph and I will read this paragraph in the French language, as submitted by the Swiss Delegation:

6. Demande à l'État partie d'inviter une mission conjointe de suivi Centre du patrimoine mondial/UICN sur le Bien au cours de l'année 2011, afin d'évaluer l'état de conservation du Bien et de toute extension qui aura été adoptée, une attention particulière devant être accordée à sa protection contre tout aménagement et usage faits par l'homme inappropriés dans et à l'extérieur de ses limites susceptibles d'avoir des impacts sur la valeur et l'intégrité du Bien, afin d'étudier la possibilité d'établir des zones tampons plus appropriées qui répondent aux exigences énoncées dans le paragraphe 104 des Orientations et afin d'examiner le projet de nouveau plan de gestion en s'assurant qu'il garantira une protection permanente de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du Bien.

Following paragraph 7 remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.7B.19 of the first unchanged paragraphs 1 and 2? I see none. They are adopted.

Moving to paragraph 3, I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. I read again the text that the Swiss Delegation would like to delete at the end of the paragraph: *to the extent of the property may be considered for inscription on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraph 3 as amended by Switzerland? I see none, it is adopted.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding their adoption? I see none. They are adopted.

As for paragraph 6, I give the floor to our rapporteur who will read the part inserted by Switzerland.”

Rapporteur:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, il y a un nouveau texte inséré entre ses *limites* et *afin d'examiner* :

ses limites susceptibles d'avoir des impacts sur la valeur et l'intégrité du bien, afin d'étudier la possibilité d'établir des zones tampons plus appropriées qui répondent aux exigences énoncées dans le paragraphe 104 des Orientations ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraph 6 as amended by Switzerland? I see none, it is adopted.

Paragraph 7 remains unchanged. Are there any objections regarding its adoption? I see none. It is adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.19** is adopted including paragraphs 1 to 7.

Next item on the list in the Europe and North America is the **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)**. I give the floor to Mr. Rao.”

Mr. Rao:

“Thank you Chair. The main issue of concern is the planned reopening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill, and it is likely to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal. Since its inscription in 1996, the Committee has expressed concerns about the mill's discharge of toxic wastewater into Lake Baikal and highlighted the importance of eliminating this issue by putting in place a close-loop water treatment system. The State Party has specified that the reopening is necessary in view of the social and economic considerations and the fact that over 2,000 individuals have lost their jobs, causing great suffering, especially in a time of economic crisis.

The mill was closed in October 2008 and the Russian authorities had committed to adopting the close-loop water cycle before restarting the mill. The State Party further states that the existing laws and regulations do not allow for discharge of harmful substances into the lake or in its basin. Hence, the pollution content and the total volume of the wastewater that will be discharged from the mill will be controlled.

On 28 June Greenpeace and WWF Russia submitted to the Director of the World Heritage Centre 1,025 petitions addressed to the director general of UNESCO protesting against the reopening of the mill. According to news reports, Russia's Supreme Court has held the reopening of the mill as legal.

In the Draft Decision, it is proposed that the World Heritage Centre, together with IUCN, convene a meeting with the Russian authorities and relevant stakeholders to discuss how these impacts can be addressed. Mr Chairman IUCN has also a comment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. IUCN notes that the mill current operation includes bleaching pulp with chlorine which creates several toxic by-products that are likely to affect the ecological balance and the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal. IUCN emphasises that there is an urgent need to evaluate the various mitigation scenarios for the mill including a cost effective close-loop water system or total phasing out, if no cost effective mitigations are possible. A total phasing out would of course require the development of alternative livelihoods for the population.

IUCN notes that these are the types of questions that should be the focus of the high-level monitoring mission proposed in paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision. We also note that the threatening operations that have been permitted through the adoption of decree N° 1, as noted in point 4 of the Draft Decision. This decree has legalized these operations. Rescinding this decree would seem to be an obvious and necessary action in addressing the threats from the reactivated mill. Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is opened for the Committee members. Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you to the Secretariat and IUCN for their mission and attention to this very difficult and important issue. Conservation of the Lake Baikal unique ecological system is one of the top priorities of the Russian government’s policies on environmental protection. The government of the Russian Federation pays utmost attention to solving the problem of the operation of the Paper and Pulp Mill. Reopening of the mill does not mean that it is allowed to discharge wastewater into Lake Baikal. The management of the company is obliged by Federal law to clean wastewaters to ensure that their conditions comply with approved standards of maximum permissible concentration of pollutants.

As you know, a special government decree, N°1, was approved in January this year. It called for the introduction of amendments to the list of activities prohibited in the central ecological zone of the Baikal area adopted in 2001. The most important thing is that the governmental decision mentioned in both neither alters, nor deteriorates the ecological status of Lake Baikal, because it is regulated by utterly strict mechanisms. The most important among them is a set of new, stricter ecological standards of maximum permissible impact on Lake Baikal for any productions located in the central ecological zone of Lake Baikal.

In July 2010, it was registered at the Ministry of Justice, thus acquiring the effective power of the federal law. According to official governmental monitoring data during the last ten years, all objective indicators, including water quality of the state of the Lake Baikal, have not undergone negative changes. The quality of water significantly exceeds requirements applied in Russia to water used for drinking and fishery purposes. Once again, it was confirmed by the analysis of samples taken from the Lake on 10 July 2010.

I would like to specifically single out the following: The government of the Russian Federation with a purpose of ensuring a long-term protection of Lake Baikal from negative impacts has initiated a series of additional substantial measures to minimise possible negative impacts on Lake Baikal.

1) The decisions have been made on development and further approval of the federal Programme Protection of Lake Baikal and Socioeconomic development of the Baikal Natural Area, which aims at coordinating socioeconomic and ecological measures as a package. Implementation of the Programme will start in 2011. Yesterday, 29 July 2011, the Prime Minister declared officially that US\$32 millions will be allocated for implementation for the first phase of the Programme in 2011. The overall budget of the Programme will be close to US\$3 billions. This is a new and very positive development.

2) The executive decision of the Russian Federation was given to several ministries to work out a programme on transfer of the production of a high quality bleached pulp from the Baikalsk mill to another mill outside the Baikal region. Taking into account the complexity and the socioeconomic situation in the town of Baikalsk and the necessity of making a balance decision on the future of the Baikalsk mill, the Ministry of Industry of the Russian Federation, owners of the Baikalsk Mill, were requested by the government to work out within a 30 month period ^[The Chairperson interrupts the speaker to ask her to conclude] a joint programme on the recycling and utilisation of waste accumulated during the long period of the mill operations.

I suppose the monitoring mission will be very, very useful and we have proposed some small changes to the Draft Decision, which we have submitted to the Secretariat. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Estonia.”

Estonia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. First of all, thank you very much for the encouraging information from the State Party, which was not available to us before. The Estonian Delegation wishes to express very serious concerns about the water pollution of Lake Baikal, which is caused by the reopening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill, but also for the inflow of the Selenga River which constitutes half of its water input. As Lake Baikal is the most important fresh water reservoir in the scale of the whole world, it is of utmost concern to ensure its water quality. We are well aware that the polluted water of Selenga River is a problem that can be solved only in cooperation with the Russian Federation and Mongolia, as the river flows in both countries.

In our view, the Outstanding Universal Value is under such a serious threat that it presents the basis for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, unless quick measures to improve the situation are taken. Therefore, we have submitted an amendment to the Draft Decision which proposes, in the absence of substantial progress by 2011, the inscription of Lake Baikal on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee at its 35th session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“This site requires our utmost attention and it is very important to underline the significant efforts that have been deployed by the State Party along these lines: Improving management, strengthening the legal protection for the site, combating pollution, prohibiting destruction of the flora and also expressing the State Party’s concern when it comes to the pipeline which is planned very close to the property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

I would also like to congratulate the State Party for its efforts and to thank it for all the information that we have just heard. We can see that measures have been taken to limit illegal construction around the rim of the Lake and also the illegal sale of land adjacent to the property. There is also the State Party concern regarding tourism, which the Brazilian Delegation understands, as it is managed on a very rational basis with a true concern to protect and safeguard the property.

Therefore, the Brazilian Delegation feels, given this new information we have just heard from the State Party and also the information we can see through measures taken by the State Party, these measures ought to be reflected in the Draft Decision, and that is a change we would suggest. This is the reason why we have suggested certain amendments to the Draft Decision. They have been submitted to the rapporteur and we would suggest Mr. Chairman whether this would be the right moment to ask the rapporteur to include the statement? Is it up to me to state the Brazilian Delegation’s amendment or is it up to the rapporteur? I was just wondering about the procedure to follow Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“I prefer to do it when we come to the examination of the Draft Decision. Would you accept that?”

Brazil :

“Certainly Sir, I just wanted to say that these amendments go along the line of what Brazil has said and the clarification from the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Lake Baikal is the largest fresh water lake in the world and is common heritage to mankind. This issue is twofold: On the one hand, we have to maintain the ecological environment and, on the other, we have to sustain the normal lives of the people living in the area.

After hearing the explanation of the Russian federation, we are pleased to see that a lot of effective measures have been taken in the managerial, legal and financial aspects. So, I am very pleased to see in the Draft Decision that a long-term monitoring process has been required for the State Party for their continuing efforts for keeping the water quality of Lake Baikal and to keep effective management of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. No further request for the floor? We will then start examining Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.22 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.22 is on page 39 of the English and 41 of the French versions of document 7B.Add. I have received amendments from the Russian Federation, Brazil and Estonia which concern paragraphs 3, 4 and 10 of the current Draft Decision. As one of the amendments is somewhat lengthy I think you may prefer to see them on the screen rather than having me reading them.

Could the technical team assist us in switching the screens please? Thank you. According to the amendments we have received: Paragraphs 1 and 2 remain unchanged.

Paragraph 3 has been amended by Brazil and the Russian Federation and would now read:

3. Notes with serious concern the recent re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) without a close-loop water system as well as the continued pollution from the Selenga river, and considers that the discharge of wastewater from the mill with a quantity of pollutants exceeding maximum permissible concentrations and from the Selenga river could impact the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal.

Concerning paragraph 4, Brazil and the Russian Federation suggest deleting it and inserting the following new text—this is the text I referred to as somewhat lengthy and wanted to show you on the screen:

Takes note of the information provided by the State Party—then, there are three paragraphs following and I assume we could name them a, b, c:

a) *On the development of the Federal Target Programme "Protection of Baikal Lake and Socio-economic development of the Baikal Nature Territory" that in particular includes activities on utilization and recycling of waste having been accumulated during more than 50 years as well as on land restoration,*

b) *On the intention of the State Party to transfer the production of a high quality bleached pulp to another mill outside the Baikal region,*

c) *On the intention of the State Party to determine 30-month period for the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill to address the issue of waste treatment and making a principal solution on the Mill's operation.*

Paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 remain unchanged.

In paragraph 10 we have amendments from Brazil and the Russian Federation and an addition at the end of the paragraph by Estonia, and I read the paragraph including all those amendments:

10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by 1 February 2011, on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular progress made in preventing the discharge of untreated wastewater into Lake Baikal, addressing continuing high levels of pollution in the Selenga River, developing a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property, and monitoring the Baikal seal population and the impacts of climate change on the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, with a view to considering in the absence of substantial progress the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

We are showing you the paragraphs in both language versions on the screen, however I would suggest that since the English version is the version that has been submitted, we would adopt on the basis of the English version and should there be necessity in the improvement of the French version, please let us know, so that we can accordingly take that into consideration. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Let’s move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.22 paragraph by paragraph. The first two paragraphs remaining unchanged, are there any objections regarding their adoption? I see none, they are adopted.

For paragraph 3, I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Paragraph 3 remains the same up to *and considers that* then continues:

and considers that the discharge of wastewater from the mill with a quantity of pollutants exceeding maximum permissible concentrations and from the Selenga river could impact the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding adoption or paragraph 3? Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry Chair, it is not actually an objection, it is an attempt to understand it. If I read the amendment there seems to be a factual question about whether it is anticipating that there are not currently polluted waters flowing to the Lake, but that there might be in the future. Can I ask the question to IUCN to understand better?”

The second question, if I may, through you Mr. Chairman. The paragraph talks about *exceeding maximum permissible concentrations* and I wonder if we could clarify with the State Party, who would set this maximum, then we might be able to insert something like *exceeding maximum permissible concentrations as determined by the State Party* or whatever the wording is.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thanks Chair. The information on the past, on the mill, is that it caused 51 percent of the atmospheric discharge and 86 percent of the wastewater entering Lake Baikal and 32 percent of all solid waste, so I guess we would assume that in the absence of any mitigation measure, which, if I understand, are not foreseen for another 13 months period, then on theory we would be contemplating that sort of scale resumption of impact. Beyond that, it is difficult to surmise, but that’s information we have on the mill on its previous operation up to its closure in 2008.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation, the State Party, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you Chair. Permissible concentrations are accepted by the law and eventually it is the government who proposes and enforces the maximum and permissible concentration of waste.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Given the explanation from IUCN, I am very happy to accept the change proposed by the Russian Federation and Brazil and given the clarification from the Russian Federation if we could just insert the words *exceeding maximum permissible concentrations as determined by the government of the Russian Federation.*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Do you accept, Russian Federation?”

Russian Federation:

“It is not a problem.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding adoption of paragraph 3? I see none. It is adopted.

Now, we are moving to paragraph 4 and our rapporteur will re-read it.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. The original paragraph 4 has been deleted at the proposal of Brazil and the Russian federation and the new text reads as follow:

4. Takes note of the information provided by the State Party:

a) On the development of the Federal Target Programme ‘Protection of Baikal Lake and Socio-economic development of the Baikal Nature Territory’ that in particular includes activities on utilization and recycling of waste having been accumulated during more than 50 years as well as on land restoration,

b) On the intention of the State Party to transfer the production of a high quality bleached pulp to another mill outside the Baikal region,

c) On the intention of the State Party to determine 30-month period for the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill to address the issue of waste treatment and making a principal solution on the Mill's operation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN has a comment on paragraph 4.”

IUCN:

“Thanks Chair. I think we should comment on this, in terms of the assessment of the impacts of the mill and I just outlined, in the answer to the previous question, the scale when the mill was in operation of its impact on Lake Baikal. One can note that the point here tries to mitigate the impact of the mill. If it is in operation, there are two points of concern.

One is to put a development like this back in operation without having assessed the impacts of that. One might consider that with the site we had in Thailand when we were talking about an impact assessment identifying alternative opportunities to mitigate, we would normally council a precautionary approach to design the mitigation, before deciding to reopen the development and especially when it had such a record of damage. And if I understand well the third point, it would create a situation where for 30 months we would not see any mitigation in place, which is a long period of time. These are just observations and it is clearly for the Committee to deliberate on the Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. I turn to the Committee members. Would you like to have the floor? Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chair. Sweden thinks that paragraph 4 is a very important part of the Draft Decision and we want it to remain.”

The Chairperson:

“Were you talking about the original text or the new text proposed by the Russian Federation and Brazil?”

Sweden:

“We were talking about the original text.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you have the floor, no? Estonia you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“We support Sweden’s proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“May I give some clarification regarding this decree? Dear colleagues, this mill never stopped, it was not reopened and it was operating all this time. Now, the government only legalised that work, because, nowadays, it is necessary to remove this mill and it is time to re-conquer the ground for cultivation nearby. It is more dangerous now for Baikal to close this mill, because tomorrow nobody will re-cultivate 50 years of wasted ground. So, I would like you to understand what we are talking about. It was not closed and reopened. It was in operation unfortunately.”

The Chairperson:

“Brazil would like to comment.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. The Brazilian Delegation notes the clarification given by the Russian Federation and we think that really does explain the need for the amendment we have submitted. The situation was very serious. The mill was not actually closed and then reopened. Unfortunately it did continue to operate. But the State Party took the necessary steps to reduce any negative effects. We maintain our amendment and we do feel that it is necessary to bear in mind the concern that we have expressed, but also the clarification provided by the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Before I give the floor to South Africa, could Sweden clarify its request? Do you have any objections on the insertion from the Russian Federation and Brazil or do you just want to keep the original text of the paragraph and you do not have any objections to the addition of the Russian Federation and Brazil?”

Sweden:

“Thank you Sir. We have no objections to the new text of the paragraph 4 if the original text is kept.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“I would like to clarify once more. To reclaim the decree is impossible because it will work in any case. We ask for 30 months. It is a governmental plan that something will be done to this mill and we invite the reactive mission to assess that it has been done. To put here *rescind decree* and what it gives in real life, I do not understand. Why is it necessary to put here *rescind*. Whether you write *rescind decree* or not, the mill is working.”

The Chairperson:

“South Africa, you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“The question that you asked, Sweden, I am not sure whether it was answered, because I wanted to understand the rationale behind Sweden’s insistence that the paragraph remains, and the explanation was not quite clear, maybe they could elaborate more. But we would like to support the amendments from Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Sweden, could you give more clarification?”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We think that there is something not so clear in the state of conservation report. According to paragraph 3, the paper mill has been reopened, but if it has been operating for the whole time, as was stated by the Russian Federation, then we can accept to delete the first original part of paragraph and go for the new text. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the Delegation of Brazil.”

Brazil (English interpretation):

“Thank you very much Sir. I am having difficulties understanding the various arguments being put forward, especially the one being put forward by the Delegation of Sweden. Once again, I would like to say that I provide my support to the State Party. It seems to me that the State Party is ready to resolve the problem and adopt a policy in this regard.

The State Party seems to be deploying all the various necessary efforts to remedy the situation. We need to get them some time to do so. We need to reiterate our confidence in the State Party, so I fail to see why we are calling into questions the intention of the State Party. I therefore support the amendment made by the Russian Federation, endorsed by South Africa. And if I am off the mark, I would like to have more clarification from the Swedish Delegation because it is not clear to me where they are driving at. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. IUCN would you have anything to add?”

IUCN:

“There are two issues that are being discussed for the moment: One is about the closure of the mill, and we have just been looking for our sources on this, and it is actually

the State Party report of 2009 which stated that a difficult situation arose in September 2008 due to the plant's adoption of close water circulation; as a result, production of the bleach pulp stopped, producing an unbleached pulp which turned out not to be profitable.

Also, the Committee has just adopted paragraph 3 which refers to the recent reopening of the mill, there is a question there of the reality and the information that we have consistently received implied the mill was closed down and reopened.

The second point is about the decree. What has happened is with the removal of what was paragraph 12 which substantially banned discharges from paper production, that is the references page 37 from the state of conservation report. I am not sure I can do more than just clarifying these Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you IUCN. Before going further with the debate and to give the floor to China, I would like to give the floor to our rapporteur. We have a new wording to propose to the member States regarding the original paragraph 4."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is never easy to propose a text in between two rather opposed point of views, but we are trying to put forward something that might be a compromise before the two positions we heard. It would not concern the new amendment proposed by the Russian Federation and Brazil. What we propose would be a replacement of the original 4. This would read:

Requests the State Party to reduce the permitted limits of wastewater disposal from the paper mills into Lake Baikal and develop in collaboration with the Advisory Body a Programme for gradual reduction of the wastewater disposal for the following 18 months.

I repeat perhaps a second time:

Requests the State Party to reduce the permitted limits of wastewater disposal from the paper mills into Lake Baikal and develop in collaboration with the Advisory Body a Programme for gradual reduction of the wastewater disposal."

The Chairperson:

"Russian Federation, you have the floor."

Russian Federation:

"Thank you very much. First of all, it is not a proposal of the Russian Federation and Brazil and I would say that it would be impossible to fulfil. Why do we have to put what is impossible to fulfil? I would say that our norms on wastewater are much stricter than in many other countries in Europe, I can assure you. So, it is not necessary to put some additional measures. The Advisory Bodies are invited, as is mentioned in another paragraph, we suggest receiving them. I propose the deletion and to keep only what we proposed with Brazil: *Takes note of the information provided* and etc."

The Chairperson:

"China, you have the floor."

China:

"After having listened to so many speakers, we think that the newly added material is much better than the original one, because the joint amendment from Brazil and the Russian Federation is very clear on the Russian action in preserving the environment, in finance, managerial and technological activities. We think reflecting their idea shows confidence and the political will of the Russian Federation. China supports the newly added amendments into this Draft Decision."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you China, but we are talking about the original text of paragraph 4"

China:

"Yes, I am talking about paragraph 4 and the new amendment replacing it."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. The floor is to Brazil."

Brazil :

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am taking the floor, once again I realise, to repeat the arguments which underscore the amendment proposed to paragraph 4 by the Russian Federation and the Brazilian Delegation. In my view, the new explanation provided by the State Party whereby there is a strict legal framework put in place by the State Party which protects the site and is designed to minimise the negative impact of the operation of the mill. In this case, then, it would seem to me that these arguments are sufficient to justify our amendment.

In my view, the Committee should show its confidence in the State Party and gives us the necessary time to carry out measures in line with the political will the State Party already demonstrated. The Committee cannot always be mistrustful of State Parties. Cooperation between Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and State Parties is absolutely fundamental."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I would like to postpone the adoption of paragraph 4 and I am asking the Russian Federation, Brazil, Sweden and also Estonia to put forward a compromise text.

We are suspending the adoption of this Draft Decision and we are moving to the next site, **Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)**, and the floor is to Mr. Rao."

Mr. Rao:

“This report was requested by a member Committee to be opened for discussion. A joint World heritage Centre-IUCN monitoring mission visited the property in May 2010. Its findings and recommendations are already summarised in the report which is for your consideration. Since the mission, the World Heritage Centre has received information about new initiatives to build several ski resorts in the Caucasus Mountains and these plans were presented in the margin of the 14th ‘Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum’, which is the main economic forum of Russia and the Commonwealth States and was held in June 2010.

According to the information available, there are plans to build a chain of five ski resorts and this includes the area of the Lagonaki plateau, with 165 kilometres of ski slopes and 30 ski lifts inside the World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that if this development is approved, it would constitute significant threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the Property. A letter has been sent to the State Party to request more information on this project and its impact. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN does not want to add anything, so I am turning to the Committee members. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chair. Sweden has been engaged in this case in previous Committee meetings and now we want to commend the State Party for the relocation of the Olympic facilities outside the World Heritage site. This is really good news for the property. There are other important plans such as the creation of a protecting corridor linking the property with the Kavkazkiy Nature Reserve. However, the reactive monitoring mission also states that there are still serious threats due to logging and tourism development in parts of the area.

We really want to highlight the progress made but also express concerns about the remaining threats to this important property of the Caucasus Mountains. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not see any further requests for the floor. We pass to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.24 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.24 is on page 49 of the English and 52 of the French versions of document 7B.ad, and I have not received any written amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.24** including paragraphs 1 to 9? No, It is adopted. Thank you very much.

We are moving to the next site, **Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)**, which has been requested for discussion by the Russian Federation. You have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. We are not satisfied with the last paragraph of the Draft Decision and I would like to give some explanations. The World heritage site Virgin Komi Forests, consisting of several specially protected areas, is one of the most spacious World heritage site of Russia. It covers an area of nearly 3.3 millions km². It is actually the last of the largest Boreal forest areas in Europe...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]*.

“Excuse-me. I was thinking that this was requested by the Russian Federation.”

Russian Federation:

“Yes, I requested to examine this site because we are not satisfied with...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]*.

“Just a minute... I am sorry, but it is fine you can go on.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. According to the Federal law on differentiation of State ownership for land in 2008, as it was stated in the State Party report, the Federal Real Estate Cadastre Agency finalised the limitation of the boundaries of the Yugyd Va National Park and Pitchullich Nature Reserve. It was a really important exercise because when there are two protected areas, which include the property. Their boundaries have descriptive and legally relative characters. I could report now that the land lot of Yugyd Va and Pitchullich Nature Reserve are officially in the Federal Cadastre and land register of Federal property. It appears that the delimitation of the boundaries resulted in an extension of the area of the National Park, as compared with the area defined by the government in 1994.

In this regard, boundaries of the National Park were specified, so as to fully comply with the area, as it was approved by the governmental decision. Such areas, which have lost their biological and ecological values as a result of economic activities and which do not have Outstanding Universal Values, were excluded of the boundaries of the Yugyd Va National Park.

The Russian Federation supports the proposed recommendation to organise a joint World Heritage Centre-IUCN monitoring mission to the property. We consider the inscription of the property to the List of World Heritage in Danger would be considered only taken into account the recommendations of the evaluation mission. Thereby, I ask to delete from paragraph 8 the sentence: *with a view of considering in the absence of substantial progress the inscription on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.*”

The Chairperson:

“Did you present an amendment to the rapporteur?”

Federation of Russia:

“Yes we did.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just to comment briefly and the Secretariat can confirm. The concern about the national exercise to confirm the boundaries is that the boundary of the World Heritage property is what has been inscribed by this Committee, so it is not possible to redefine the boundaries or determine areas that are or not an Outstanding Universal Value through a national exercise. That would be done via minor boundary modification or an extension or other Committee process. I think, firstly, there is a call for concern there, but it does seem that the material issue is whether there is a de facto mining activity within the area that is already inscribed on the World heritage List despite that national exercise. That issue is explained in the report, I will not go further on that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. Any further requests for intervention? I see none, I suggest we examine Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.25 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.25 is on page 49 of the English and 52 of the French versions of document 7B.ad. I have received a shared amendment by the Mexican Delegation and the Russian Federation which concerns paragraph 8. The two Delegations propose deleting the following phrases of the paragraph:

Focusing specifically on the halting of mining and the restoration of all areas of the property to protect the area status and deleted would be the end: with a view to considering in the absence of substantial progress the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The remaining paragraph would then read:

Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property, taking into account results of a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, (this in an addition) for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

I read again the addition: taking into account results of a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections on the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.25 paragraphs 1 to 7? I see none. They are adopted.

Moving to the last paragraph, number 8. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this paragraph after the amendment from the Mexican and Russian Delegations? I see none. It is adopted.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.25 including paragraphs 1 to 8 is adopted. Thank you very much.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

We still have one site on our List, **Alejandro de Humboldt National Park (Cuba)** and before that I would like the Russian Federation, Estonia and Sweden to come with a compromise amendment on the Lake Baikal, as we are going to examine this after the following item. Secretariat you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The main concern regarding this property lies in the existence of non-attributed mining concessions located both within and immediately adjacent to the boundaries. Though non-attributed, the ongoing existence of clearly define mining concessions in the property represents in the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN an expression of interest in the option to activate them in these areas in the future.

For the past two years the Committee has requested that these concessions be legally terminated. The State Party has responded in both cases by indicating that it had no intention of activating the concessions, but not by terminating them. As the Committee recalls, the conservation objectives of the World Heritage Convention have also been formally recognised by the World's largest mining companies assembled under ICMM, the International Council on Mining and Metals. In their 2003 policy statement, the ICMM has recognised the World Heritage *Convention* above all other heritage conservation initiatives, due to its intergovernmental nature and its rigorous and technical review processes associated with it.

In this regard the World Heritage Centre and IUCN also believe that the ongoing existence of mining concessions within the property boundaries risks giving ground for ICMM to reconsider its very important commitment to the World Heritage *Convention*.”

The Chairperson:

“No further statement from IUCN? The floor is to members of the Committee. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you very much Chair. We have noted the Humboldt issue of mining has been at the fore of the discussion of our Committee and we would like to thank the Secretariat for its comments. We would like to specifically refer to the mining concessions that have been granted within the boundaries of the property.

It seems to me that the State Party could move forward in activating those and we would like to see a presentation in terms of the current status of these concessions. We understand that they are currently inactive, but we would like to see them, in fact, revoked. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. I give the floor to the State Party if it is in the room.”

Cuba :

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Distinguished members of the Committee, the situation of this Park is quite abnormal. There were mining activities in this Park in the 1950s and 1980s as well and then in the 1990s. We gave up the mining activities as our economy was in a difficult stage. However, in the new millennium exceptional natural resources have been given their due, and we keep this Park in its original shape and we want to maintain it on the List knowing that it was first listed in 2001.

The current situation is this:

1) Mining concessions granted previously on this site have never been activated, and at the last Committee session, we informed the Secretariat, twice as a matter of fact, that there will be no mining operations carried out in the site.

2) The state of conservation report made it clear that the area is in a better state of conservation than it was when it was first inscribed in 2001.

3) Cuba has officially and firmly expressed its commitment to conserving this site and proofs of this are the numbers of activities we have taken in that direction. This is all contained in the report that the Secretariat has received.

Cuba would like to take this opportunity to once again reiterate its commitment to conserve the Alejandro de Humboldt National Park and I can tell you that we have made a great effort in terms of keeping this property in proper shape. If it actually came to revoking the mining concession, this is something that might not be necessary.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. The Brazilian Delegation would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for the report and the explanation that we have received. Indeed, the concerns on the part of Brazil have been covered by what Cuba has just told us. Therefore, Brazil has no questions to the State Party.

We would like it to be noted that in the Draft Decision, there is the idea that the very presence of the mining concessions presupposes a risk on the part of Cuba, but they did actually pre-exist as concerned the 2001 inscription. So, they are actually only a risk if they are going to be activated, in our opinion. If they were to be activated then the mining activities would indeed be a threat to the site. But as these mining concessions predate the listing of the site, we do not think they present a threat and would like to make an amendment along those lines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. China you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We are very pleased to see that much has been done by the State Party in terms of the management of the property. For example, the prevention of forest fires, restoration of habitats and ecotourism infrastructure maintenance. We have also studied the state of conservation report of the State party for this site and we think that according to this report, in view of the World heritage Centre and IUCN’s comments, there is a possibility that the State Party might mine the property, which threatens the Outstanding Universal Value of the site.

However, we think that the expression of this intent does not show that the State Party will, for sure, open the mines. At this stage, we do not think that actual actions of the State Party for whether to open the mine or not carry much weight other than a possibility that it will be open. We think that it is better that in the future, the State Party should receive a long-term monitoring from the Centre and IUCN. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sir. Iraq has the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I express my great happiness about what the State Party is doing and endorse completely what was said by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Iraq. Mexico, do you want to have the floor again?”

Mexico :

“Thank you very much Chair. We just wanted to point out, that given the explanation we just heard from the State Party, the Mexican Delegation has submitted an amendment and we would like to put this forward, as we think that it might solve the problem.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. There are no more requests for the floor, let’s then move on to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.33 and I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.33 is on page 88 of the English and page 94 of the French version of document 7B.ad. I have received amendments from two Delegations, Brazil and Mexico, which concerns paragraphs 4 and 6.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 remain unchanged. In paragraph 4 the Delegation of Brazil suggest replacing *must be considered* by *if activated could be considered*. The last part of the paragraph then reads:

but considers that the continued existence of mining concessions if activated could be considered as a potential threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines.

Paragraph 5 remains unchanged. In paragraph 6, the Delegation of Mexico proposes deleting the following phrase: *specific actions confirming the examination of all mining concessions that could affect the property* and to replace this phrase by *on the inactivity of all mining concessions with a view to their upcoming cancellation*. Paragraph 6 would then read:

6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the inactivity of all mining concessions with a view to their upcoming cancellation, and updating the World Heritage Committee on any other factors significantly affecting the Values and integrity, of the property."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 3 of Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.33? I see none, they are adopted.

The floor is to the rapporteur for paragraph 4."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. In paragraph 4 the Delegation of Brazil suggests deleting *must be* and to replace it by *if activated could be*. The last part of the paragraph then read:

but considers that the continued existence of mining concessions if activated could be considered as a potential threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. IUCN would like to comment."

IUCN:

"There is a need to understand that, if a mining concession is activated, it is not a potential threat, it is an ascertained threat. I wonder if the rapporteur could consider that in the language. It is clear that if the mine is activated then it is no longer a potential threat."

The Chairperson:

"Brazil would you like to comment? You wish to maintain the text as amended. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? Australia you have the floor."

Australia:

“Sorry Mr. Chair. I should have asked for the floor earlier, but I understand the point of IUCN clarification was almost a logical point. If we follow Brazil’s wording which we are happy to do, there is a change from being considered as a potential threat to becoming an actual threat. That just seems a matter of logic and with this sort of clarification we would be happy to accept the Brazilian amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur please.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much chair. I believe this can be solved by deleting the word *potential*. The phrase would then read:

Considers that the continued existence of mining concessions if activated could be considered as a threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“The Brazilian Delegation feels that the rapporteur’s suggestion was perfect as to the wording and I think that solves the problem. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“As I understand the logic of the situation, the issue would be moving from *could be considered a threat* to *would be a threat*. I think the rapporteur got us halfway there and was very helpful, but *could* needs to be changed to *would*.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is back to the rapporteur for a final reading.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I make one letter change, the c becomes w and it would read:

Considers that the continued existence of mining concessions if activated would be considered as a threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 5 remains unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this paragraph? I see none. It is adopted.

Now, paragraph 6, and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“In paragraph 6, the Delegation of Mexico proposes deleting the following phrase: *specific actions confirming the examination of all mining concessions that could affect the property* and to replace this phrase by *on inactivity of all mining concessions with a view to their upcoming cancellation*. Paragraph 6 would then read:

6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the inactivity of all mining concessions with a view to their upcoming cancellation, and updating the World Heritage Committee on any other factors significantly affecting the Values and integrity, of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 6? I see none, it is adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.33** is adopted in its entirety from paragraphs 1 to 6. Thank you very much.

Lets’ move back to Draft Decision **32 COM 7B.22.**”

Russian Federation *[interrupting The Chairperson]*.

“We are not ready. Give us some more time as they are still in the meeting room.”

The Chairperson:

“No problem, I give them more time. We have finished this region. A number of sites on the list have not been discussed by the Committee, but we have to adopt the Draft Decisions adjoining to these items.

Are there any objections regarding these remaining Draft Decisions? I see none. They are adopted.

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

I would like, as we mentioned yesterday, according to the meeting, we are going to examine **the suspended point regarding items 7A and we move to Draft Decisions of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls**. I would like to leave my Chairmanship for transparency purposes. And the floor is now to the new Chair.”

The new Chair:

“Dear colleague, we now move to item 34 COM 7A.20 concerning the Old City of Jerusalem. As you may recall we still have one item remaining to be examined under 7A, and it refers to the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger. The property is the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls. It is a site proposed by Jordan and the document of reference is WHC10/34.COM/7A.ad. The Draft Decision 34 COM.7A.REV for our approval is being distributed in the room.

I have the pleasure to announce that the concerned parties have been able, today, to reach a consensus. On behalf of the Committee, I should like to express our deepest gratitude to all parties involved and to the director general of ICCROM, Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, who was entrusted with the role of facilitator by the director general of UNESCO during the discussions between the concerned parties.

Given the tremendous work that has been put to the process and the consensus achieved, I ask to adopt the Draft Decision 34 COM.7A.Rev by consensus without debate. Are there any objections? I see no objections. I therefore declare **Draft Decision 34 COM.7A.Rev adopted**.

I would like to give the floor to the State Party of Jordan and to Mr. Bouchenaki.”

Jordan:

“Thank you Chair. The government of the Kingdom of Jordan is deeply concerned by unilateral measures and intrusive excavations that have adversely affect the integrity, authenticity and cultural heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls. There are many violations, but in the interest of time I will only mention the following few:

- 1) At this very moment there are 13 Israeli tunnelling excavation projects in and around the Old City and al Haram al Sharif. In addition to dozens of excavations, furthermore the Israeli Antiquity Authority has conducted illegal works outside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and confiscated the fence surrounding the western wall door.
- 2) Illegal tunnelling and excavations by the occupying power are hollowing out areas around and under al Haram al Sharif including the adjacent Arab neighbourhood. These unnecessary and illegal works in violation of applicable UNESCO Convention create a serious risk of damage and destruction to the site.
- 3) An intrusive Israeli trench was trounced within four metres of the Old City wall between Jaffa Gate and New Gate. It is not only offensive aesthetically, but also compromises the authenticity and integrity of the site and adversely affects the foundation of the wall through vibration.

- 4) The Damascus Gate which is the main entrance to the Old City will be arbitrarily closed by the Israeli authorities for two years to undertake additional unlawful works.
- 5) After reviewing the report of the state of conservation report of the property of sites in Danger under item 7A, Jordan is concerned about planning project submitted by the Israeli authorities which demonstrate an agenda to accelerate its policies to change the unique universal character of the Old City.
- 6) The concerned parties are considering proposals to address the issue of the Mughrabi Ascent in accordance to the UNESCO instruments and provisions on the protection of cultural heritage. Section 2 of Draft Resolution 34 COM.7A.20 the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls was explicitly drafted in this spirit. Jordan sent a comprehensive report to the World Heritage Centre preventing Israeli violations. This report is available here today and my Delegation is ready to provide any additional information.

In conclusion, and due to obvious reasons that impede Jordan from fully carrying out its duties, we call upon the urgent intervention of the Committee and the Centre to ask Israel to comply with the 1972 *Convention* and stop its illegal works in and around the Old City. We also urge the Committee and the Centre to follow up on this Decision and enable independent, impartial monitoring to ensure compliance. We believe that this will facilitate confidence building between the concerned parties in a city of universal importance to all. Thank you Chair.”

The new Chair:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Director of ICCROM Mr. Bouchenaki.”

ICCROM:

« Merci Madame la Présidente. Madame Irina Bokova, directrice générale de l’UNESCO, m’a chargé d’une mission pendant cette 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Celle d’assurer le rôle de facilitateur entre les parties concernées sur les points inscrits à l’ordre du jour de votre Comité et notamment la vieille ville de Jérusalem et ses remparts, site proposé par la Jordanie.

Deux collègues, Madame Paola Leoncini Bartoli, chef du Bureau exécutif de l’ADG, le sous-directeur général pour la culture, et Madame Krista Pikkat du cabinet de Madame la directrice générale ont été désignées pour m’assister dans cette tâche que j’ai commencée il y a deux semaines à Paris pendant deux journées de contact avec les Délégations de toutes les parties concernées. Dès notre arrivée à Brasília, nous avons bénéficié du soutien des collègues du Centre du patrimoine mondial et en particulier de son directeur, Monsieur Francesco Bandarin et de Mademoiselle Véronique Dauge en charge du dossier.

Nous avons mené les discussions avec les Délégations d’Israël, de Jordanie et de Palestine dans un esprit d’ouverture à travers un dialogue ouvert auquel les Délégations d’Australie, du Brésil, de Belgique, des États-Unis, de la Fédération de Russie et du Japon ont été étroitement associées. Le groupe arabe, présidé par l’Ambassadeur de Libye, a suivi quotidiennement le déroulement des discussions et a apporté son soutien constant pour la recherche de solutions aux questions soulevées en accord avec les principes et idéaux de l’UNESCO.

Madame la Présidente et chère amie, je voudrais remercier les ambassadeurs des pays directement impliqués dans les négociations pour leur vision et pour les propositions

constructives qui nous ont permis d'aboutir à un texte consensuel. Après l'expérience positive vécue au cours de la précédente session du Comité du patrimoine mondial tenue à Séville, cette session de Brasília gardera le souvenir de ce consensus qui fait la singularité de l'UNESCO. Madame Bokova, directrice de l'UNESCO, sera sans doute satisfaite de voir que l'esprit de rapprochement qu'elle veut promouvoir se voit concrétisé par la décision que vous venez de prendre, merci de votre attention ».

The Vice-Chair:

“Dear colleagues, the floor is to the ADG for culture to make a statement on behalf of the director general.”

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you. On behalf of the Director-General, I would like to welcome the decision reached on Jerusalem. The director general would like in particular to congratulate all the concerned parties for the willingness they have shown in order to reach an agreed text and for their openness to dialogue and exchange. Our sincere thanks go to all delegates that have contributed to this effort to reach this decision, and finally, the director general would like to specifically thank Mounir Bouchenaki who has not spared his skills and energy to spur the entire process. Mounir you have all our admiration.

We know that this is just a small step in the very complex situation of Jerusalem, but we are also aware that this step is in the right direction, the one we all work for, the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of Jerusalem. Thank you very much.”

The Vice-Chair:

“Thank you. And finally I would like to say—as Chairperson of the Executive Board: I am so happy, that it seems to me a very good signal for the next Executive Board. I hope that the five questions that we have in our agenda concerning this item will be resolved in the same spirit of consensus. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much to all of you. It is 6 o'clock and I suggest closing. Before closing we have five minutes for the compromise text? Russian Federation?”

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

[Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) Continuation]

Russian Federation:

“The compromise text will be presented by Sweden.”

The Chairperson:

“Sweden, you have the floor Sir.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. After further clarification about the paper mill decree, Sweden accepts the new wording of paragraph 4 and the deletion of the original wording. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“In the light of encouraging information provided by the State Party Estonia would like to withdraw its amendment of the last paragraph. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Estonia. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 4? Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Sir. Just to thank members and particularly Sweden for its understanding and cooperation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.22, paragraph 4, are there any objections? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraphs 5 to 9 remain unchanged. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of these paragraphs? I see none. They are adopted, thank you.

And I give the floor to our rapporteur for the adoption of paragraph 10.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I understood that Estonia withdrew its amendment to paragraph 10 and that the Russian amendment remains. The paragraph would then read:

Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by 1 February 2011, on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular progress made in preventing the discharge of untreated wastewater into Lake Baikal, addressing continuing high levels of pollution in the Selenga River, developing a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property, and monitoring the Baikal seal population and the impacts of climate change on the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

I would like to correct myself, the amendment is by Brazil and the Russian Federation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 10? I see none. It is adopted. **Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.22 is adopted** from paragraph 1 to 10.

We are now going to adjourn this session. We will meet at 7pm sharp. The floor is to the Secretariat for an announcement.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, c'est pour vous informer que les organisateurs brésiliens ont organisé un groupe de samba à côté de la piscine de l'hôtel, près du bar du capitaine, donc vous êtes tous invités à vous y rendre maintenant à 18 h. Deuxième annonce, il vous a été distribué une liste provisoire des participants qui est bien entendu un projet, puisqu'elle se base sur les enregistrements que vous avez effectués. Donc, nous vous remercions de nous contacter pour toutes les modifications que vous souhaiteriez effectuer. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia is asking for the floor.”

Australia:

“Just an announcement. We had announced on the consultative group for the future of the *Convention* that there will be a paper available today at 6pm in front of the podium, I am afraid it will have to be 10pm tonight in front of the podium at the closure of the session. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia, no further requests for the floor, this session is now closed, thank you very much.”

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 30 July, 2010

Friday, 30 July 2010
THIRTEENTH SESSION
Evening session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

The Chairperson

We are going to start. Would you join your seats please. I am going to ask the Secretariat if we have a quorum. Do we have the quorum? The Secretariat has confirmed to me that we have 14 members of the Committee, so we are going to start.

ITEM 7.2: REPORT ON THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM (*Continuation*)

We are going to start. Would you join your seats please and we are going to start with item 7.2. Actually this item was suspended up to the discussions of the item related to Jerusalem and I am asking the Delegations of Australia, Jordan and Egypt do you have a compromise text regarding paragraph 5 and 5bis. I am going to give the floor to our Rapporteur to give us more clarification regarding this item.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. When we decided to adjourn Draft Decision 7.2 Rev. we had already adopted all paragraphs with the exception of paragraph 5. The latest wording of the proposed paragraph 5 was divided into two paragraphs - paragraph 5 and paragraph 5bis. It was based on the Revised Draft Decision that had been distributed in the room on a blue paper 7.2 rev. At the suggestion of Australia the last part of the amended paragraph of Jordan and Egypt had been deleted and now reads as follows:

“Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism at US \$100,000 starting from 2010.”

Following the deletion of the last part a new paragraph was suggested by the State Parties of Jordan and Egypt, which in its last version read:

new 5bis The budget allocated for the reinforced monitoring mechanism for the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls should support the complete property.

Following this, the Australian Delegation requested to adjourn the discussion on both paragraphs until the Draft Decision for Jerusalem 7A.20 has been approved. So much for where we stopped. We have examined the Draft Decision adopted on Jerusalem 7A.20 and I note that the Draft Decision does not contain a reference on the expansion of the reinforced monitoring mechanism to the complete city of Jerusalem. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Jordan and Egypt do you maintain your amendment. You have the floor Sir.

Jordan

Well this was the intention to expand the monitoring system to include the entire old city of Jerusalem.

The Chairperson

Sir, do you maintain your amendment?

Jordan

Yes, Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Australia? Australian Delegation, you have the floor Sir.

Australia

Thank you Chair. Australia would request, the Rapporteur just reminded us, what was in the decision we took earlier, and I think she said that the decision we took did not extend to the whole of the site. So could you perhaps please repeat that for us please.

The Chairperson

I will give the floor to the Rapporteur to repeat the text and then I would like to have the opinion of the Legal Adviser.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson, I have read the decision 7A.20, I could not find any explicit reference to the reinforced monitoring mechanism being expanded to the complete property. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Britta. The Legal Adviser, I would like to have your point of view if the Committee has recognized to extend the reinforced monitoring.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman, I would seek your indulgence please. I would need two clarifications. The first clarification is if the Secretariat could please clarify how the budget is allocated or the procedures and the second is if afterwards the Rapporteur could explain the amendment again please. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Legal Adviser. I give the floor to the Secretariat. Mr Bandarin you have the floor.

The Secretariat

Thank you Mr Chairman. I think I explained it the last time. In fact any decision that has budgetary implications has to be left in suspension for the budget part, because we don't approve in our practice budget decisions in a scattered manner. We wait for the examination and approval of the budget document. So whatever is approved in terms of budget will have

to left in square brackets because then we have to see if it matches the availability of resources when we approve the budget documents.

The Chairperson

Thank you Francesco. Britta you have the floor.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. Just to summarize again the Legal Adviser. We are considering decision

The Chairperson

Legal Adviser, do you have the Draft Decision 7.2.

Rapporteur

We are considering the Draft Decision 7.2 Rev. We have previously adopted paragraphs 1 to 4, as well as 6 and 7, we left pending paragraph 5 in order to take into consideration the decision reached for the state of conservation of the old city of Jerusalem and its walls under item 7A.20. The latest version of the Draft Decision for paragraph 5 and paragraph 5bis was the following. Based on the submission of Jordan and Egypt and following a request for deletion of its last part by Australia, paragraph 5 reads as follows:

Decides to set a ceiling on the budget for the operation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism at US \$100,000 starting from 2010.

At the first request from Jordan and Egypt and as a compromise in accepting this deletion, paragraph 5bis was proposed which reads in its latest version:

The budget allocated for the reinforced monitoring mechanism for the old city of Jerusalem and its walls should support the complete property. The decision of both paragraphs was then adjourned at the request of Australia to take into consideration the decision on Jerusalem and I note again that in decision 7A.20 we were not able to identify an explicit mention of the expansion of the reinforced monitoring mechanism to the complete property. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australian Delegation you asked for the floor, but I would like to give the Legal Adviser the floor before. Do you mind? Are you going to give more information? Legal Adviser can I give the floor to the Australian Delegation? You have the floor Sir.

Australia

Thank you Chair. I am actually hoping to propose a solution to this problem which would be acceptable to both parties having had a brief discussion there. For Australia, our earlier objection was purely on the grounds of procedure. We just wanted to make sure we didn't take a decision on this particular item before we taken the decision on Old Jerusalem. Now that we have taken a decision Australia is very happy to have a direct reference to that decision in this decision, so if I may with your indulgence, just propose some words to go into this Draft Decision. I'll read the whole thing so that its clear.

“Decides to set the ceiling on the budget for the operation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism at US \$100,000 starting from 2010 in order to cover the RMM costs” and then insert “in relation to decision 34 COM 7A.20 Rev.” and that would be the end of that paragraph.

Just so that it is quite clear that this decision relates to the decision that we have just taken. With that proposal Australia would be very happy.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. I understand from that that Jordan and Egypt agree on the text. I give the floor to our Rapporteur for a re-reading.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The proposed text in agreement of the three States Parties would then read: "Decides to set a ceiling on the budget for the operation of the reinforced monitoring mechanism at US \$100,000 starting from 2010 in order to cover the reinforced monitoring mechanism costs in relation to decision 33 COM 7A.20 Rev." Thank you Mr Chairperson and the budget amount US \$100,000 will remain in square brackets until the budget working group has presented a draft amendment which was accepted by the Committee. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président, l'Egypte est d'accord avec la proposition Suisse et la version finale de la proposition d'inscription, merci. La proposition australienne, pardon.

The Chairperson

La Jordanie est-ce-que vous êtes d'accord avec le texte proposé par l'Australie ?

Jordan

Well in the spirit of the Draft Decision which has been taken on Jerusalem I think we should expand the monitoring system to include the entire city of Jerusalem.

The Chairperson

So you maintain that the previous text as you asked to amend.

Jordan

Yes, I just don't see where is the problem in that.

The Chairperson

You had the explanations from the Secretariat and our Rapporteur and I would like to remind you that this Draft Decision was suspended up to the adoption of the Draft Decision referring to Jerusalem and the decision adopted for the site of Jerusalem doesn't mention any reinforcing monitoring for the old city. Do you remember, you agree with me?

Jordan

Yes I agree with you, but our proposal was very clear and I hope that the Director of the World Heritage Centre would comment on that. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I would like to give the floor first to the Legal Adviser before giving it to the Director of the World Heritage Centre. Legal Adviser you have the floor.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chair. I think that the clarification that was provided by the Secretariat of the Centre is quite clear. There are budgetary procedures that have to be fulfilled and with the amendment proposed by Australia it is clear that the budgetary appropriation will be made to implement the resolution that was recently adopted on Jerusalem. So, from our point of view if the Secretariat is satisfied with the text as proposed by Australia and fits within the practice of the Committee we recommend that it be adopted. We recommend to the Committee that that should be easiest process. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you Legal Adviser. Secretariat, would you like to add something.

The Secretariat

Thank you Mr Chairman. I would like to confirm that the text proposed by Australia is completely exhaustive because it refers to the decision that was just adopted, by the way it took almost a week to be agreed and I think this is the effect of the present reference for this site. I would think that the text proposed by Australia is fully satisfactory from our point of view.

The Chairperson

Thank you Secretariat. Jordan you have the floor Sir.

Jordan

Well, o.kay, just for the sake of closing the debate on this, I would agree with that.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Jordan. Any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 5. Draft Decision 34 COM 7.2 Rev. I see none. Adopted. And **Draft Decision 34 COM 7.2 Rev.** is adopted in its totality, paragraphs 1 to 7. Thank you very much.

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

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/7C

*Decision: **34 COM 7C***

We are moving to the next item on our agenda, to item 7C regarding the reflection on the strengths of the state of conservation and I would like to give the floor to Mrs Rössler of the World Heritage Centre to use the outcome and the analysis of the discussion that had been held in Quebec City. Mrs Rössler you have the floor.

The Secretariat

Thank you very much Mr President and good evening everybody. This refers to two discussions we had in Quebec in 2008 and in Seville in 2009 and the Committee asked to present this document to you. In addition, it refers to the guidance on heritage impact assessments which was already presented to you by ICOMOS. You also recall that Mr Rao

at the opening of item 7 referred to this item on Transia. This document was prepared with my colleague Mr Veillon and it presents an analytical summary of a period of five years, that means from 2005 to 2009. The analysis is of course only on the basis of reports of properties presented to the Committee, we said at the orientation session that it was the top of the iceberg. So scientifically the data may not be statistically significant and therefore we have made, if you wish, a kind of disclaimer in paragraph 18 of your document as the numbers are too small for sound scientific analysis. However, I would like to just show you two slides for the sake of time. You have here in front of you the percentage of the natural and cultural properties by each of five primary groups of threats. As you can see in the document, we have grouped it by five types and you see here for cultural heritage that the issues relate in particular to management and legal issues and for natural heritage to development proposals infrastructure and other human activities.

Next slide please. The second slide shows the threats by region and in red you see the increasing one and in green the stable, but high threats over a five-year period. In essence we have quite a wide range of threats. We have, in particular, the two key groups of threats, development and infrastructure, in particular with high-rise buildings and dams and management and legal issues, and I have to highlight that the absence of management plans and management systems remains a very important threat. We also have to note unfortunately that civil unrest and war remains important and are on the increase. Mr President, IUCN will make a statement on behalf of the Advisory Bodies.

The Chairperson

IUCN you have the floor.

IUCN

IUCN on behalf of the subsidiary bodies welcomes the summary compiled by the World Heritage Centre on the state of conservation of those world heritage properties that have been the subject of state of conservation reports that have been the subject of state of conservation reports over the last five years. IUCN would like to note that a broader understanding of the state of all natural world heritage properties would be timely and beneficial. To this end IUCN would like to develop a more comprehensive review of the overall state of inscribed natural properties in order to better inform the Committee. Lastly, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to two documents relating to the state of conservation of natural world heritage sites. The first is titled "tourism and natural heritage", priorities for enhancing performance and provides an analysis of the impacts of tourism on natural properties and it includes recommendations for better management. The second document entitled "Making natural world heritage sites more resilient to climate change" presents a possible way forward to support an effective response to climate change in natural world heritage sites. These documents are available from the IUCN desk. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So now I invite the members of the Committee to express their comments. I see Sweden, Estonia, Mexico. Sweden you have the floor Madam.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Sweden would like to thank the Centre for this excellent report. This is indeed the kind of input the Committee needs when addressing state of conservation issues in the future direction of the Convention. Including sustainable development and sustaining the credibility of the Convention. The trends give us signals when to act and how to make priorities in issues like management legislation, international assistance and capacity-building and education. The report points to the fact that

development and infrastructure projects and insufficient management and legal protection among other issues are the main threats. What to worry you is the key issue here is the necessity to strengthen management and legal protection of the properties. The striking feature in many of the problematic cases is an apparent lack of information sharing and communication between stakeholders. What also often is lacking is a holistic view and good planning processes and procedures. We would like to highlight two important aspects here. Always look for alternatives and analyse their consequences. Make sure you involve stakeholders. We would also like to see higher demands on protection and management at the time of inscription of sites and a guarantee of sustainability for a certain period of time to avoid early alarming statement of conservation for endangered listing. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you Mr Chair. Estonia also appreciates this thorough and systematic analysis provided by the World Heritage Centre very much. We would like to focus on one specific time concerning the Convention as international standard setting instrument and its legal implications at national level. As reflected in this paper and evident in many state of conservation reports management and legal issues are one of the key threats to the world heritage properties worldwide. More than two-thirds of the properties mentioned are affected by this threat. One of the reasons for this tendency might be that even though Member States are expected to set their legislation in conformity with international conventions, it is not always the case. We have seen from the practice that unless the regulations derived from conventions are reflected in local legislation they do not have the desired effect when taken to a court for example. We think this is of utmost importance for the States Parties to consider these issues. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. Mexico you have the floor.

Mexico

We would also like to congratulate the Centre on this absolutely excellent study that gives a general picture of the global situation of the state of conservation of sites and gives a picture of future trends and we are also quite pleased to note that in Latin America, for instance, the situation has not worsened, at least that's what the graphs we saw showed us. However, we do feel that for the future, such analysis need to be done more often and we feel that they must be detailed in the presentation of each region. We think this will be an amazing tool for planning and for conservation of sites and also for policies at Committee level. In this same vein, we would like to point out the fact that we feel that we are moving towards a new revision of issues that have been left out in the past. We are looking at a systematic revision of the OUV of the sites. We are working on this in Latin America and we are nearing the initial findings. But at the same time we also feel that the establishment of category 2 centres will go a long way to lightening the extremely heavy burden of work of the Secretariat in Paris and we believe that with all the tools available in the regions we will get a better understanding of problems that are specific to each region. So we warmly welcome this work and I feel that this is one of the paths that we need to explore in the future. Thank you very much Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you Mexico. Australia you have the floor Sir.

Australia

Mr Chairman, this item 7.3 is a very useful innovation that I think started the Quebec meeting. The Committee and does enable us to lift our heads a little bit above that particular state of conservation issues that we face. In relation to that Australia is pleased to be able to let members know that we will be hosting a workshop, organizing a workshop to look at the state of conservation issues, to look at these systemic problems that do arise and to consider whether there are ways to actually undertake additional steps to try and reduce their frequency, severity and incidence. That workshop will take place early next year and we do look forward to bringing the results of its conclusions to the 35th session for discussion, and hopefully improvement over the medium-term of some of these issues that we see before us. Finally Mr Chairman, may I note that we have some fairly small changes to the Draft Decision. They relate to the use of remote-sensing, which in certain instances can be a very useful tool to monitor the incidence of threats in relation to particular types of properties. So, when we get to the Draft Decision we can explain that further, if needed. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. France vous avez la parole Monsieur.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. A mon tour je voudrais féliciter le centre pour cette synthèse, ce tableau synoptique qui nous montre tout l'éventail des dégradations, des menaces et en même temps qui nous en offre une vue synthétique pleine d'enseignements. En ce qui nous concerne on pourrait relever deux catégories disons principales de causes de ces problèmes. Il y a dans un premier temps, et tout le monde l'a constaté, y compris dans les séances que nous venons de vivre, la question des infrastructures et des grandes infrastructures. Il me semble que cela pose un problème de méthode, ou plutôt des exigences de méthode que pourrait avoir le comité à travers les orientations, parce qu'enfin des infrastructures importantes ne naissent pas comme des champignons dans des forêts humides, elles sont longuement préparées, elles sont souvent longuement méditées par les Etats qui les proposent, et c'est une exigence d'étude préparatoire, d'étude d'évaluation, qui devrait permettre d'orienter les choix. On est quand même un peu surpris y compris dans les états de conservation que nous avons examinés au cours de ces deux journées, de projets qui sont déjà dans un stade avancé de développement voir de chantier, et qui pourtant posent des problèmes par rapport à la conservation du bien, qui ne sont pas encore résolus ou correctement évalués. Et donc il y a vraiment une exigence de méthode à avoir que ces études préalables, que ces études d'impact, que ces études qui mettent en balance les valeurs du bien et les avantages attendus de l'équipement en question soient soigneusement étudiés et préalable. Je pense que c'est vraiment une exigence fondamentale, et moi c'est un petit peu comme l'œuf de Colomb, enfin ça semble quand même relativement évident.

Le deuxième point que je voudrais, (vous devez conclure dit le Président). Bien, alors je m'arrête ici.

The Chairperson

Brazil, you have the floor please.

Brazil (Portuguese)

As I said, I would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the very interesting and very useful report that was presented to us. This practice that the Committee took of reflecting on

the trends of the state of conservation of the properties of the world heritage once the reports are examined will allow us to identify the most important threats to conservation. Still, we must recognize that the Committee still is not completing its function to examine the state of conservation of most of the properties on the list, and this is because of the lack of time, because the workload of the Committee has grown exponentially and the time available for discussion is still limited and even decreasing in some cases. So the study that was presented by the Secretariat makes it easier to present a synthesis, conclusions that the Committee should come to without needing this study, because we could see these trends if we could examine more reports. Of course the threats that the different properties face are not identical in the different regions. This table here simplifies a bit the level of threats and also the different types of threat through this categorization. The reports also are not representative of all the different threats to the properties because there are many world properties that were not the object of a report or of which we don't see all the problems in the reports, so we do have a study which is a very interesting one, but it is still limited. I would like to recommend to the Centre, if possible, to expand the universe, not only of the reports, but also of the period of time under study, because of course the reports that were presented before still are in the archives of the Centre, so a search could be done and we could try to expand the period of time under examination. This would allow us to look at the trends better. Still, I would like to congratulate Australia for the idea of having an expert workshop to examine these trends and, of course, all these reflections would help us to identify future threats to the implementation of the Convention. These are trends that have to be discussed with all State Parties, so it is a very relevant and very important subject which should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the States Parties. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Brazil. I don't have any further requests for interventions. Mali, you have the floor Sir.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie le centre du patrimoine mondial pour ce document excellent. Je voudrais faire une petite contribution. J'aurais souhaité qu'une correspondance soit rédigée à chaque Etat, parce qu'il y a des spécificités selon les régions par rapport à ces menaces et qu'il serait souhaitable également de rappeler l'importance de la dimension patrimoniale, que ce patrimoine soit naturel ou culturel, à chaque Etat partie, et leur prise en compte dans l'élaboration des plans de développement. Ceci a l'avantage de nous alléger ou alors d'améliorer l'Etat de conservation des biens et de faciliter aussi la mise l'application ou la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Merci au Mali. J'ai pas d'autres demandes de la part des Etats membres pour intervenir donc je suggère qu'on procède avec le Secrétariat, Souhaitez-vous faire un commentaire ? Vous avez la parole Madame.

The Secretariat

Thank you very much Mr Chair and I would like to thank all the delegates for their extremely useful comments. Concerning the delegate from Mali, I would like to point that the Committee has at its disposal different processes and in particular the periodic reporting is also a tool to identify trends. We also agreed that legal issues are very complex and that needs further reflection referring to the comment from Estonia. Concerning the comment from Mexico, we fully agree that with category 2 centres it is a useful development in terms of capacity-building and also sharing experiences among the regions and we very much

welcome the offer from Australia for the meeting on the further reflection on the state of conservation. Concerning the comment by the delegate from Brazil I pointed out that of course this is simplification. We grouped it in five groups of trends just to get some data, but as I said we have a disclaimer in paragraph 18. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Advisory body would you like to comment?. So we are going to proceed with the examination and adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.7C and I give the floor to our Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is in your document 34 CON 7C and I have received one amendment by the Delegation of Australia which suggests the introduction of two new paragraphs between paragraphs 5 and 6, so these would be called 5bis and 5ter, as well as a smaller amendment to paragraph currently 11. Paragraphs 1 to 5 remain unchanged, the introduction to paragraph 5bis would read as follows:

“Notes that the availability and application of satellite imagery and other remote-sensing techniques are continually improving and notes that such techniques can provide evidence over time to determine whether some impacts on world heritage values continue to occur or are being addressed”.

I repeat the paragraph a second time. 5bis would read:

“Notes that the availability and application of satellite imagery and other remote-sensing techniques are continually improving and notes that such techniques can provide evidence over time to determine whether some impacts on world heritage values continue to occur or are being addressed”.

Australia further suggests a new paragraph 5ter which would read:

“Requests that the Advisory Bodies and in particular, IUCN, work with the World Heritage Centre and relevant remote-sensing agencies to examine the feasibility of using remote-sensing to help assess the potential contribution that it could make to the monitoring of certain threats to the outstanding universal value of properties.

I also repeat this paragraph a second time.

“Requests that the Advisory Bodies and in particular, IUCN, work with the World Heritage Centre and relevant remote-sensing agencies to examine the feasibility of using remote-sensing to help assess the potential contribution that it could make to the monitoring of certain threats to the outstanding universal value of properties.

Paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 remain unchanged. In paragraph 11 the Australian Delegation suggests the insertion of the phrase “the feasibility of improved utilization of remote-sensing” in the middle of the paragraph and the complete paragraphs would accordingly read:

“Requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to report back on criteria, thresholds and processes relevant to the initiation of state of conservation reports, the feasibility of improved utilization of remote-sensing and the preparation and review of the desired state of conservation statements for the removal of properties from the list of World Heritage in Danger for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.”

Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. IUCN would you like to comment.

IUCN

If I may Chair and as we were dividers in particular I think in the amendments. I think this is a very interesting proposal which we would fully support. It is true that very often the missions that we perform would be greatly complemented by remote-sensing material and as we see extensive sites, large forest sites, large marine sites, being inscribed on the World Heritage List, it may become more and more relevant as a technique. I think just two points of reaction. The first is that we have actually already started to reflect on this and we mentioned earlier in this meeting the project we have with the Swiss Marva Foundation one of the activities we are going to fund through that is a piece of scoping work with UNEP's World Conservation Monitoring Centre looking precisely at the use of remote-sensing. My other observation is that UNESCO's Science Sector has arranged partnerships with a range of leading space agencies and it might be a useful small addition to Australia's amendments to just make a reference to UNESCO's Science Sector as a partner in view of the fact that they have already done the partnership-making with a range of the providers of remote-sensing information that could benefit this activity. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Australia, would you like to add something - No. Très bien. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.7C, I would like to remind you that paragraphs 1 to 4 remain unchanged. Paragraphs 6 to 10 remain unchanged. We have just amended paragraph 5, including 5bis and 5ter and amended paragraph 11. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of this Draft Decision? I see none. **Draft Decision 34 COM.7C** has been adopted. Thank you.

ITEM 8: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2010, in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*

Document WHC-10/34.COM/8A

Decision: 34 COM 8A

The Chairperson

Now, according to our agenda we are moving to item 8A regarding the Tentative List as of 15 April 2010 and I would like to give the floor to Mr Balsamo from the World Heritage Centre to briefly present the main issues regarding this item.

The Secretariat

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Document 34 COM/8A presents the Tentative List of all States Parties submitted in all conformity with the Operational Guidelines as of 15 April 2010. In particular Annex III presents a list of all properties submitted on the Tentative List received from the States Parties in alphabetical order while Annex II presents all those new in the Tentative List or additions to the existing Tentative List which are being submitted by States Parties since the last session of the World Heritage Committee. As of 15 April 2010 of the 107 States Parties which have ratified the Convention, 166, that is 88% of the States Parties have submitted to the Tentative List in accordance with the requirements specified with the

Operational Guidelines. Twenty-one States Parties have not submitted any Tentative List. All nominations submitted for examination at this session in 2010 are included in the Tentative List of the States Parties concerned. Since the 33rd session of the Committee, 32 States Parties have submitted new Tentative Lists or modified their existing list. The number of properties added is 92. There are other topics directly relating to the Tentative List to be examined in other items of the agenda. The Expert Meeting on Upstream Processes to Nominations recommended that the word “preferably” be deleted from paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines. You will find this proposal in different documents in the form of amendments of the Operational Guidelines and in documents 13 and 12. The decision on document 34 COM/8A is on page 3 of the document. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you Mr Balsamo. Now we would like to invite the Member States to express their comments. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you Chair. I would like to ask ICOMOS have your analysed or looked through how the Tentative List reflects the global strategy in regard to the filling of gaps or about over-representative fields. What is the situation in regard to these things. Thank you.

The Chairperson

You have the floor Madam.

ICOMOS

Thank you. Currently the Advisory Bodies do not comment or ICOMOS does not comment on the Tentative Lists that have been submitted. But this is a subject that has been discussed many times and indeed the recommendation is that the Advisory Bodies should, where possible, work upstream in advising States Parties on Tentative Lists and Nominations. Quite how that is achieved is still really a matter for debate and of course it involves considerable resources. If the Advisory Bodies were to go into any level of detail in looking at Tentative Lists.

The Chairperson

I don't see any further requests for intervention. So Secretariat would you like to add something. Thank you. So I would like to proceed further for the examination and adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.8A and I give the floor to our Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is included in your document 8A and I have not received any draft amendments.

The Chairperson

Thank you Brita. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of the Draft Decision? I see none. The **Draft Decision 34 COM.8A** is adopted. Thank you very much and we are going further for 8B and I leave my place for our Chair. (The speakers change)

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/8B and 8B.Add and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B1 et Add, WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B2; WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B3; WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B4

The Chairperson

Good evening. At this point we will start examining point 8B which is nominations for the World Heritage List. At this point in time we will examine the nominations of properties to be listed in the World Heritage List. For ease of reference, may I remind you that the relevant working documents are as follows:

WHC 10/34.COM/8B

WHC 10/34.COM/8B.Add

The evaluations carried out by the Advisory Bodies first are contained in the informative documents below, namely, ICOMOS evaluations regarding the nominations of cultural and natural or mixed properties to the list of World Heritage Sites document/INF.8.1, WHC 10/34.INF.8b1 Add. – Evaluation carried out by the IUCN regarding the nominations of natural and mixed properties to be listed in the World Heritage List WHC 10/34.COM.INF.8.B.2. May I call to mind that document WHC 10/34.COM/INF.8B.3 features a list of all of the nominations received until 1 February 2010. highlighting those nominations which reviewed as being thorough or complete nominations. Such nominations will not be discussed during our Brasilia debate sessions, because such nominations are foreseen for review during the upcoming meeting or session of our Committee. A thorough list of nominations received up until 1 February 2010 and those that are under review for the Committee for the 31st session containing WHC 10/34.COM/INF.8B.3. As indicated furthermore at the request of the 33rd committee session the Advisory Bodies have prepared an informative document titled WHC 10/34.COM/INF.8b.4 focussing on the implications and the differences between, referring and differing nominations. I would like to ask everyone to please take those differences into account or considerations into account while reviewing the nominations. Information from the Advisory Bodies regarding referral or deferral of nominations based on decision 33 COM/8b.54, WHC 10/34.COM/INF.8B.4. Let us now examine point 1 of the agenda which addresses the withdrawal of nominations to be reviewed by this session of the Committee. To that end I would like to call upon Mr Balsamo to read out the lists of current nominations that have been withdrawn at the request of the State Party.

The Secretariat

The following list which was drawn prior to this Committee's session. Sites of Christianity in the Galilee, Israel, Augustów Canal – a work of man and nature by Belarus and Poland, Mount Vernon by USA and The Matheran Light Railway, an extension to the Mountain Railways of India by India. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mr Balsamo. Any further comments at this point? Before we move on to the actual examination of the nomination I would like to call your attention to the fact that this year we have received a number of letters submitted by States Parties notifying us regarding on factual mistakes made by States Parties in the document reviewing their nominations. I would like to ask Mr Balsamo to please read the list of such letters.

The Secretariat

Thank you Mr Chairman. This year a number of letters detailing factual errors have been received. However, some of these letters contain both notification of factual errors and advocacy. Following a series of consultations, only the parts of the letters dealing with factual errors are being translated, compiled into one document, available in the two working languages and distributed. The letters concern the following nominations:

Australia – for the Australian Convict Sites

Ethiopia – Konso Cultural Landscape;

Japan – Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape;

Kiribati – Phoenix Islands protected area;

Marshall Islands – Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site;

Netherlands – Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht;

Norway – Roros Mining Town and the Circumference;

Saudi Arabia – At-Turaif District in ad-Dir'iyah

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – Darwin's landscape laboratory; and

Viet Nam – Central Sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long – Hanoi.

The Advisory Bodies will present the content of the letters received for each nomination and will address the factual errors at the end of each concerning presentation. In addition, Mr President, just allow me to draw your attention to the fact that the Secretariat is proposing an additional Draft Decision 8(b) which will state that old nominations submitted for examination in document 8(b) are included in the Tentative List of the States Party concerned. Thank you Mr President.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Any comments or remarks at this point. Examination of natural mixed and cultural goods to be nominated and included in the World Heritage list. How are we introducing the, or since we are talking about introducing the nomination items on the agenda may I use the opportunity to call to mind two key processes regarding the nominations to be examined. As you will certainly recall, the Committee is invited to examine recommendations and draft minutes contained in the relevant documents. And in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Operating Guidelines, as well as make the or take decisions according to the following four categories. Inscription, decision not to inscribe, referral and deferral - the Committee may decide to inscribe a property on the World Heritage list, paragraphs 154 of the Operational Guidelines. The Committee may decide that a property should not be inscribed (paragraph 158) of the Operational Guidelines. The Committee may decide to refer back to the State Party for additional information (paragraph 159 of the Operational Guidelines). The Committee may decide to defer a nomination for more in-depth assessment or study or a substantial revision by the State Party. (paragraph 160 of the Operational Guidelines). In particular, nominations which the Committee decides to refer back to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the following Committee session for examination. For a nomination that is referred there is no new

nomination prepared and there is no evaluation mission of the relevant Advisory Bodies forcing to the property Should the Committee decide to defer a nomination, that will mean that an in-depth assessment or study or a substantial revision of the nomination by the State Party is needed. Therefore, a new nomination should be submitted by February the 1st and be re-evaluated by the relevant Advisory Bodies during the course of the four-year and a half evaluation cycle according to the procedures and timetables outlined in the paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines. Also on the specific issue of the submission of additional information on nominations, may I recall that point (h) in paragraph 148 of the Operational Guidelines establishes the deadline for the submission of additional information on nominations and reads as follows: The evaluation and presentation of the Advisory Bodies should not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after the 28 February in the year in which the nomination is considered. We can now proceed to the examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List. I am going to call again on IUCN and ICOMOS to be very concise in their presentations as you will be allocated no more than five minutes to present each nomination. I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Presentations of nominations for the examination of nominations we will follow the order of working document titled WHC 10/34.COM/8B beginning with the natural rather than nominations to be followed by the cultural nominations to be then followed by the natural nominations or the nomination of natural goods. As in the past, for ease of reference, the number or the page number of the Advisory Bodies evaluation documents INF.8B and INF.8B.Add for ICOMOS and INF.8B2 for IUCN will be shown on the PowerPoint presentations. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

L'ICOMOS sait très bien à quel point les décisions du Comité sont importantes aux Etats parties qui souhaitent l'inscription d'un bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial, et c'est pour cela que chaque année nous commençons les présentations de nos recommandations concernant les nominations avec un bref aperçu de l'évaluation que chaque nomination a subi pour assurer de la manière la plus professionnelle la présence de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et aussi d'une structure solide pour sa protection et sa conservation. Je vous assure, distingués membres du comité, que c'est un processus à étapes multiples qui garantit que chaque nomination est soumise à l'examen minutieux de plus de 40 experts représentant d'un large éventail de disciplines et provenant de toutes les régions du monde dont plusieurs d'entre eux sont ici en tant que membre des Délégations de leur Etats partie. Je crois qu'on n'a pas aujourd'hui le temps de faire la présentation très brève du processus. Est-ce qu'on a le temps ? Alors si on a le temps, avec la permission du Président je voudrais maintenant passer la parole à mon collègue Alfredo Conti qui est le président du groupe de travail du patrimoine mondial de l'ICOMOS et qui vous offrira cet aperçu. Merci.

ICOMOS

This will be a short presentation on some aspects of the ICOMOS process of evaluations. Well, I think you all know the process which is shown in the slide. The ICOMOS evaluation is designed to ensure that the rigorous and institutional evaluation occurs. The process is accompanied by policy to avoid perception of conflict of interest. This policy is available on the ICOMOS website. Through the evaluation process a number of individual experts from ICOMOS and the International Scientific Committees are engaged in the task of reviewing all the aspects of the nomination in line with the regulations set forth in the Operational Guidelines. An average of 40 people can be involved in the evaluation of one nomination before finalizing the recommendation of ICOMOS. We would like to highlight that the ICOMOS panel, which is the body who decides the recommendation to the World Heritage Committee, is chaired by the ICOMOS President. It is composed by some members of the ICOMOS Executive Committee representing all the regions of the world,

representatives of relevant partner organizations, such as IUCN, TIKI for industrial heritage or DOCOMOMO for modern heritage and relevant experts on certain specific subjects to be evaluated.

Just to give you some figures in 2010 ICOMOS evaluated 50 nominations, of which, 21 were new nominations and of which 10 were serial nominations, including 822 monuments and symbols and sites. Before presenting our evaluation for consideration, we can offer several reflections on the work undertaken by ICOMOS for the World Heritage Committee this year. Firstly, generally speaking, ICOMOS has noted for several years that nominations are increasingly complex, reflecting to an extent the diversity, wealth and evolution of cultural heritage. Secondly, certain nominations would benefit if more time were taken over legal questions and over the finalization for the adoption of plans and the carrying out of research. In making this observation, ICOMOS acknowledges that the preparation of nominations is a substantial undertaking for all States Parties. Thirdly, ICOMOS evaluates the protection, conservation and management of the property at the time of nomination and not some hypothetical time in the future after the adoption of the laws and management plans. ICOMOS is concerned to maintain its dialogue with States Parties throughout the evaluation process. In 2008, ICOMOS decided to bring forward the date of its panel meeting, so that the latest request for additional information could be sent out earlier giving the States Parties more time to reply. The quality of the replies provided by the States Parties in most cases has greatly assisted ICOMOS in finalizing its evaluation to propose helpful additional recommendations. The information paper from the Advisory Bodies provides the information specifically on the advisory board's recommendations for referral and deferral.

To briefly summarize for referred back nominations ICOMOS considers that Outstanding Universal Value has been demonstrated. Supplementary information must be supplied, but not further technical evaluation mission will be required. For deferred nominations, ICOMOS considers that the Outstanding Universal Values is not demonstrated at this stage and/or their need to improve and/or implement the management system or the management plan. The very nature of the information requested means that a substantial revision will occur. A new mission is necessary to evaluate the nomination again. ICOMOS has not examined additional information received after the deadline of 28 February 2010 as prescribed by paragraph 148(h) of the Operational Guidelines. The Chairperson has circulated the factual errors found in the ICOMOS evaluation texts.

This year ICOMOS evaluated 10 serial nominations with a 122 monuments and sites and groups of buildings. ICOMOS has tried to make explicit for the committee the questions it asks in relation to the nature of serial nominations. What is the justification for the serial approach? How were the chosen sites selected? How do they each relate to the overall Outstanding Universal Value of the property? Does the comparative analysis justify the selection of sites? Are they separate components of the property linked? Is there an overall management framework for all its components? ICOMOS notes that the evaluation of such properties involves a high investment of human and financial resources, while at the same time offering welcome innovation and diversity to the implementation of the Convention.

During this cycle ICOMOS has evaluated five proposals for extensions to existing World Heritage properties. A specific evaluation format has been set up. Assessment of criteria is carried out in relation to the criteria used for the existing inscription and how they might apply to the proposed extension. The same criteria should be justified for the original inscription and the proposed extension. To finalize ICOMOS in its evaluation process maintains scientific rigour and independence. ICOMOS respects its role and the role of the Committee to take decisions. As always, the first mission of ICOMOS is for the conservation of the world's cultural heritage and to be of assistance to the Committee and all States Parties in their long-term care and commitment to their heritage.

Ladies and gentlemen, allow me to finalize by introducing our three advisors who will present their nomination evaluations. They will be Mrs Luisa de Marco, Mrs Susan Daniel and Mr Michel Cotte. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for your attention. Thank you Mr Chairman.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. We will now examine the nomination of the **Central Highlands of Sri Lanka, its natural and cultural heritage**. IUCN and ICOMOS you both have eight minutes for your presentation. Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Swiss representative.

Switzerland

Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. Excusez-moi d'interrompre la marche des travaux, mais avant de passer à l'examen des différents objets soumis ce soir et ultérieurement à notre appréciation et après avoir entendu vos commentaires sur le processus de décision, les explications d'ICMOS sur les procédures d'évaluation et de la façon dont se fait en quelque sorte, dont se crée en quelque sorte une décision ou des décisions de ce Comité, j'aimerais en ma qualité de chef de la Délégation suisse, poser une question sur les méthodes de travail et d'évaluation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des biens présentés. En effet monsieur le président nous avons été saisis de certaines indications que certains membres du conseil se sont engagés au préalable à soutenir l'une ou l'autre des propositions qui nous sont soumises. De l'avis de l'Estonie, de la Suède et de la Suisse, cette procédure vide les discussions que les experts vont entreprendre de son sens. Je pense que nous devons garder notre esprit ouvert et sur la base des discussions qui ont lieu sur différents objets, prendre des décisions de manière autonome, j'aurais bien voulu savoir de la part du Secrétariat et de la part de la Présidence, au fond, comment ils conçoivent nos méthodes de travail pour le futur. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

I now give the floor to the Egyptian representative.

Egypt

Merci monsieur le Président. En fait, avant de passer à l'examen des candidatures pour les nominations, j'avais un commentaire général que je voudrais avoir une réponse en retour de la part d'ICOMOS. Alors en fait je remercie l'ICOMOS pour la présentation à propos du processus de nomination. J'ai souligné ce qui est mentionné par l'ICOMOS que le processus de nomination évaluation, devient un processus extrêmement complexe et en fait je voudrais poser une question fondamentale à propos de l'objectif et le rôle des organes consultatifs. Nous avons examiné le dossier qui a été évalué par l'ICOMOS et les organes consultatifs et il y a certains dossiers qu'on a pas de doute sur la valeur universelle, et malgré ça en fait les recommandations d'ICOMOS pour les organes consultatifs ça a été plus pour le diffère ou non inscription. Je peux comprendre que certains dossiers sont peut-être pas tout à fait bien rédigés qu'il manque certainement à apporter en ce qui concerne la gestion et le plan de gestion du site. Mais le cœur de notre convention, la convention de 72, sur lequel nous sommes réunis aujourd'hui c'est l'inscription afin de conservation du site. Alors je me pose la question, et à travers vous, pour l'ICOMOS, quand il n'y a pas de doutes sur la valeur universelle de certains sites et malgré le mal, disons que les dossiers manquent de certains éléments, quel est le rôle des organes consultatifs dans ce sens-là et comme

aident à porter pour les Etats concernées afin de compléter leur dossier. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair and I will try to address your concerns. ICOMOS as you have just heard from the presentation looks very carefully at several aspects of a nomination dossier. It primarily looks at outstanding universal value and whether the nominated properties have satisfied the criteria. It also has to look at authenticity and integrity and finally it has to look at protection of management. Any property that is recommended for inscription has to satisfy all those various facets. So, not only does it have to satisfy the criteria, it has to demonstrate authenticity and integrity and that means that the boundaries have to be adequate. In some properties we can certainly see that outstanding universal value is there, if you like, but the boundaries have not been drawn in a way that respects all the attributes that carry outstanding universal value. In other cases the attributes of outstanding universal value may be there but very vulnerable and authenticity might be questionable. It is the adviser's role as we understand it to undertake a rigorous analysis of the dossiers and to point out where we think there are weaknesses.

Now, those weaknesses are often most manifest in terms of protection and management and this is something that has just been highlighted in fact in the previous discussion on trends and I think there was a comment that indeed that it would be preferable if the benchmarks for protection and management were perhaps even higher than they are at the moment. So ultimately, the aim of protection and management is to sustain the outstanding universal value over time and is the Advisory Bodies role to try and assess whether that protection of management is in place or whether it could be improved or whether changes need to be made.

Now, it is not very often that the Advisory Bodies recommend non-inscription. In the majority of cases the recommendations were for inscription, referral and deferral. In all those cases the Advisory Bodies are giving encouragement to the State Parties, in the case of inscription its obvious, that pleases everyone, but in the case of referral and deferral, that is not turning the property down. In the case of referral it is recommending slight amendments that could be met quite quickly and the property could come back next year. In the case of deferral, there are more amendments or changes that need to be made but it is still a sign of encouragement that that property will ultimately be inscribed on the World Heritage List. So certainly, I hope it is true for IUCN, I hope I speak for them as well, that we see our role as ultimately looking at the best interest of property in terms of conservation and trying to make as positive a recommendation as we can in terms of how ultimately that property might be inscribed on the World Heritage List. I hope that answers your questions.

Egypt

Pas tout à fait, mais je vous remercie quand même.

IUCN

This covers a very brief introduction on IUCN's work, but just to complement ICOMOS's answer and we support everything that ICOMOS suggested. Just a few complementary points. Firstly, I think it is worth noting in paragraph 148 – (a) through (i) the Operational Guidelines give a very clear statement about what the expectations are for the Advisory Bodies. Secondly to note that the job we have to identify outstanding universal value is about all of the components of outstanding universal value as ICOMOS has just explained and I think within the process that we operate beyond the point which is that we see referral and deferral as ways of not as turning sides down but ways of the Committee

interacting with sites that have potential to be on the World Heritage List, it is also with noting the process which is very similar for IUCN as it is for ICOMOS to interact with the State Party during the evaluation of the nomination by requesting supplementary information and also through the evaluation mission. And the last point that will be covered in a different item of this agenda is the whole debate around upstream processes and ways in which we can design better ways to interact earlier in the process to help to guide the development of nominations before they come into the evaluation process. We think that it is a very valuable initiative. It has some challenges in terms of both the roles of Advisory Bodies and States Parties but I think that that is an important debate which also responds to the point from the delegate of Egypt. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Mr Bandarin also wishes to take the floor.

The Secretariat

To try to answer the question that was raised by the delegate of Switzerland, I think that most of the answer has been given already by the representatives of the Advisory Bodies. However, let me just recall what is the cycle of our work. This is a very long cycle what we are doing tonight and normally in the discussion of a nomination is just the last step of a very long process that starts with the creation of the Tentative List, already something that you examine at the beginning, that goes into the preparation of nominations, sometimes it takes years to do, and very often assisted by us and by other technical bodies, then of course when the nomination comes we check it for completeness. You know all about these difficulties that we often encounter. Then we have the evaluation process. It is something that is delegated to the Advisory Bodies and they spend a lot of time on that, they do missions, they write reports, they consult technical and scientific bodies. What is given to you tonight for discussion is an elaborate result of a very long process and, of course, we try to do it as best as possible, to offer you the best basis for discussion, because you have to check on the coherence and the accuracy of these reports, to use this for your decision and of course your decision has to use this material, but it is a decision that belongs to a sovereign body, the Committee that has to look at the principles of the Convention and of course build on its credibility and its prestige. So, what we are doing in this process is essentially in your hands. We can offer you material, the best possible material, but then the examination and the use of these documents for your decisions is completely in the hands of the Committee. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I would like to give the floor to IUCN and ICOMOS to present the details of the nomination of the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka.

ICOMOS

This is a new serial nomination and this is composed of three areas. The Peak wilderness protected area, the Horton Plains National Park, the Knuckles Conservation Forest is proposed as a mixed site. The Peak wilderness protected area and the Horton Plains National Park are contiguous but the Knuckles Conservation Forest is separated from the two by 80 kilometres stretch of forest and mountainous land. Regarding the natural values Adams Peak of Sri Pada in the Peak wilderness protected areas bears witness to a well routed cultural religious tradition dating back to the pre-Christian era. While the Horton Plains National Park contains traces of human occupation since the Mesolithic period and of early agricultural practices, the Knuckles Conservation Forest has revealed traces of human occupation in the Mesolithic period and the Iron Age. At this summit the peak has an indentation that is believed to be Lord Buddha's footprint. Along the centre is the place has been visited by several reigning monarchs and by famous travellers, such as Marco Polo and

Ibn Battuta, and has become a prominent religious place, visited by million pilgrims each year.

At Horton Plains, ecological and palaeological services have revealed several sites of pre-historic occupation with traces of hunting and foraging, followed by slash and burn resin practices. Later evidence of early serial domestication and science of subsequent sub-systematic cultivation has also been found.

In the Knuckles Conservation Forest ecological investigations have discovered caves with evidence of occupation since the Mesolithic period. When Buddhists were persecuted the monks fled to other countries bringing replicas of the Sri Pada and the worship was therefore spread all over the region. Multi-proxy records here can be shown to attest to the early agricultural practices that have been found at Horton Plains. While here we have examples of the primary tool types that have been found in the caves in the Knuckles Conservation Forest, the Meemure villages is one of the examples of traditional settlement and agricultural practices that have also been found in the Knuckles Conservation Forest. The component parts of the property do not relate according to the same set of values that is required for the serial properties, but to completely unrelated ones. The religious significance of Sri Pada, the archaeological evidence of early domestication of series at Horton Plains, evidence of a Mesolithic occupation in the Knuckles Conservation Forest. The State Party has assessed integrity only for the natural values and not for the cultural ones and thus for the authenticity of the religious significance of Sri Pada has been credibly attested by the actively described by the State Party and that is not the case for the other elements included in the series from the cultural point of view.

The boundaries only take into account the natural features, the physical attributes that convey cultural significance need to be included in the nominated property. Protection and Management are granted eminently to natural features and there is no adequate inventory of the cultural attributes. Some of them have in fact been found outside the boundaries of the proposed site. Also management of cultural resources is not adequate, both in terms of objective resources, and there is finally no overarching management framework for the series as a whole as it is required by the Operational Guidelines.

So the serial nomination focused predominantly on natural aspects of the nominated property. Moreover the cultural criteria proposed for each component of the series belong to different thematic groups and the cultural interrelationships among components appear weak and not made explicit. ICOMOS therefore recommends that the examination of this nomination be deferred to allow the State Party to reconsider the entire scope of the nomination. A number of additional recommendations have also been done by ICOMOS and for details please see page 29 of the ICOMOS evaluation volume. Thank you for your attention.

IUCN

Thanks Chair. Just while the slides are coming up for IUCN, because we have had the discussion already I will skip just the first three or four slides which were by way of introduction, because I think there has been an introductory discussion, I just want to emphasize firstly, how seriously we take the task and the interaction that we just had with the Committee and the presentation by ICOMOS I think covers that point. I do want to pay tribute to our partners in this work, our other Advisory Bodies and especially the interaction with ICOMOS and I would like to note this year for the first time we participated directly in each other's panel processes. I know Committee members have asked us to interact more and I think we really are doing that. I like to also note the partnership we have with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of UNEP, a partnership which we are extending and the Head of the Protected Areas Programme from UNEP's WC&C is here and I would like to thank him personally for the support he gives us and lastly, I would like to note the interaction we have with the International Union of Geological Sciences and the International

Association of Geomorphologists who support our work, in particular on the assessment of criterion (viii).

With that, I will just turn to the evaluation of the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka. IUCN's evaluation with this property is at page 131 of the English version of our report, page 135 of the French version and the nominated property is a serial nomination comprising three component parts and ICOMOS has introduced those parts to you already.

This mixed nomination is proposed under all four natural criteria. The case for inscription of the property in relation to criterion (vii) is not strong, although there are some important view points within it and they are significant at the national level. They cannot be considered as outstanding at the global level. There are many mountain protected areas of much greater size and scale than this property. The case for inscription under criterion (viii) is also not compelling, the land forms fall within the property are of national and subregional importance, but are not particularly unusually distinctive at the global scale.

We do think the nomination meets criterion (ix). The criterion dealing with ecosystems. The nomination includes the largest and least disturbed remaining areas of the submontane and montane rain forests of Sri Lanka, which are a global conservation priority on many accounts. The nomination also makes a strong case for inscription under criterion (x). Considering its size, the property protects exceptional numbers of threatened species, demonstrates high levels of species richness and endemism, and the montane forests in the three serial components are of prime importance for the in situ conservation of threatened biodiversity.

Can I have the next slide please. Thank you.

An existing World Heritage Site, the Sinharaja Forest Reserve is strongly related to the nominated property in terms of its value. The nominated property and this existing site share values as the most important remnants of once extensive and contiguous natural forests. There are both contrasts and overlaps in the values of the properties and IUCN considers that Sinharaja and newly nominated property could, in principle, have been considered and could still be reconsidered as a single serial property. The protection status of the nominated property meets the requirements set out in the Operational Guidelines. IUCN considers its boundaries are appropriate, but it notes the potential for extension connected with Sinharaja that I have just mentioned.

Buffer zones for two of the components are stated to be conceptually designed in the nomination and are in need of formalization and clarification. IUCN has evaluated these zones and does not consider that they are fully functional buffer zones in the way that term is defined in the Operational Guidelines, being based rather on apparently well regarded community programmes surrounding the property.

Coordinated management of the separate components of this property is not in place. The nomination contains an explanatory note that states that a revised system of management would be developed and implemented within two years of an inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. The management plans of all three components also need to be made consistent.

The nature and magnitude of existing potential threats includes the impact of a significant pilgrimage route, illegal extraction of gems, cultivation and tourism. But actions to address these threats are part of the management of the property. They need to be sustained.

In summary, IUCN considers that this property meets criterion (ix) and (x). It needs requirements of integrity as set out in the Operational Guidelines. The association with the Sinharaja site should be considered regarding the serial approach and the properties do not

fully meet the requirements for protection and management for the reasons noted already in this presentation. So with regard to the natural values of this property, IUCN recommends that the Committee refer the nomination of the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka, to address the above points and to consider the possibility to link this property as a serial extension of the existing Sinharaja site. The Draft Decision is at page 11 of the English and page 12 of the French versions of document 8 B. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Are there any comments from the members of the Committee. Brazil has the floor.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chair. Now that we have begun a new item on the agenda, I would like first of all to congratulate the work of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The documentation is very long and it takes a lot of time for us to read all the reports, all the dossiers, but in fact it is a very thorough work that was carried out and Brazil would like therefore to say that we are very happy with the work well done, with the judicious work of the Advisory Bodies. Now, regarding the site in discussion here Brazil sees that the State Party tried to nominate a mixed site and the recommendation is much more favourable on the natural side than the cultural one. We understand therefore, Mr Chairman, that maybe the State Party or that the Committee would like maybe to appreciate only the natural characteristics of this nomination taking into account the recommendation of IUCN. In the same sense Brazil would like to take the opportunity to ask the State Party, if there are any representatives of the State Party here, if they would like to see this nomination considered in the sense that I have just described, i.e. based only on its natural features. So, with your permission Mr Chairman I would like to suggest us to ask the State Party to present the dossier in the way that I just described. Thank you very much. I give the floor to the State Party, Sri Lanka, for clarification.

Sri Lanka

At the very outset, on behalf of the Sri Lankan Delegation, I wish to thank The Chairperson and the Committee for giving us this opportunity to speak regarding our nomination. Sri Lanka is indeed very happy to agree to the recommendation of IUCN for the nominated property to be inscribed as a natural world heritage site. In this context I wish to draw the attention of the esteemed Committee that the IUCN in its report has categorically stated that the property meets criteria (ix) and (x) to a superlative degree, calling the property a super hotspot in terms of biodiversity.

Interrupted by The Chairperson

I would like to ask for you to please just provide the technical clarifications that were asked, because according to the rules of procedure you cannot make just general considerations. Thank you.

Sri Lanka

We agree to proceed by the natural heritage site.

The Chairperson

I now give the floor to Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. En fait l’Egypte a juste deux ou trois remarques. Je remercie les représentants des organes consultatifs. En fait dans le projet de décision en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 4 il y a une demande d’établir en cadre de gestion globale. Malgré ça et en même temps toujours au paragraphe 4 dans le projet de décision, petit b, c’est d’établir aussi une zone tempo-fonctionnelle. Là en fait je me dirige vers les organes consultatifs parce que dans leur paragraphe 6 ils félicitent l’Etat partie pour ses efforts de gestion et de conservation significatifs, déployés dans leur protégé Peak Wilderness et leur parc national Horton Plains et la forêt de conservation Knuckles, en fait je me demande ce que ça veut dire déjà par rapport au plan de gestion globale, en même temps je voudrais avoir un peu plus d’informations à propos des zones tampons fonctionnelles de la part des organes consultatifs. Et si vous me le permettez aussi, je voudrais demander à l’Etat partie s’il pourra donner un peu plus d’informations en ce qui concerne les cadres de gestion globale pour le site. L’Egypte rejoint le Brésil pour recommandation de l’inscription sur les critères que la Délégation du Brésil a mentionné. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the Advisory Bodies.

IUCN

Thank you Chair. This is a clear question and I am happy to reply to it. There are three points that I mentioned under item 4. If the point is why recommend a referral and not an inscription, the one which is key 4(a) and the reason for recommending a referral is with regard to paragraph 114 of the Operational Guidelines which says in the case of serial properties, and this is a serial property, a management system or mechanism for ensuring the coordinated management, the separate components is essential and should be documented in the nomination. As I explained in my presentation that is one aspect which is not in place at the moment. The proposal of the State Party is that at the moment of inscription it would take two years to put that in place, that is not the formula which is explained in the Operational Guidelines and that is the reason for recommending a referral. We also considered that in terms of the IUCN recommendation a referral option would also give the possibility to at least reflect on the potential links with the Sinharaja Forest Reserve, which is an existing site and consider whether an extension of that property would be an option. So that is the answer to the question. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Iraqi representative.

Iraq

Thank you. It is noted that the IUCN has recommended that the State Party established effectively furnishing a buffer zone for the property which will ensure the protection from a threat arising from the outside of its boundaries. In consultation with the local stakeholders, in order for the Committee to consider Sri Lanka’s request for inscription of the nominated property as a natural world heritage site, we need to ascertain whether Sri Lanka has indeed complied with this recommendation. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to Bahrain.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Mr Chair. Bahrain strongly recognizes the important and the value, especially the natural value of the site, and going through the report and listening to IUCN, we feel that this would be the suitable place to have the site inscribed as natural heritage. However, we feel that at this time, because the nomination file was addressed for a mixed property, it would be more advisable to follow the advise of the IUCN to take the file back to the State Party and focus on the serial nomination, adjust all the requirements and bring it back next year, hopefully, to be registered, to be inscribed as a natural heritage site. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. China now has the floor.

China

Thank you Mr Chairman. First of all China thanks the Advisory Bodies for their hard work on the evaluations. For this new nomination the reports of ICOMOS and IUCN state that management plans are available and have been produced. However, it is noted that the State Party has not complied with the recommendation of the IUCN that it needs to establish an overall management framework for the serial property as required in the Operational Guidelines. With your permission Mr Chair can we request Sri Lanka, the State Party, to respond to this. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Sri Lanka, the State Party, has the floor for its reply to the question.

Sri Lanka

Within the three components of the CHS namely the peak wilderness protected area, the Horton Plains National Park and the Knuckles Conservation Forests are being managed quite effectively under three distinct management plans as acknowledged and commended by both Advisory Bodies, IUCN and ICOMOS. Sri Lanka is agreeable to formulate an overall management plan framework in respect of the nominated property once it is granted inscription as a natural world heritage site, in consultation and with the guidance of IUCN, within the shortest possible period.

The Chairperson

France now has the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme il s'agit du premier dossier d'inscription que le comité examine lors de cette session, permettez-moi en premier lieu de remercier les organisations consultatives et le centre du patrimoine mondial pour la qualité d'expertise et la qualité scientifique des documents qui nous transmis. Monsieur le Président qi vous me le permettez j'aurais également une question pour l'Etat partie. L'IUCN, comme cela nous a été exposé, recommande dans son rapport que l'Etat partie reconsidère sa candidature et surtout évalue la possibilité de la représenter comme une extension en série du bien qui est déjà inscrit au patrimoine mondial de Sinharaja. Le rapport de l'IUCN considère en effet que le dossier de candidature serait complémentaire, et j'insiste sur cet aspect, complémentaire du bien inscrit. Et nous voudrions avec votre permission entendre l'Etat partie, les précisions de l'Etat partie sur cette question de la complémentarité. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

The State Party now has the floor for the relevant clarifications.

Sri Lanka

This matter has received careful attention of scientists in Sri Lanka. We are of the considered view that the low tropical rainforest represented by Sinharaja and the submontane and montane rainforest represented by the nominated party falls into two distinct ecosystems with distinctive characteristics in the eco-systems. The nominated property CHSL includes the largest and the least disturbed remaining submontane and montane rainforest which is categorized as a separate eco-region in the terrestrial eco-regions of the Indo-Pacific as described in the conservation assessment done by Eric Wickramanayake, Wildlife Fund, 2002, Island Press. The IUCN, in its own report, has stated that the flora and fauna of the Knuckles is so distinct that is recognized as a separate floristic region within Sri Lanka. The report further states at least 10 out of the 23 endemic bird species that make Sri Lanka an endemic bird area also occurs in the Knuckles region. Thus, confirming that the Sinharaja lowland tropical rain forest and the nominated are, in fact, two distinctive eco-regions.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Jordan has the floor.

Jordan

Thank you Chair. Jordan congratulates the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for all the efforts in producing this important document as a mixed property. We would like to endorse the suggestion made by Bahrain, taking into consideration the cultural component of this nomination, especially after the ICOMOS report. They are very important aspects of the archaeological aspects of the property and we would like to see this file reconsidered for referral. Thank you.

The Chairperson

The UAE now has the floor.

United Arab Emirates

Yes, actually our question was already asked by other States Members but what we can do now is just to endorse the proposition again made by Bahrain and seconded by Jordan. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I now give the floor to the Swiss representative.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous comprenons que cette nomination soit centrée sur des critères naturels uniquement mais pour les biens sériels un cadre de gestion globale qui coordonne tous les éléments constitutifs de la série et d'une particulière importance et il serait mieux aussi si au moins partiellement ils étaient en place déjà lors de l'inscription. Par conséquent nous soutenons donc la proposition de Bahrein et d'autres Délégations de renvoyer pour cette année cette candidature afin de lui donner tout le temps nécessaire d'améliorer et de revenir peut être déjà l'année prochaine pour une inscription. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Alright, thank you very much. The representative of Mali has the floor.

Mali

Merci monsieur le Président. Je remercie également l'ICOMOS pour la brillante présentation, je remercie aussi par ailleurs l'Etat partie pour les nombreux efforts consentis. Et techniquement ce qui a le plus attiré notre attention c'est l'élaboration de l'outil technique de conservation, à savoir le plan de gestion, ils ont parlé de l'existence de trois plans de gestion, mais aussi de la volonté politique affichée du pays de procéder à l'élaboration d'un cadre de gestion globale. Pour cette raison fondamentale l'Etat partie du Mali rejoint la proposition du Bahrein. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Does any other Delegation wish to use the floor at this time? I would like to consult with the Rapporteur as to whether we have received any amendment or written amendment thus far.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision to this nomination is on page 11 of the English version and on page 12 of the French version of your document and numbered as 34 COM.8.B 9 and I have not received any written amendments to the Draft Decision Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

I would like to consult with the Committee members as to whether we agree, or you agree, with the Draft Decision as is. Brazil now has the floor.

Brazil

Mr Chairman, Brazil would like to ask a question, or address a question, either to the Secretariat or to the Legal Counsel or to advise us as to considering what the State Party, Sri Lanka answered earlier in terms of focusing attention only on evaluation of the natural components of the property. So the question we ask is whether the decision can be divided, whether the Committee could consider only the natural components or features of the property. I am not sure whether this is a grounded procedure in line with the relevant rules of procedure, so I would like to, with your permission, try to elicit that clarification. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

The Legal Adviser now has the floor for the relevant clarifications.

Legal Adviser

Mr Chairman, but I think the Secretariat should first provide a reply on the practice if you don't mind. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I would now like to give the Secretariat the floor for the relevant clarifications regarding the question raised by the Brazilian representative.

The Secretariat

Yes, it is technically possible the Operational Guidelines give us this possibility. The Draft Decision as it is written now foresee the possibility of referring a natural criteria and

deferring on cultural criteria. But the Committee may decide to change one of these two decisions. In any case in the past we had this kind of position where a Draft Decision were changed by the Committee and it is certainly possible to go only on the natural aspect and leave out the cultural.

The Chairperson

Brazil has the floor.

Brazil

Thank you Mr Chairman. Thank you also to the Secretariat for the clarifications. That being the case Mr Chairman, I would like to suggest that perhaps through you other Delegations could voice their views at this point as to whether or not the Committee would agree with solely considering a decision focusing on nothing but the natural components of the property. So that would be Brazil's proposal at this point. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I would like to consult with the Egyptian representative. The Egyptian representative has the floor. Egypt please.

Egypt

Merci monsieur le Président. L'Égypte soutient la proposition du Brésil. Je voudrais poser une question au représentant IUCN, peut être ça va apporter plus de clarifications à notre débat, est-ce que d'après l'information fournie par les Etats membres et selon les recommandations données dans le rapport de la part de IUCN, vous pensez que l'inscription va renforcer la protection du site et va encourager les Etats à fournir les plans de gestion globale?

The Chairperson

Please IUCN if you care to answer.

IUCN

Well, we always have. That inscription on the World Heritage List is a way of reinforcing conservation. Absolutely and the challenge here is I think we refer to a paragraph of the Operational Guidelines which seems to be quite clear about the expectations for coordinated management of a serial property. It says it should be documented in the nomination. The Operational Guidelines ask us to be rigorous and consistent. So that's why we make our recommendation. I don't know if there are any other comments on this, but that is the response I think. We would certainly hope an inscription would lead to a reinforcement of conservation efforts certainly. A reinforcement of cooperation between components of a serial property we would hope would follow from listing. The Guidelines do expect there to be something in place in time of inscription.

The Chairperson

The Egyptian representative now has the floor.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Après l'information fournie par le représentant de IUCN que je remercie très chaleureusement, je m'adresse à travers vous au conseiller juridique,

est-ce-que il y a un empêchement légal d'empêcher l'inscription du site du Sri Lanka sur les critères comme propriété naturelle ?

The Chairperson

I now give the floor to our Legal Adviser for the relevant clarifications.

Legal Adviser

Mr Chairman, I think that the consultation, the IUCN, explained to the members of Committee where the criteria that had to be fulfilled before a site could be inscribed and I think it is up to the Committee to determine whether it wishes to follow the recommendation or not. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

I would like to know whether the Brazilian Delegation and the Egyptian Delegation agree with that clarification. Brazil please.

Brazil

Thank you Mr Chairman. Given the explanation heard from the Legal Adviser it is Brazil's view that the criteria that apply are indeed very clear and should therefore be complied with. Nevertheless it is my view that this Committee is precisely the forum that passed the Operational Guidelines, therefore we are sovereign over such guidelines. So given the above, Brazil would like to propose that the management related criteria or the management plan related criteria for serial property as the one in hand should therefore be lifted in this case. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Egypt now.

Egypt

L'Egypte soutient tout à fait le point de vue du Brésil. Nous proposons d'amender le paragraphe 7 pour que soit recommandée l'inscription de haut plateau du centre du Sri Lanka au patrimoine naturel. Je remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Switzerland

Nous aimerions juste rappeler avant de prendre cette décision qu'il y a plusieurs autres sites qui seront dans une situation analogue et si on procède ici à une inscription qu'on devra tenir ça en tête pour rester cohérent pendant toute la session du Comité. Donc voilà, merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Brazil has the floor.

Brazil

Thank you Mr Chairman. Brazil would like to endorse the proposal made by the Egyptian delegate to the effect of inscribing this property as a natural property. And we would also like to ensure that the resolution contains language to reflect the need for the State Party to undertake all relevant and required efforts so that within a given timetable it would be in a position to comply with the criteria envisaged in the Operational Guidelines. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

May I clarify that the proposed amendment must be forwarded to the head table in writing. Egypt now has the floor.

Egypt

Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. C'était juste une réflexion par rapport aux remarques de la Délégation de la Suisse. En fait chaque site a ses circonstances particulières et dans ce sens- là, d'après l'explication donnée par l'IUCN, je voudrais attirer l'attention des membres du comité que l'inscription du site va à la fois renforcer la protection et aussi encourager l'Etat membre à présenter les plans de gestion globale et après avoir entendu notre conseiller juridique et la Délégation du Brésil, l'Egypte ne voit aucun empêchement donné par le comité, pour l'inscription de ce site sur la base de critère naturel. Voilà notre proposition d'amendement du paragraphe 7, tout en tenant compte de l'importance que l'Etat partie soit fourni un plan de gestion globale. Je vous remercie monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Would any other Delegation like to use the floor at this time. The representative of Ethiopia has the floor.

Ethiopia

The recommendation made by Brazil and Egypt to the property should be inscribed as a natural heritage site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Australian Delegation.

Australia

Thank you Chair. Australia strongly supports the application of the Operational Guidelines as a standard practice, however, we also believe that it is very important that the Committee considers the individual merits of each nomination. In this particular case, recognizing that there is effective management arrangements in place for each of the three components of this serial nomination and therefore that there is little of any risk of loss of any Outstanding Universal Value if the site was to be inscribed. Australia could consider supporting inscription providing that any decision included a clear commitment, requiring the establishment of an effective overall management framework within a limited period of time, for example, a maximum of 12 months. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation.

Russian Federation

Thank you Chair. I would say that the Russian Federation supports the inscription of this site by the criteria of a natural site given at the same time some time for the State Party to change the dossier and to improve the management of the site. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Iraq has the floor.

Iraq

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I endorse fully the position, I mean the position of my colleagues from the Russian Federation and Egypt. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Before giving the floor to the next Delegation I would like to recommend that the Rapporteur should perhaps start drafting the new wording because there is a clear cut trend to accept the proposed recommendation, to accept the site as a natural site. Thank you. Thailand has the floor.

Thailand

Thailand would like to support the nomination proposed by Egypt and Brazil and Russia. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. China has the floor.

China

Thank you Mr Chair. China supports the proposal by Brazil and Egypt. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Before giving Brazil the floor I would like to ask Brazil to please make sure that you provide the clarification as requested by the Rapporteur as to the pertinent or relevant criteria. Brazil now.

Brazil

Thank you Mr Chairman. Very clearly the proposal is to inscribe the site under criteria (ix) and (x) of the Operational Guidelines which are precisely the criteria that the IUCN takes into account and checks in order to determine the sites OUV or Outstanding Universal Value. Now given time constrains and also given the fact that we do not yet have a readymade paragraph for this Draft Decision, it would perhaps be desirable and appropriate for the interested States Parties, Brazil and Egypt, in particular Brazil would like to volunteer to draft the resolution or a resolution to be considered by the Committee tomorrow morning, Saturday morning, that is.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Jordan has the floor.

Jordan

Jordan would like to endorse the recommendation made by Egypt and Brazil. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I would now like to give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman. We would like to associate us with the proposal of Brazil and Egypt. However, we have a problem. We need some clarification. The statement of the advisory body has clearly demonstrated that the property as a natural site has an OUV. This is established. Probably that is why they are recommending referral. Secondly, the explanation given by the IUCN is that inscribing it will help the State Party to develop a complete and appropriate management regime for the site. Which means that it will be more appropriate to save the property by inscribing it as a World Heritage Site. However, the clarification we require is that what happens to the dossier which has already been presented as a mixed site. Will the State Party need to go back to develop another dossier that would reflect this new status as a natural site or do we just extract those requirements from the site. Who is going to do this? This is the clarification that we want. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

I would like to ask the Secretariat to please provide this clarification on this procedural matter.

The Secretariat

The Committee decides to inscribe the site only on the natural site. It should eventually see the rest of the Draft Decision and if it confirms the deferral under cultural criteria that will mean that the State Party could present another nomination, a new nomination, just under cultural criteria.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. South Africa. I apologise to South Africa, but Nigeria would like to make a comment on the clarification provided.

Nigeria

I'm afraid Mr Chairman, I don't think we have been well clarified on this issue. The point I am making is that if it is going to be described as a natural site and the dossier that is before us is presented as a mixed site, so is the State Party now going to be required to go back to represent it as a natural site or is it the work of the Secretariat to extract what is required to qualify it as a natural site This I think will help us. If it is that it means that the file would just be appropriate.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to Mr Francesco Bandarin to provide clarification.

The Secretariat

I think the question is very simple. The site described as a natural site on the basis of the recommendation that has been presented by IUCN and that is the declaration of the site as such, the dossier will remain what it was because it is an act preparatory document for the decision of the Committee.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The representative of South Africa.

South Africa

Thank you Chair. I was going to comment on that also. The dossier can contain many many things and it is for the Committee to consider even one of the many many things, but South Africa would like to support the position put forward by Brazil, Egypt and the rest that the site be inscribed, but also to delete No. 3 in the Draft Decision and amend 2 to say it decides to inscribe.

The Chairperson

Mali please.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense qu'au cours des débats la tendance a beaucoup évolué et de manière objective je veux tout simplement que suivent les débats. La Délégation malienne se rend compte que le bien a été proposé en tant que bien naturel et sur un processus d'inscription bien établi parce que l'IUCN a parlé de l'existence d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Donc nous sommes entièrement favorables à l'inscription du bien en tant que bien naturel, mais nous rejoignons cette fois-ci l'Etat partie d'Australie qui a posé comme condition l'élaboration d'un cadre de gestion globale qui est nécessaire et qui est un outil de gestion du bien. Merci.

The Chairperson

The representative of Egypt please.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Juste pour économiser du temps, je pense qu'on peut modifier le paragraphe 3 dans le sens de l'inscription sur les critères naturels, supprimer le paragraphe 7 parce qu'il n'y aura pas du tout nécessité. Et aussi nous voulons appuyer la recommandation donnée par la Délégation de l'Australie sur la nécessité d'établir un cadre de gestion global dans un intervalle de temps précis. Merci Monsieur le Président et je pense que nous pouvons avancer dans ce sens- là.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Cambodia.

Cambodia

Merci Monsieur le Président. Le Cambodge aimerait appuyer la proposition d'inscription en tant que site naturel. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you. United Arab Emirates please.

UAE

Well, having actually listened to the lengthy discussion we have to say that we endorse I mean the proposition again made by Brazil and Egypt, but at the same time we just wonder whether it is still possible, I mean to grant permission from The Chairperson actually I mean to request the Sri Lankan Delegation to give us, if they have, some sort of management plan, to actually manage the site and any framework, especially for tourism. Actually we know that this is a very natural site and we agree, although it has an archaeological aspect as well, which might be an extended and added to the natural in the future, but we need to know if the State Party can answer a question like this, I mean management for tourism. Thank you.

The Chairperson

It seems to me as Chair that clarification has already been provided on this topic. Actually there is a large majority trend for accepting the inscription as a natural site with the supplementation made by Australia. I believe that sometimes instead of repeating ourselves, perhaps we should converge in order to allow the Rapporteur to make the proposal. Thank you very much. The representative of France has the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je vais être très court. Je crois que l'honorable délégué du Nigéria avait posé une question qui est extrêmement importante. Peut-il en effet y avoir une césure entre d'un côté un dossier de candidature et une décision qui extraierait de ce dossier de candidature les éléments qui sont souhaités par le Comité. Nous avons une réponse très claire de Monsieur Bandarin et je l'en remercie. Alors la Délégation française souhaiterait tout à fait aller dans le sens de la proposition qui a été proposée par l'Australie et nous soutenons cette proposition.

The Chairperson

The Rapporteur has the floor too. I apologize. The Russian Federation would like to speak please.

Russian Federation

Dear colleagues we spent a lot of time here. We are tired and I have one proposal. So now to formulate like this all together the Draft Decision is impossible. It seems to me that we have to ask the Secretariat to, based on this discussion, that the majority of countries supported the inscription as a natural site, propose for tomorrow morning, you know the Draft Decision, that is all.

The Chairperson

The words of the Russian Federation is pertinent because we are actually tired and we are in an agreement trend, but there is a proposal of the Rapporteur and perhaps we

should listen to it because maybe then we can make our decision. So I give the floor to our Rapporteur and then we will take your remarks.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I fully understand the Russian proposal as an inscription which requires statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be included in the Draft Decision, which indeed is some work to be drafted and would certainly take more time than we have available tonight in this meeting room. However, we had some prior consultations to the opportunity or possibility that a case like this could occur and how we would handle such a situation and The Chairpersonperson, the Vice-Chairperson, the Secretariat and I consulted and we considered the opportunity that we could adopt the respective paragraph that leads to the inscription of the property, as well as considered different recommendations that we want to give to the site, on the basis of the recommendations that are already included in the Draft Decision, but we prepared a statement of Outstanding Universal Value and we would leave this paragraph adjourned and would distribute a printed version of the statement of Outstanding Universal Value to you, as well as for any other site that would be in a similar situation and adapt all statements of Outstanding Universal Value "en bloc" at the end of item 8(b). So we would leave the respective paragraph pending, but determine the relevant paragraph that would leave to the inscription of the property.

Having said that, in the case of the Draft Decision in front of us, we have three paragraphs that express the opinion of the Committee as regards the criteria proposed by the State Party and whether they are considered inscription, referral, deferral or non-inscription. We have paragraph 2, 3 and 7. Paragraph 2 in the current Draft Decision decides to non-inscribe according to the culture criteria (vii) and (viii), paragraph 3 in the current Draft Decision decides to refer according to criteria (ix) and (x) and paragraph 7 defers according to the culture criteria which we have proposed which were (iii), (v) and (vi) in this particular proposal. Now I believe that we have to make a statement with regard to each of the criteria and I think it is not advisable to simply delete the paragraphs in question, but to reach a position on how the Committee feels about each of these individual criteria.

Following the proposal from Brazil, I understood that the Committee would prefer an inscription according to natural criteria and according to criteria (ix) and (x), while the Committee seemed quite comfortable to not consider criteria (vii) and (viii) and at the same time to defer the culture criteria (iii), (v) and (vi) as expressed in paragraph 7. Therefore, your current wish for inscription would only require amendment of one single paragraph, which is paragraph 3 which would then read: Decides to inscribe the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka and probably we would need a name change in this context because it is cultural heritage would not seem appropriate so it would be: Decides to inscribe the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka to the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria (ix) and (x). Thank you very much.

A new paragraph 3bis would start with: Adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the Committee would probably need to leave that pending until the end of the discussions under 8B, as was suggested by the Secretariat, The Chairpersonperson and the Rapporteur. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Before we give the floor to the Plenary and also before consulting on whether we agree with what has been presented by the Rapporteur, it seems necessary to me that IUCN prepares for tomorrow morning a declaration of the OUV and I give the floor to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Brazil would like to thank the Rapporteur for the exceptionally good work it has been performing throughout all of these days, which has been proven by the proposals she has only just presented by simplifying the whole discussion that we had previously tonight. Brazil supports the text proposed by the Rapporteur. It believes that the wait for the declaration of OUV to be prepared by the IUCN. By doing so the decision would be complete as it is. It would meet the concerns raised by Australia and other Delegations once it recommends that the State Party implements an overall management system for the site and Brazil would only like to suggest a last paragraph, maybe the Rapporteur would know best where to place it. It requests the State Party to report the progress made regarding the recommendations above. So these are the recommendations that would have been made in paragraph 4 in its next session in 2011. And I hope that translation has been able to capture the English text, but in any case Brazil would be willing to provide the English text for this last paragraph. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia has the floor.

Australia

Australia also commends the word for the Rapporteur. One suggestion. I think it is consistent with what Brazil just mentioned. Australia would like to see effectively a variation of the current paragraph 4 which is in the text because it sets out important requirements that we would like to see actually happen. The first of which was the establishment of the Overall Management Framework for the serial property and include in that what is currently paragraph 4(a) a time frame. Include after those first words "within 12 months" so we have that clearly reflected in any decision we take. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the Rapporteur in order to capture the concerns expressed by the latest speakers.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. According to my current perception three amendments to the Draft Decision, the amendment to paragraph 3 which I will repeat once again, which would then read "Decides to inscribe the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka to the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria (ix) and (x)". Then following the request of Australia, there would be an amendment to paragraph 4(a) which would read: "Establish within 12 months an overall management framework for the serial property as required in the Operational Guidelines and to also establish completed and effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property". And then following the proposal by Brazil there would be a new paragraph 10 at the end of the Draft Decision which would state as follows: "Requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre on the above recommendations by 1 February 2011 for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011. Thank you very much Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

I consult the Committee whether you are willing to approve the Draft Decision as it was proposed by the Rapporteur. I give the floor to Australia.

Australia

Thank you Chair. Sorry I probably was not clear enough in my earlier intervention. Australia would also request that existing paragraphs 4(b) and 4(c) are also included because we believe that they are sensible suggestions for future work and that they could be easily incorporated. Thank you.

The Chairperson

The Rapporteur has the floor.

Rapporteur

Excuse me Australia, I didn't clearly understand this proposal. But it can be very easily integrated. Accordingly in addition to paragraph 4(a) which I just read out, paragraph 4(b) would read: Establish within 12 months effectively functioning buffer zones for the property which will ensure its protection from threats, arising from outside its boundaries, in consultation with local stakeholders and small (c) would read: Establish within 12 months a fully effective management and monitoring framework for tourism. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I apologize beforehand for asking for the floor yet again and for a comment that can be considered just us putting some makeup on the text, but I would recommend to the Rapporteur, I am not a native English speaker, but I would recommend perhaps that the reading should be; To recommend to the State Party to establish in 12 months: (a) an overall management framework; (b) a buffer zone; (c) a fully effective management framework, etc. So the capot (?) of the paragraph 4 would just say "Establish in 12 months" just once to improve the text and structure of the Draft Decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

The rapporteur has the floor.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much for the very valuable suggestion indeed. I will be happy to incorporate it. I don't think it is necessary to read the text out again as it has not changed the content, but just the style of the decision.

The Chairperson

I consult the Committee whether we can consider approved the Draft Decision as read by the Rapporteur.

IUCN

As you move to approval, just three comments. Firstly, I think you asked a question about a statement of OUV whenever you have identified that it meets the criteria then we are comfortable to draft a statement of OUV although clearly we don't have it here. So this is a matter for tomorrow. Secondly, in terms of paragraph 4, I didn't actually catch the precision of the drafting but I would suggest if the Committee is adopting an inscription, rather than a referral that the word requests would be immaterial. The word to choose to adopt in the chapeau of that paragraph because that conveys the requirement that is in the Operational

Guidelines that is being somewhat set to one side with another formula and the last point in terms of drafting the paragraph is that it would be helpful to have a reporting back process which is framed in terms of the normal state of conservation process and there is standard language for that which the Secretariat can help you with. Thank you.

The Chairperson

A minor point of correction. Why to consult with the Committee Members as to whether the Committee is willing to accept that.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. J'ai juste encore une petite question. Le paragraphe 4 commence bien pas par « Recommande » l'Etat partie, mais par « Demande » à l'Etat partie, parce que si on met ensuite un délai il faut bien qu'on demande et qu'on emette pas juste une recommandation. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The Rapporteur has the floor.

Rapporteur

I think that perhaps for the sake of clarity I will read this re-amended paragraphs again. Its late in the evening and I want to make sure that every Committee Member has full clarity on what is being adopted.

Paragraph 3 would be changed to the following text:

Decides to inscribe the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka to the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria (ix) and (x).

Paragraph 4 would be amended to read:

Requests the State Party to establish within 12 months: (a) an overall management framework for the serial property as required in the Operational Guidelines and to also establish completed effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property; (b) effectively functioning buffer zones for the property which will ensure its protection from threats arising from outside its boundaries in consultation with local stakeholders; and (c) a fully effective management and monitoring framework for tourism.

And a newly added paragraph 10 would read:

Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report on the above recommendations by 1 February 2011 for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I would like to consult with the Committee members at this point as to whether the Committee members agree to approve the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.9** as read. Approved. (Applause)

I would like to congratulate the State Party and if there is any interest on the part of the State Party you will have two minutes for a brief remark or statement.

Sri Lanka

I thank the Committee for taking the decision to inscribe this property as if to help us to protect the property and I thank all the members for taking this step because Sri Lanka, after a period of 30 years, which has suffered terrorism has moved in to a new era and this would definitely help us. Thank you.

MIXED PROPERTIES

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. We will now proceed to the examination of the nomination of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument in Hawaii, United States of America.

I would like now to invite the Secretariat to present the new information available.
ICOMOS

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Can we now turn to the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument in the United States of America. This map shows the very large scale location of these islands. Papahānaumokuākea is the name for a vast and isolated linear cluster of small, low lying islands and atolls with a surrounding ocean extending to some 1900 kilometres to the northwest of the main Hawaiian Archipelago. The area has deep cosmological and traditional significance for living Native Hawaiian culture, as an ancestral environment, as an embodiment of the Hawaiian concept of kinship between people and the natural world, and as the place where it is believed that life originates and where the spirit returns after death. On two of the islands, Nihoa and Makumanamana, there are archaeological remains relating to pre-European settlements and use, including a large ensemble of shrines with tight specific to these islands.

In terms of categories of cultural properties that are in the Convention this is a site. In terms of the Operational Guidelines it is also a cultural landscape. Here is a map of the islands. The nominated area is seen to the West of the main Hawaiian islands. Polynesian voyagers arrived in the isolated Hawaiian Archipelago around 300 A.D. as part of the great migration around the Pacific that started perhaps some 3000 years ago from South-East Asia reaching Polynesia and then spreading across the rest of the Pacific over the next two millennia.

The property consists of 10 islands and atolls and by contrast with the vast seascape which surrounds them, the landmass of the 10 islands is very tiny. The islands were found uninhabited or abandoned at the time of western contact in the 18th century. By contrast with the main Hawaiian islands to the East, the nominated islands have only minimal freshwater resources and were used it seems sporadically, with only one island Nihoa exhibiting settlements. It is positive that Native Hawaiians lived on Nihoa for a 700-year period between 1700 A.D. The island inhabitants captured rainwater in seeps in the three main valleys and these practices may have sustained a population of up to around a 100 people.

Around 13 per cent of the island is covered by agricultural terraces cut into rock slopes and phased with stone. These created shelter from the **harsh** sea winds and storms. Artefacts recovered from Nihoa include finished and unfinished stone adzes, hammer stones, grindstones, stone balls and bone tools and so on. There are burial sites, ceremonial terraces, platforms and many rock shelters which may have also served as habitation sites. There is a threat to these remains in terms of the nesting sea birds, especially the burrowing

species, and these have damaged some sites. The birds are protected and therefore increasing in numbers.

At the moment, the mitigating actions taken as to repair the damaged walls, but in the long term this measure alone may not be sufficient to protect the integrity of the archaeological resources. It is recorded that until the late 19th century people from the main Hawaiian islands travelled to Nihoa to collect fish, leaves and grass for cordage. In contrast to Nihoa, Makumanamana does not appear to have supported a permanent population. It does, however, have instead a remarkable collection of shrines and other remains which had some sort of religious function. Altogether some 33 shrines, made of bastled uprights, rising from stone rectangular platforms and courts and these follow the crest of the island, tracking the sun and it is believed that the solar solstice hits upright stones of these shrines that are at a significant angle. And there are stone figurines that were found at this site which provide an intriguing link between Hawaiians and eastern Polynesian culture.

The islands are still used occasionally for ceremonial purposes connected to the summer solstices. But the very remote nature of the islands and the lack of harbours means that very few archaeological missions have taken place. There is certainly a need to enhance documentation. This is currently being undertaken. Papahānaumokuākea is now respected by Hawaiians in the main islands as a sacred place containing the boundary between the world of light and the living and the world of the God spirits and primordial darkness from which all life comes and to which it returns after death. Makumanamana island represents this boundary between the two worlds. The world of Gods and the realm of light when native Hawaiians and the rest of Hawaiian's living creatures reside. At death, the westward road of the ancestral spirits, native Hawaiians believe that when a person's body dies their spirit travels to portals found on each of the islands in the archipelago.

The conditions of integrity and authenticity have been met, although ICOMOS considers the integrity of the archaeological attributes is vulnerable. We continue that the nominated property meets criteria (iii) and (vi). In terms of the way that the property can be seen to position the Hawaiian tradition within a wider 3,000 Euro-Pacific Polynesian Cultural Continuum. And for the way the vibrant and persistent beliefs associated with Papahānaumokuākea are of outstanding significance as a key element in Pacific socio-cultural evolutionary pattern of beliefs.

The main threats to the property are as I have already mentioned are from these burrowing species and, at the moment, there is no deterrent it seems to this. There is concern for the fragility and disruption of the archaeological remains. We also consider that this needs to be addressed, as well as the need for further documentation of the cultural resources.

The management system for the property is adequate, provided there is an equitable balance between the protection of cultural and natural attributes and that a cultural heritage person is appointed. Finally, ICOMOS recommends that Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (vi). We further recommend that the name of the property be changed to Papahānaumokuākea. It's simply that or to another name which may better reflect the nature of the property as a mixed cultural and natural property. We have a few recommendations which are listed in your papers. Thank you.

IUCN

Thanks Chair, while the slides are arriving you can find IUCN's evaluation of Papahānaumokuākea, on page 145 of the English version and on page 149 of the French. So Papahānaumokuākea is a large, mostly marine seascape, located in the North Central Pacific Ocean, roughly 250 kilometres North West of the main Hawaiian islands. The total area of the nominated property extends across the whole of the Papahānaumokuākea

Marine National Monument. It is a vast area. It is larger in extent than New Zealand, but with only 14 square kilometres of land area. The property is being nominated under criteria (viii), (ix) and (x) in relation to the natural values it possesses.

IUCN considers that the property meets criterion (viii). It is an exceptional example of island hotspot progression, comprising a major portion of the world's longest and oldest volcanic chain. The scale, distinctiveness and linearity of the manifestation of these geological processes are unrivalled. The geological values of the property are directly connected to the values in the already inscribed Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, recognized under criterion (viii) only and we note the importance of this relationship in the Draft Decision that has been recommended to you. Papahānaumokuākea constitutes a remarkable example of ongoing evolutionary and bio-geographical processes with high endemism and its reef ecosystems are still dominated by top predators such as sharks.

IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (ix). The terrestrial and marine habitats of this property are crucial for the survival of many endangered and vulnerable species. The distribution of which are highly restricted or entirely restricted to this area. It constitutes a vital nesting and nursery habitat for many of the species including seabirds, sea turtles and cetaceous. It is collectively the largest tropical sea bird rockery in the world and it includes almost the entire populations of two species of threatened albatross. Thus the property also meets criterion (x). The property meets the requirements for protection. It is a highly protective area established through presidential proclamation in 2009 which adds to a range of other legal mandates that govern its management and the boundaries are being clearly defined. Also a buffer zone is considered unnecessary. There are clear, mature and effective governance arrangements for the property and an inter-agency coordination committee has been established to engage other State and Federal agencies that support monument operations. And the marine ecosystems of Papahānaumokuākea are in exceptionally good health.

Management and protection mandate strategies and implementation arrangements are by and large sound and sufficient to address the threats facing the area and those threats are noted in the evaluation report, but we would like to draw attention to the work that is needed to ensure that military presence will not in any way affect the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

The evaluation of cultural aspects is carried out by ICOMOS and you have heard their report. We would like to note in relation to natural values that the cultural uses of the property and their associations with nature, at their past and at their present levels are positive and appropriate in relation to the conservation of the natural values of the property.

In summary, IUCN considers that this property meets criteria (viii), (ix) and (x), together with the condition of integrity and the requirements for protection and management and therefore we recommend that the Committee inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in relation to its natural values and you can find the Draft Decision at page 12 of the English and page 13 of French versions of document 8(b). Thank you.

The Chairperson

I'd like to praise and thank ICOMOS and IUCN for their explanations and I would like to invite the State Parties to express their views on this nomination. I give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

Jordan

Mr Chair, well this is a very impressive nomination and we endorse the recommendations made by ICOMOS and IUCN and its rather late now and we say congratulations.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Mexico please.

Mexico

Thank you very much Sir. Mexico should like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the tremendous efforts made by the USA government in preparing this dossier and also the amount of work that they have done with several Federal agencies is the Hawaiian State and some Hawaiian bodies as well. I know that this goes a long way back. Public consultations have been held. This has been a very important basis indeed for the future management of the resources in question. And as we have heard from the Advisory Bodies, their approach is positive to having this property listed and Mexico should like to endorse that. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. Barbados supports the various comments made with respect to the extraordinary beauty and breadth of the site. So on the basis of the natural criteria we have no difficulty in accepting the inscription of the site. We are a little concerned though about the information provided with respect to the archaeological basis for the finding of the cultural criteria and we would like to ask, through you Chair, both ICOMOS and perhaps the State Party to give a little more clarification about how they have reached the conclusion with respect to the connection between the cultural manifestations at this site and eastern Polynesian cultures. Because you see Chair, the evaluation provided suggests that there is very limited archaeological research that has taken place within the context of this site. And so we would like to have a little more information before we feel completely comfortable about accepting the cultural criteria. But please understand that we are looking forward to the inscription of the site but we would like to have further clarification. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to ICOMOS for clarification.

ICOMOS

I think one has to bear in mind that these are very tiny islands. Yes, I made the point that there have not been too many archaeological expeditions to these islands, but it doesn't take very long to see what is there. I wasn't suggesting in any way that there hadn't been adequate archaeological investigations of the islands and I hope that our text explains that. I mentioned the question of documentation and there was last year a mission to the islands to increase the documentation of what is there, but our view was that there was sufficient identification and research had been done to establish the claims that were put forward.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the State Party according to the request of Barbados.

USA

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. The United States is honoured and gratified by this inscription of Papahānaumokuākea which is the first nomination we have made in 15 years. Both the tremendous size of this area and its integration of natural and cultural values make it one of our most treasured places. We pledge to give it the highest possible level of

protection. I now give the floor to Aulani Wilhown, the site superintendant who can answer the questions.

Thank you very much Mr Chair and for the question from Barbados. We fully support the statement just made by ICOMOS and would also like to add that in addition to the archaeological work that has been conducted the presence of our history as native Hawaiian people in Papahānaumokuākea is documented through oral histories, through our songs, through our chants and through names that are evident in not only oral but also in written literature that is in our native language. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Bahrain.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Mr Chair. Last year in February, the Bahrain action plan has been developed and this year last month a meeting was held in Germany, on the island of Whelen to develop the marine thematic study by the IUCN and the Centre. This property really reflects an example of what the meeting and the group, especially the marine team expects to see. We would like to congratulate the State Party and the people of Hawaii for this nomination. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I would like to ask for the understanding of this Committee but we have a time problem and we would need for you to cooperate and please make briefer comments. I give the floor now to the representative of the Russian Federation.

Russian Federation

Thank you very much. Mr Chair we fully support the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. South Africa

South Africa

Thank you Chair. This is one of the clear cut cases for inscription. South Africa wants to warmly congratulate the State Party on this nomination and strongly supports the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List given the deepest geo-morphological and traditional significance for the living native Hawaiian culture in an ancestral environment and its unique pristine natural environment. Based on the comments that have been made so far Chair, I would recommend that we probably maybe close the matter and make a decision.

The Chairperson

I accept the South African suggestion. It seems to me that there is a trend for unanimity of support on the part of all. I intend to give the floor to the Rapporteur because of the lateness of the hour.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 34 COM 8.B.10 is on page 12 of the English version and page 13 of the French version of the document 8.B and I have not received any written amendments Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

I would like to consult the Committee as to whether we agree with the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8.B.10** Sweden has the floor.

Sweden

Thank you Sir. I don't think that it's necessary.

The Chairperson

I wanted to give the floor to the State Party for two minutes.

USA

The Delegation of the United States wants to express its deep and sincere gratitude to the Committee for the first US inscription onto the list in 15 years and I turn the floor over to my dear Hawaiian colleague Aulani Wilhoun.

(Greetings in Hawaiian. Aloha!)

On behalf of my colleagues the underground managers back home in Hawaii, the ones who work everyday to restore habitat, to protect our cultural sites, to conduct research and monitoring and engage our communities and enforce regulations and respond to emergencies in order to protect Papahānaumokuākea. We thank you so very much for recognizing the great natural and cultural legacy of our vast ancestral place. We feel your decision to list is first mixed natural and cultural seascape carries forward the founding philosophy of the World Heritage Convention of the inextricable link between nature and culture. It also brings global recognition of the importance of marine heritage and the intimate relationship that living indigenous cultures in the Pacific still have with the ocean today. We look forward to other sites joining us on the list to continue to expand representation of marine world heritage. Aloha! (in Hawaiian). Thank you so much again.

The Chairperson

The meeting is adjourned. I would like to congratulate all of you for the progress that has been achieved. We will start again at 10 o'clock tomorrow and the Bureau meeting at 9.30 a.m. Thank you very much.

Saturday, 31 July 2010

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Morning session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

ITEM 8: NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson

Kindly take your seats members of Committee, we are about to get started. Good morning everybody. I wish you a successful working day. I hope that we have a very productive day ahead of us. A special welcome to our experts.

Good morning. Kindly take your seats everybody. We are going to get under way but first I would like to make a comment as Chair. It is important for everyone to cooperate closely today as concerns us sticking to our time. The panel is here to make sure that the decisions don't take too long when members of Committee make decisions, but I really call on you to respect the time limits so as not to waste any time at all. Insofar as we have seen that we are behind schedule we would really like the 34th session of the Committee to finish on time and with efficacy. So please I beg all of you to offer your cooperation on this matter and I'll hand over to Francesco Bandarin so that he can tell us about the timetable and the possible solutions we have before us.

The Secretariat

During the Bureau meeting this morning we examined the situation of time management and as you can imagine there is an issue. We are late and there are still 37 nominations or extensions to be examined plus 20 items on the agenda. So we have discussed different options but for the time being we would like to propose one for today which is feasible and we have checked with the interpreters. We propose to have an evening session, but it would be more than an evening session it will be a night session. We are going to organize a session in the afternoon in the following way. We will start at 3 p.m. and go on until 7 o'clock. So four hours, then we will interrupt for an hour and then we will start at 8 o'clock and go through until midnight, which makes it four more hours. I know this is a very tiring and difficult agenda and timetable, we believe that this is the only way we have to recuperate a little bit the delay that we are in. Then after that we will have to take other decisions for next week. Thank you Mr Chairperson. As I have the floor let me just inform you that the documents for the working group were here, they are not here anymore, anyway they were deposited here and you can pick them up when you go out. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I shall hand over to the representative of Australia.

Australia

Chair, I think Mr Bandarin you were announcing that there are two documents for the consultative group on the futures that were on the podium just at the foot to be collected for people who would like to attend their meeting, I wonder Mr Bandarin if it is possible for them to be brought back there so that interested people could collect them as soon as possible. I do apologize.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The Chairperson

Would anyone else like to take the floor. I think not, therefore we can get started with this mornings programme of work. Let us start then with the **Cultural Landscape of Konso in Ethiopia** and I shall hand over to ICOMOS, so that we can hear a presentation of the details. So over to ICOMOS. You have about 5 minutes.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. The nomination is for the Konso cultural landscape in Ethiopia. This is in the South-West of Ethiopia in the southern nations nationalities and peoples regional state as shown on this map. The property is at the end of the Ethiopian arm of the Great Rift Valley. The intensively terraced steep and arid Konso Highlands rise to around 2000 metres and over look plains on all sides. The stone wall terraces support fields of millet and corn and a part of an intense communally organized and finely balanced agricultural system which incorporates water management systems that ensure water seeps from one terrace to another. Within the terraced landscapes are stonewall settlements, collators, crowning the summit of hills. They are variously encircled by between one and six defensive stonewalls. Each of the settlements have several large open and communal and ceremonial spaces with thatched roof structures. The Konso people who live in these areas are notable for the erection of memorial statues for dead people to commemorate heroic events. There is no buffer zone. In terms of categories of cultural properties, this is a site and in terms of the Operational Guidelines it is also a cultural landscape. The property consists of four main elements. Agricultural terraces, wall towns, sacred forests and shrines which we will look at one by one.

First of all the terraces. The nominated area extends to 55 square kilometres and what is being nominated is the place where the terraces and fortified settlements are at their most dense. The Konso area has a high degree of uncertainty regarding rainfall due to its position at the end of the highlands. And the problem is not the absence of rain but in abundance in a short time. Hence, the need to collect and maximize the rainfall and discharge the excess. This is what the terraces do. They prevent soil erosion and maximize water retention and they are extremely efficient in that a huge variety of crops are grown in rotation throughout the year. The nominated property broadly encloses the upper reaches of three high-level valleys. The landscapes and the wall towns are largely managed, conserved and maintained by traditional practices through a clan system that includes strong communal obligations towards repairing walls and managing the terraces. Water is collected in reservoirs located within or near the forests. The wall towns are all on or near the summits of hills. They are enclosed by one or six walls reflecting it seems a response to population increase with the inner walls being the oldest and often the tallest. Traditionally in many of the towns there was a dense grove of trees between the town and the fields that provided firewood and other resources. This particular town Gomoli has three stone walls, but the woodlands surrounding the town are mostly destroyed due to population and development pressure. This is a view inside the town showing the walls cutting through the houses. Mekelle with three walls is one of the few towns to keep part of its surrounding woodlands. Loadkatu has six walls with an outer length of around 1.6 kilometres. One of the vulnerabilities of the town, as identified by the State Party, is the gradual movement of residents away from the centre of the towns to the outskirts. And there are currently no planning policies that restrain this new development or, indeed, prevent tourist lodges being developed in prominent places. In Gotcha town the walls are said to be mostly destroyed, so the condition is variable, but what is not being provided in the nomination dossier is adequate documentation to allow full understanding of the precise extent of the surviving walls or indeed their state of conservation. We have very little detail of history and the formation of

these towns or indeed their overall extent within which the nominated sites have been chosen. What is clear is that there is an enormous conservation task to keep these terraces and walls and forests in order. In recent years, outside funding has helped with this process in a limited way to compensate for the declining number of people available for repairs as younger people move to the plains. This is just a view of the houses and individual compounds within the towns. In each of the towns there are several communal areas which have these tours around roof structures which are a reflection of communal pride and serve as show pieces to the village. It is not quite clear how many of these exist nor where they are, but some, as this one, have recently been restored. The paths may be surrounded by generation trees, dead junipers or stone stele. There are three areas of sacred forests in the nomination, but we don't have any illustrations of these. One of the things that this area is notable for are the erections of these memorial statutes to dead people, representing heroic events. Unfortunately many of these are now neglected.

The boundaries proposed are somewhat arbitrary with long straight sections cutting across the landscape and do not coincide with either recognizable landscape features or cultural units. Since the overall management system is closely related to the management of water resources and to the cultural units focused on the towns, ICOMOS considers that the boundaries need to be aligned with natural and cultural landscape features. At the moment the boundaries tend to cut through settlements in other areas. We are also concerned that what is not clear is what is not included. To the North-East, just outside the boundaries, is a fast-growing town which is omitted and there are currently no planning or other policies that can adequately control development in the way it interacts with the nearer by wall towns.

ICOMOS considers this site has huge potential to be included on the World Heritage List, but we do not consider yet that it is ready for inscription for the following reasons. We consider that it is essential that landscape that is sustained by communal farming activities relate to those units and to cultural units. Secondly, there is the need to set out much more clearly the distinctiveness of this landscape and what sets it apart, thus what is its key attributes and what needs managing. Unless it is clear what is being protected and what can evolve and change we consider that this extremely complex and large landscape will be almost impossible to manage. There is also a need for better documentation to show more precisely what is being nominated and the condition as a baseline for future monitoring. The traditional management systems in place underpin the overall management of the landscapes and towns, however, they are highly vulnerable to demographic and social pressures. There is currently no accommodation between development and tradition through incentives as well as constraints that might support traditional practices and the economy of the terraces.

We consider it essential for traditional management to be supported through legal and planning frameworks to avoid the slow drift away from the towns and the abandonment of the terraces, otherwise there will be problems that will be experienced in other similar landscapes around the world. Traditional management on its own cannot address the many pressures. There is a need for governance that integrates customary and formal protection. Overall ICOMOS commends the State Party for developing this nomination from community level. The nominated landscape bears striking witness to an intense, resilient land use forged by very specific social and cultural systems responding to an unpredictable environment. However, the system is under considerable pressure and faces enormous challenges. We therefore recommend deferral in order to allow the State Party to address these issues and these are listed on this nomination document in our evaluation.

Finally, we would like to add that we consider that a strengthened nomination addressing the points raised could provide the property of great resilience to meet the many challenges that it is likely to face. ICOMOS would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the State Party the practical measures that could be put in place to address the issues identified. We would also like to acknowledge the factual error letter received from the State Party and we accept the errors that we have identified.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Madam. The floor is now open for States Parties. Sweden you have the floor.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairman. Sweden supports the evaluation of the Advisory Bodies and supports in this case a deferral on grounds elaborated in the evaluation dossiers and is visible in the Draft Decision. However, we have two questions to ICOMOS. The first one is if the comparative analysis that should be elaborated a little bit should be only on the African continent as a way forward. The other one is that we have noted that both Konso and Ngorongoro that we are discussing later are located in the Great Rift Valley system. To our knowledge there is a serial nomination going on for the Rift Valley. Are those two nominations linked in any way to that serial nomination. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS

First of all the comparative analysis – certainly we would agree that the comparative analysis needs to be undertaken within the same, what we would call geo-cultural region. We do not think there is need for a global comparison of analysis, but certainly a comparative analysis within an appropriate area which could consider what is absolutely distinctive about this area in comparison to the many tourist landscapes in other parts of East and West Africa. Secondly, on the question of the Rift Valley – as we understand it the Rift Valley serial nomination is looking at primarily a combination of natural and cultural features that involve geology and early sites of early man. As we understand it, it is not a serial nomination that encompasses everything related to the Rift Valley but the very specific items that can be found from one end of the Rift Valley to the other. Maybe there are other people in the room who could elaborate further on that, if that is not considered satisfactory.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Mali you have the floor.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie également l'ICOMOS pour les nombreux éléments d'informations. Nous avons à faire Monsieur le Président à un paysage culturel, autrement dit à un paysage naturel exceptionnel autour duquel nous avons des pratiques culturelles vivantes. Je voudrais poser une petite question à l'ICOMOS parce que j'ai suivi l'exposé et je n'ai pas entendu parler de la notion de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Le paysage culturel proposé présente-t-il une valeur universelle exceptionnelle ? Par rapport à l'Etat partie comme l'a dit l'ICOMOS, il y a des menaces par rapport à des villages fortifiés et quels sont les efforts consentis par l'Etat pour pallier à la dégradation de ces murs et en termes également de gestion et de protection des lieux, l'ICOMOS a retenu que le système de gestion traditionnelle est faible. Je voudrais savoir que fait l'Etat partie pour renforcer ce système traditionnel. Merci.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS

Thank you. In our evaluation and in my summary I said, and it is ICOMOS's view, that certainly this landscape has the potential to demonstrate OUV (Outstanding Universal Value), but we have to be clear if we are saying a property has Outstanding Universal Value we have to say what area we are talking about and what are the specific attributes that convey that Outstanding Universal Value. And in this case we don't feel either of those two issues have been clearly identified. So I don't think we can just vaguely say that this area as a whole has Outstanding Universal Value. We do need to pin it down more precisely to a satisfactory rational area within which we can say that certain key attributes have Outstanding Universal Value and those are the ones we need to hang on to, whether it is the defensive walls, the terraces, the agricultural system, so there is a degree of certainty as to what should be protected and conserved and what can evolve. Because that is the crucial thing in a cultural landscape to understand, as it can lead to very difficult issues and management. So certainly we consider this landscape has the potential to demonstrate OUV as the Honourable delegate from Mali said as an exceptional cultural landscape, but there is a 'but' because we don't think that it has been pinned down sufficiently.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Concerning the questions asked by Mali, the management committee has been established and agreed at the national level to include concerned governmental administrative officers and community members, including traditional leaders, youth and women representatives, and that committee has been formed at the community level is exemplary while the involvement at regional and national level is confined to inscription. So we have prepared the system so that we can follow up the conservation of the site and also on the management level involving every administrative level concerning the conservation of Konso. Thank you.

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman. Actually the Nigerian Delegation's question relates to the issue of management as outlined by ICOMOS. We sincerely thank them for a thorough job done, but with regard to the management I think we will join ICOMOS in congratulating the State Party on the grass root initiative in providing documentation and the commitment of the local community to this dossier. According to the Operational Guidelines the management initiative should provide effective protection. The indication in the ICOMOS evaluation that a management committee has been agreed at the regional level to include concerned governmental administrative officers, community members, including traditional rulers, youth and women is ample evidence of a management system guaranteeing the protection of this property. While the question of implementation is perhaps a question of money and finances we consider that with strong local commitment, the role of the regional and national government should be confined to inspection. However, we feel that this is the issue of a situation where we are talking about the chicken and the egg. Probably I wonder if the Party, the State Party that is present here will give details regarding to the responsibilities of this Committees. Perhaps that might give a clearer picture of what this committee is going to do and the fears of ICOMOS might be allayed in terms of the management of the property. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much, Ethiopia you have the floor.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairman. Actually when we chose the site we have chosen the best example and the best management and the notion is because the site is a living heritage which is not possible to freeze it. In addition, it is a living heritage. Konso people do live both in the hills and on the flood low lands so the system we established will help us managing the site properly, but as it is said by my colleague it is only a matter of financing to run and solve all the problems facing concerning conservation. The site, the area we now nominated, only extends to 55 kilometres, which is about 2.5% of the overall Konso hill. The whole area is 2,354 kilometres. So our thinking is to first exercise and get good practice and learning from this small part we can extend and include all the others. That's why you see that we haven't put the buffer zone because still maybe in the future it is going to be included in the site also. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS

I just want to respond to the clarifications by the State Party on the management, but I would like to point out that what we have to satisfy is both protection and management and one of the areas where we consider that there were some difficulties over the lack of protection in legal and planning terms. So, management certainly is one element and there is the other side of the coin as well.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. China you have the floor.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. We think the evaluation report has rightly identified the major problems of the site. We also learned from the State Party that the State Party has made a considerable progress in this area. Actually, one of the strengths of this nomination is that it comes from the local community who are waiting to keep their traditional ways of life and the production. This is exactly what we can count on for sustainability of the site. We also noticed that in some clients the local customer laws and traditions are as strong as national laws. If this is true to this site and if this can be properly guided, we believe that these traditions and customer laws can serve well the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. So we would like to draw attention to ICOMOS, if the problem is merely the way of presentation in the nomination dossier we would like to suggest to refer this site for this inscription and if it is not the problem with the nomination dossier but is the problem actually with the site, we think perhaps the State Party could invite international expert mission to the site. Not for reevaluating the site but for identifying the need for international assessment or assistance because this is also one of the issues, the lack of international assessment to the site as well. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Switzerland you have the floor.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. L'analyse comparative qui a été tentée dans le dossier de nomination ne semble pas être complète. Toutefois l'ICOMOS conclu lui-même qu'il n'y a guère pareil degré de continuité dans d'autres sites de communauté agricole. Parmi les éléments qui ont été discutés, figure notamment aussi le besoin de redéfinition des limites. Il

est vrai que les limites proposées, soi-disant géométriques, du bien ne prennent pas en considération des conditions géomorphologiques et des espaces socio-culturels, ce qui serait nécessaire et logique pour la délimitation d'un paysage culturel avec ces caractéristiques. La redéfinition de ces limites nécessitera une nouvelle mission d'évaluation, ce qui nous fait soutenir le report, donc *defer*, de la nomination tout en reconnaissant évidemment les grandes qualités de ce site et notamment aussi les efforts déjà entrepris de l'Etat partie. Nous avons d'ailleurs beaucoup apprécié l'offre de l'ICOMOS de soutenir l'Etat partie pour se futurs travaux. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Switzerland. Mexico, you have the floor.

Mexico

Thank you Sir. Two brief comments. First of all we would like to acknowledge the work carried out by the State Party in terms of involving the local communities in conserving this site. This is a very praiseworthy effort and we believe it falls in line with the objectives of the Convention. Secondly, we would like to have some clarification with respect to some of the basic concepts here. So this is a question for the ICOMOS representative. How do you believe, how do you see this site? Is it a productive cultural landscape and how was this site characterized in line with the various categories laid out by the scientific committee. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mexico. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS

Thank you, Chair. In terms of the categories of cultural landscapes as set out in the Operational Guidelines, these are in relation to this sort of landscape basically to a fossilized landscape or a revolving landscape. We certainly consider this as a revolving landscape. But in saying that one has to understand that not everything in a cultural landscape can evolve or in 50 or 100 years time the landscape may have metamorphosed into something completely different. So usually the idea or the essence of an evolving cultural landscape is that one identifies some practices, some processes, some features which you need to try and hang on to. But within that framework then there is room for evolution and change to meet peoples evolving needs. So I think perhaps the word simply evolving is too simple. That evolving cultural landscape involves certain elements being allowed to evolve and response to change, but other elements we need to try and hang on to. Because this landscape without the terraces, this landscape without the defensive walls would no longer be this landscape. So we have to understand what we are trying to hang on to and what can change. But on the other hand the landscape needs to change, there needs to be schools, there needs to be improvements in other directions in order that it can be a thriving profitable landscape for the people who live there.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you for the floor. Estonia supports the deferral of the nomination as advised by the Advisory Bodies and we would like to commend the State Party for the way it has developed the nomination in cooperation with the community concerned. We believe in the strong potential of the nomination and we feel that deferral gives the State Party an

opportunity to undertake more detailed inventory of the key attributes as asked by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS you have the floor just to clarify this particular comment.

ICOMOS

There's not much more we can add other than to acknowledge what has just been said is in line with our recommendations.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Brazil you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you Sir. We are faced with a complex situation. We are talking about a landscape which has Outstanding Universal Value and I would like first of all to congratulate the State Party for the efforts deployed in an attempt to preserve and conserve this property. There is no doubt in my mind that considerable efforts have been undertaken by the State Party to protect and to manage the property. I would also like to congratulate the State Party for another reason. They took the initiative of providing additional documents and additional information which are available to the committee and which deal with the development of local communities and their participation. Participation for Brazil in any case is extremely important with a view to preserving this property. At the same time I would like to refer to the report presented by the Advisory Bodies. In their general presentation it was pointed out that it was very important that the international community be asked to support the State Party in order to be able to overcome the various gaps that are clear in this nomination file.

Finally Mr Chairman, if we take into account the arguments put forward by several Delegations, while both taking into account the efforts of the State Party and looking at the state of the nomination of the file then it does make sense to defer the nomination and thereby encourage the State Party to take the necessary measures in the interim to make up for some of the gaps in their file. I would have a question for the advisory body however, and for the Centre and the State Party for that matter. And perhaps in the order that the President of the WHC considers most important, most appropriate rather. What sort of support is being provided to the State Party in this particular case, and in fact what is your opinion and what is the State Party's opinion when it comes to the assistance that it has received from the WHC. Could this assistance be increased? Could there be a new mission sent on site? Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Let's start with the State Party.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The State Party received international assistance in 1998 before the preparation of the nomination file and we are concerned that there seems to be a shortage of finances. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Secretariat would you like to respond.

The Secretariat

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais effectivement confirmer ce que le distingué délégué de l’Ethiopie vient de dire. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Bahrain has the floor.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Mr Chair. The degree of community involvement illustrated in the Konso nomination is really extraordinary and has been highly commended despite the immense strength of the traditional community system with its complex obligations in regard to conservation and management. The local traditional practices should be better supported from the regional and national level. In particular, through assistance by skilled heritage professionals, financial resources and legal protection. These are, however, requirements that can be easily put in place within an assured period of time. These actions will also contribute to sustain the agricultural and traditional practices, as well as to mitigating any potential threat of abandonment of the villages due to social and economic pressures. The inscription of the site will be of high benefit to the local community. The inscription will also positively contribute to their wish to sustainably increase tourism. Mr Chair, after listening to the interventions of the State Parties and the respected delegates it is of the Committee Members Bahrain wishes to support the Konso nomination. However, at this stage we would consider referral, the most appropriate recommendation. We agree with ICOMOS that the boundaries may need to be revised to better reflect key attributes and fully support the Outstanding Universal Values identified. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you. The Chairperson says that there is a measure of consensus and I would also like us all the contribute to saving time and I will now give the floor to Mali, who is asking for the floor for a second time and please be brief.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je promets d’être bref. Suite aux différentes réactions de l’ICOMOS et de l’Etat partie, je retiens qu’il y a des efforts consentis par l’Etat partie et que nous avons à faire, dans ce cas précis, à un système gestion intégrée pour les populations qui sont initiées à la gestion du site. En me basant sur ces deux éléments techniques et au nom de la stratégie globale dans l’optique d’une liste représentative crédible, je rappelle que nous sommes sur un continent sous représenté, et mieux, la catégorie proposée aussi est sous représentée sur le continent africain, à savoir le paysage culturel. Alors la Délégation du Mali propose un renvoi du dossier pour permettre à l’Etat partie de mieux se préparer et je rejoins aussi la proposition de la Chine qui consiste à envoyer des experts internationaux pour assister le pays. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of France.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. A vrai dire ce que je voulais dire a déjà été dit, en particulier par la Délégation Suisse. Mais je profite de cette occasion puisque un renvoi a été proposé, il me semble que si les limites doivent être changées, nous ne sommes pas dans le cas d'un renvoi. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

South Africa

Thank you Chair. I would like to comment a job well done by ICOMOS and the State Party. South African welcomes the nomination of this cultural landscape by the State Party and South Africa believes that there is reason to believe that the site is OUV and therefore it should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. However, there are many aspects that still needs resolution and therefore we propose that the nomination be referred back to the State Party instead of deferral. This should encourage the State Party to resubmit the nomination. We also urge the State Party to take cognizance of the recommendations and concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies and to address this in order to resubmit the nomination dossier for consideration. We would also, in line with China, encourage the international community to give the necessary support but also encourage the State Party at the same time to work with the African Fund. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you, Chair. Barbados is fully in support of this stunning and extraordinary cultural landscape. Particularly important for us too is the fact that if it is supported, maintained and revered by a living community, a living community that continues to demonstrate its traditional practices, both in terms of the maintenance of the cultural landscape and its cultural resonances within that landscape. It is critically important that the Committee take cognizance of the fact that we have very few opportunities such as this to recognize and give support internationally to a cultural landscape that does not have the kinds of influences and interventions that others do. I am not satisfied with the suggestion that because there is no money available we cannot advance the work that is necessary in respect of this site. I find it critically important that in some way we are able to underpin the work that is being done by the traditional community instead of seeking in some sense to override it. So I would like to support what my colleagues from Bahrain, Mali and South Africa have said and I hope that we can give consideration to at least a referral. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Jordan has the floor.

Jordan

Thank you Mr Chair. Jordan likes to endorse the proposal made by Bahrain, Mali and other representatives and refer the property. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to Switzerland. Perhaps you would like to be brief.

Switzerland

Thank you Sir. I don't know why this Committee is so afraid of the decision deferral. Now we have a discussion on referral, but in both cases the file goes back to the State Party for amendment and further works. In this case we have a situation where the OUV has the potential but not yet completely defined. I think therefore that we should go for the deferral because we will otherwise in the end have problems and state of conservation reports and so on. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I see that there is no one else which is just great. I give the floor to Australia.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chair. We will be very brief. We would like to support Bahrain in both reasons that they gave and the conclusions reached on this side. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Nigeria for a second time. Please be brief.

Nigeria

Thank you once again. I think the point that has been established by the presentation of ICOMOS is that the OUV of this site has been established. The only issue are two, management and boundary. And management given the explanation by the State Party as to what efforts have been made to develop a management regime that will adequately preserve the integrity of the site. The only issue that will be fired back to the State Party is to establish this boundary. In which case, Nigeria strongly believes that referral would not only encourage them but will be able to solve the problem by giving them enough time to define this boundary. So I would like to go with the consensus of the majority of the Committee that the State Party should get a referral and not a deferral. This will be an encouragement. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Iraq.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chairman. We support the referral. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Thailand please.

Thailand

Thank you Mr Chairman. Thailand would support the proposal by Mali, Bahrain and China and ask the State Party to cooperate with international aid and agrees with our colleagues to refer the property. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the representative of Brazil and I ask you to please be brief because you are speaking for the second time.

Brazil

Thank you very much for your indulgence and understanding, but as was said by one of the Delegations the Committee seems to have a fear on deferral, but I don't think that is overriding. Feeling at least with the respect of the Delegation of Brazil we feel neither referral or deferral, but in this specific case we maintain our opinion in that these defers a referral, but its not out of any fear on the part of the Delegation of Brazil.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Estonia has the floor.

Estonia

Thank you very much. I would like to remind the Committee of the debate we had when the Advisory Bodies explained the background paper on referral and deferral and I believe that we were all in agreement but deferral is an option that gives more opportunities in way for a State Party, because referral can be a decision that is limiting as to the changes that a State Party can make to a nomination. And therefore we also heard by expression that referral can sometimes be a poisonous gift which our Delegation fully shares and therefore we believe that the decision of deferral in this case is fully justified and I would like to support it. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. I would just like to point out the implications of referral in terms of amendments to the boundaries. I think all the honourable delegates who have spoken have recognized the need to redefine the boundaries. The difficulty is that if we go for referral then there will be no opportunity for a mission to evaluate these new boundaries and this could be quite difficult. Likewise, under referral the original nomination is meant to be supplemented by minor additional information rather than adjusted or rewritten which could give the opportunity to spell out more clearly Outstanding Universal Value, but I do think that the crucial thing that perhaps should be considered is whether or not this site needs another mission.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will give the floor to the Rapporteur. We really have not had a consensus so I turn to the Rapporteur and to go ahead and help us out.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. In turning to the Draft Decision, the Draft Decision is on page 15 of the English version and equally on page 15 of the French version of document 8(b) and I find myself in somewhat of an ambiguous situation because purely counting we have a majority of Committee members expressing their preference for referral but I have not received a written amendment to this Draft Decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I would like to know if we are ready to take a decision. Is there anyone else who still wishes to take the floor. Who agrees with the Rapporteur's proposal? I give the floor to Mali.

Mali

Merci monsieur le Président. Je ne serai pas long. Nous sommes partis sur la base d'un certain nombre d'éléments techniques, à savoir le processus d'inscription, et selon l'exposé qui a été fait par l'ICOMOS, on a parlé de l'existence d'une VUE potentielle. Alors nous nous sommes dit qu'il y a déjà un dossier qui est là, qui est consistant, mais qui reste à compléter, il n'y a que des éléments complémentaires à fournir. La zone tampon n'est pas une exigence, ça fait partie des orientations, ce n'est pas une exigence. Les limites on peut les préciser. Ce qu'il y a lieu de faire maintenant c'est de voir dans quelle mesure l'organe consultatif peut mettre ça dans son calendrier au cours de l'année. Nous maintenons donc le renvoi. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I turn to the Committee. Do you agree with the proposal?

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I would just like to repeat what I said. I want to be sure that all Committee members understand fully what decision they are taking. I have not heard any Committee member making an amendment to the decision so far, so at this moment you would agree to the Draft Decision as it is included in your documents. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. I would just like to respond to the Honourable delegate from Mali and to clarify the question of a mission. Within the timescale for referral it is not possible to have a mission as set out in the paper that is being circulated on referral and deferral, because the amount of time between when we receive referred dossiers and when we have to produce our report to the Committee is extremely limited, very tight, and there is no possibility of a mission. So, paragraph 3 in the Draft Decision would not be possible with referral.

The Chairperson

South Africa has the floor.

South Africa

South Africa volunteers to make a proposal decision in writing that speaks about referral.

The Chairperson

Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I don't think it will be necessary to have in writing at this point. But we have a draft amendment to the Draft Decision. I assume that South Africa would like to amend paragraph 2 of the current Draft Decision and change the text as follows. From defers to examination of the nomination of Konso the text would change 'refers the examination of the nomination on the basis of culture criteria of Konso cultural landscape of Ethiopia back to the State Party to allow it to. Then accordingly the Members of the Committee would need to review the sub-items (a) to (g) and consider their appropriateness giving the amended paragraph 2 and perhaps the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies could provide us with some guidance as to the appropriateness of the following paragraphs in case the decision of paragraph 2 would be changed. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Is there anyone who is against this Draft Decision? Approved. Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Just adopted decision 8 be 11 in terms of referring the nomination. I have received advise from the Secretariat that subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) may no longer be required. So I hereby take the opportunity to inform the Committee that those may be deleted as an editorial consequence of the decision taken. Thank you. Sorry, there was a misunderstanding apparently. Paragraph 3 is to be deleted and not (a), (b) and (c). I apologize.

The Chairperson

Estonia has the floor.

Estonia

Thank you Mr Chair. I just want to understand what really happened here because it was our understanding that the Draft Decision as amended and read out by the rapporteur had some questions to ask from the Advisory Bodies and we were looking for their reply and all of a sudden the decision was already adopted. So I am afraid we couldn't follow it very well.

The Chairperson

Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. Yes I believe indeed that there was some confusion because I asked a question and we suddenly adopted, but according to my understanding we adopted paragraph 2, the umbrella paragraph, and perhaps we could then seek guidance from the Secretariat as to the relevance of the remaining paragraphs that follows. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Secretariat please.

The Secretariat

Thank you. On our view and I think we share this with the Advisory Bodies. All the subparagraphs from (a) to (g) will remain in the decision. On the contrary, I think the

rapporteur also mentioned that paragraph 3 at this point cannot be adopted as such and should probably be deleted and so we remain with paragraph 4 to be adopted.

The Chairperson

Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Given this explanation I would suggest to you that all remaining paragraphs, except paragraph 3 remain in the Draft Decision as present at this moment. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Mexico please.

Mexico

Thank you Chair. Well, it seems that there is some confusion and so we would like to hear from the Legal Adviser as to this decision, adopted without any objections, but without us having a clear picture of what the real wording was on paragraph 2 and 3. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Legal Adviser please.

Legal Adviser

Mr Chairman thank you. I really don't have comments on this. If the Committee determines that it wishes to review how it adopted the decision I guess it can reopen the question again, but it is up to the Committee to decide what to do. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I would like the Rapporteur to read the text in its entirety so that we can examine it for adoption and then we will confirm or not confirm the adoption of the decision. Over to you Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Mr Chairperson, I will therefore read again to the Members of the Committee the paragraph as it is now proposed to you for adoption. Paragraph 1 remains unchanged, paragraph 2 would be amended as follows:

Refers the examination of the nomination on the basis of cultural criteria of Konso Cultural Landscape, Ethiopia back to the State Party to allow it to:

Then the subitems (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) would remain unchanged. We would propose to you to delete paragraph 3 and then existing paragraph 4 would become new paragraph 3 but remain unchanged. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Now I should like to ask the members of the Committee whether they are in a position to approve the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.11** as we have just heard it read out with those clarifications from the Rapporteur. Approved.

Now for **Fort Jesus, Mombasa, Kenya**. I should like to see the ICOMOS presentation and I would like you to please bear in mind the time constraints that we are facing. Thank you.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Fort Jesus, Mombasa, was built by the Portuguese at the end of the sixteenth century as part of the defensive system erected to protect the transcontinental trade and exploratory sources from Africa. In terms of category, this is a monument. Mombasa is a port city that is located in the southern edge of the Kenyan coast. At the time when the Portuguese arrived in the area there were already several prosperous times existing along this stretch of the coast, namely Pate, Malindian and Lamo. The nominated property that you can see here contoured by the red line is located by the sea at the edge of the old town and it comprises the Fort, the rock on which it stands, the moat and immediately surrounding area. Mombasa Old Town acts as a buffer zone for the nominated property and is contoured here by a blue line. The Fort has been erected to the design of Giovanni Battista Cairati, an Italian architect, who worked exclusively for the Portuguese in Africa. The Fort is organized around the central courtyard and closed by four bastions, one in each corner. Towards the sea a rectangular gun platform gives the Fort a roughly human shape. Along the perimeter runs a ditch with a dry moat which has been subsequently filled in. Due to the restless history of the region, the Omani Arabs, the Portuguese, the Turks and the Dutch, and subsequently the British clashed for centuries to gain control over the Fort and so the Fort underwent several attacks, transformation changes, events and uses. Nevertheless it has maintained its original layout. Although the defensive walls, as well as the interior structures, bear witness of the transformation of changes of the Fortress that has been undertaken along the years.

Mombasa Old Town – here we have some other examples of the structures of the Fort in fact. There are some vulnerabilities actually in the area around close to the sea because part of the coral rock has collapsed a few years ago. That should be taken into account. So we have a few pictures of old Mombasa that exemplify very well the colonial past as well as the combination of different cultural contribution that has been brought by all these different populations that have lived in the area. ICOMOS considers that the importance of Fort Jesus, Mombasa has not been fully demonstrated. Integrity and authenticity have been assessed together while the Operational Guidelines in fact require that they are assessed separately. Nor has comparative analysis contributed to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. At present the criteria that have been selected are not demonstrated but only stated. ICOMOS considers that further work on the dossiers is necessary to demonstrate that the property possesses OUV. As it has been said before, the main threats to the property regards the marine erosion of the coral rock on which the Fort is founded and the development pressure in the buffer zone that may also affect the nominated property. The boundaries at the moment appear at this stage adequate, but there is perhaps the necessity to include the underwater remains and this is suggested in our recommendation. And also to amend the discrepancy between the size of the gazetted conservation area, which is said to coincide with the buffer zone, and the size of the buffer zone itself. A holistic management structure is needed and the operational instruments and bodies to implement active conservation measures also need reinforcement. ICOMOS therefore recommends that examination of this property be deferred so that the State Party may further develop the nomination dossier, expand consequently the comparative analysis and demand the designation note in the gazette. ICOMOS has also made several other recommendations that you can find at page 61 of the evaluation volume. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I invite members of the Committee to take the floor if they would like to comment. Jordan you have the floor.

Jordan

Jordan sees that there is a kind of controversy in the decision of ICOMOS. So we would like to allow the State Party to clarify this situation please.

The Chairperson

The Secretariat asks the following question. The State Party could take the floor on a very precise question and not for an overall analysis of the situation. So Jordan please what is the exact question that you would like the State Party to answer.

Jordan

Yes sir. About the Outstanding Universal Values and the comparative analysis.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I shall now hand over to Ethiopia.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The Fort has Outstanding Universal Value and I think it is well described in the document. The authenticity and integrity of the property, for me there is no doubt. Because it is already there in the document. The management of the site as a heritage site it has been in place since 1950. It is an older site so a comparative study has been done. It covers all over with the structures and in our opinion is adequate. Conservation issue of the buffer zone is not a problem since the site is located in a protected area and if there is any issue they are minor and can be dealt with after the inscription. So Ethiopia therefore recommends the inscription of Fort Jesus in the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now over to the representative of China.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. We fully agree with the comments of the ICOMOS evaluation report suggesting that the property has in some instances demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value, but a better comparative analysis is needed to support the justification. We also noticed that in the evaluation report it says that the current state of conservation and management are adequate. We have learnt from the State Party that a considerable progress has been made to meet the requirements of the evaluation report. We would like The Chairperson to give the State Party the opportunity to report on the Committee on this progress made. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I would hand over to the State Party and I suggest that the information please remain quite strictly to the progress as China has just mentioned. Thank you.

Kenya

Thank you very much Chair for giving us this opportunity. I think the question really covers on the issues of management and conservation, particularly of the buffer zone, as

well as the Fort itself, which is being inscribed. The Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for Local Government has already gazetted the Mombasa Old Town Planning Commission which has since been operational, since the last time the expert missions have been there. The Secretariat of the Mombasa Old Town Planning Commission is actually the Mombasa Old Town Conservation Office which is a department of the National Museums of Kenya. Since then a management plan has also been put in place where all the conservation issues, such as removing of the car park and so on and so forth have been foreseen in this management plan. And therefore, currently together with the National Museums of Kenya the Mombasa Municipal Council and as of 1995 the by-laws of the Mombasa Old Town Conservation Office has been put into the by-laws of the Mombasa Municipal Council. All these are now operational and are in place. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Over to Mali.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Le site de Fort Jesus est un extrêmement intéressant. D'abord il est entouré d'un centre historique urbain protégé, la ville de Mombasa, l'ICOMOS a déjà dit dans son intervention que la zone tampon est en fait une partie Mombasa, qui est une ville protégée, un centre urbain, et un modèle. Et c'est dans ce cadre que ça a été aussi choisi pour abriter la réflexion sur les centres urbains, qui a eu lieu cette année à Mombasa. Monsieur le Président, je me réjouis également de la déclaration de l'ICOMOS qui parle d'un état de conservation adéquat. Cela veut dire qu'il y a un système de gestion mais aussi de protection. Je voudrais savoir, comme l'a demandé l'ICOMOS, est-ce que l'Etat partie dispose d'une structure, une seule, ou plusieurs, pour s'occuper des mesures de conservation. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Over to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Well, if I have understood correctly the question regards the protection and I can say that the State Party has provided information about protection of the site. The restructure with the National Museum of Kenya that takes care of the Fort as it is operating as a museum and the problems in terms of, there are not many problems, at least for ICOMOS in terms of protection apart from the clarification about the size of the gazetted conservation area and there are some more issues regarding management but actually ICOMOS in its evaluation has not focused only on management but on the expression in fact of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We do not propose deferral for management issues but we have proposed deferral because in our understanding it was not clear which was according to the State Party the Outstanding Universal Value that we are proposing for. That is why we have proposed deferral. I think that it should also be borne in mind there are not only issues regarding management, but also regarding the clarification and expression of the value of the site. Thank you. I hope I have responded to the question that has been made about protection.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now hand over to Jordan.

Jordan

As well as I know Fort Jesus compares the latest of the sixteenth century fortress illustrates a new style of remarkable fortress that apart from being meritorious work fortification and surpasses exceptional example of their philosophical debate underlining the architectural theory of their higher renaissance. A superior design was subsequently used to improve that , such as the Saint George Castle, El Mina in Ghana and the Fortress Sebastian in Mozambique. Throughout history the Fort has been at the centre of complex human relations that resulted from the quest of economic supremacy, political domination and the struggle against such domination. The culture of the Fort meant automatic control of the entire East African Coast, the Arabian Peninsula and the East. The Fort also represents a landmark of a human spirit of courage and endurance during a period of uncertainty, a representation of not only human achievements but the past turbulence that has come to shape the present societies in the region. Its universal value is favourable, demonstrated by the unsurpassed interest shown by the various powers and its control, such as the Portuguese, the Turkish, the Omani Arabs, the Dutch, the British as well as the African Swahili and others. Today, the Fort is a symbol of common heritage of humanity with European, Asian and Africans claiming a share of its history. Fort Jesus was built in a way that it became impossible to win military specifications. Jordan in this context would like the site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I hand over to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you Chair. I should like to congratulate the subsidiary bodies for their significant work and their very thorough report as to the site with a wealth of detail and also their concern for showing very clearly what the situation of this property is on the ground. What the difficulties are, what measures have been taken as we have heard from the Member State. When it comes to the situation of this property the Brazilian Delegation feels, and this is rather personal opinion, because I was able to visit this site on three times recently and my colleague here, seated to my left, has just come back from Kenya in fact, he too is a Brazilian diplomat and he also has visited the site several times and he knows the situation on the ground very well. Brazil believes that Fort Jesus in Mombasa is an exceptional example of architectural and architectonic prowess and Brazil would like to congratulate ICOMOS for their work and for their ICOMOS report that we have received. We also want to congratulate them for their very rich way in which it was presented and yet we would like to ask ICOMOS one question and it's a question that relates to some additional clarifications as to ICOMOS's opinion. What do they mean when they say in their report that the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List could create social tensions and a loss of quality of life for the town of Mombasa. And we would also like to take this opportunity to say that Brazil should like through The Chairperson to request some clarification about the authenticity of the property from the State Party and also information about some of the measures taken by the State Party to safeguard the authenticity of the site and guarantee its authenticity. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS has the floor and then the State Party.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. To respond to the precise question that has been made by the Honourable Delegate of Brazil, ICOMOS had the feel that the inscription could in fact create problems in terms of relocation, changes of uses within the old town due to the exceptional

increase of tourists and visitors that the site may have following the inscription. Although the conservation area of Mombasa is there, according to our information there might have been problems relating to the implementation of the Commission and of the Office that takes care of the Mombasa Old Town. That is Mombasa Old Town Conservation Office that they really, at least, according to our information, were not fully operating, and that is why we have suggested that there might be tension and possible negative consequences due to inscription right now. In fact we are not suggesting inscription, but ICOMOS is suggesting deferral to assess first Outstanding Universal Value and adjust the management issues that were open. That is why we have put these elements regarding development pressure in the area. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. State Party please.

Kenya

Thank you very much Chair for this second opportunity. Fort Jesus has been standing since 1593. It has survived many many invasions and it is one of the few European fortresses of Portuguese origin that still stands in its original format and therefore as a State Party we feel that the authenticity and integrity is quite intact and the coral rock on which it stands has some problems, but is still quite stable as per the architectural evaluations. Mr Chairman, additional information is that several evaluations that have happened in Mombasa Old Town, including by the National Museums of Kenya, the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa, the Ministries of Planning and Local Government have shown that the people of Mombasa Old Town would wish this site to be inscribed. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I shall now hand over to Nigeria.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Nigeria would like to thank ICOMOS for the excellent job they have done in assisting this very important site. This site is very very dear to Nigerians and most Africans, especially professionals engaged in the management of immovable heritage. First, it is the home to Cheddar, the premier institute engaged in the training of managers in immovable heritage in Africa. I find it very strange that there will be tension if this site is inscribed onto the World Heritage List in the Old Town of Mombasa because Mombasa has been home to Cheddar for several years. Professionals come from all over Africa to engage in training on the management of immovable heritage and they have always provided an example with which students are trained to be able to identify conservation problems, develop management plans and the dossier for presentation to the World Heritage Centre. But given the explanation that has been given by the State Party, I am sure we are now convinced that it is not very clear that serious tension will erupt as a result of the inscription of this site to the World Heritage List. The second point I will like to address Mr Chairman is the issue of OUV. OUV according to ICOMOS has not been demonstrated but it has merely been stated and this is likely because no comparative analysis has been carried outside Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. I would like to ask ICOMOS, if you like Mr Chairman, to provide further clarification on this. Because if OUV has been identified and as has been supported by several speakers on the outstanding value of this site, I wonder if we need to go outside these two areas. At least comparative analysis has been carried out in Africa and outside Africa in Asia and I think this should be enough to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of this property. So I want ICOMOS to please clarify and give further information as to why this is inadequate. Thank you very much Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will hand over to ICOMOS for some clarification.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Thank you also for your question. ICOMOS has considered not adequate the comparative analysis although comparison has been made within Africa and Asia and it has been limited to the Portuguese fortresses. According to the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value that has been provided by the State Party ICOMOS considers that exploration in also other cultural areas, that means not only the Portuguese fortresses of colonial influence should have been included in the comparative analysis. Also the Outstanding Universal Value of the property refers clearly to renaissance design principles and maybe in fact ICOMOS has considered that it would have been important also to include in the comparative analysis examples of renaissance fortresses that have been built in other contexts, as well as in Europe to confirm that in fact the property is an outstanding universal example of a fortress that has been built according to the renaissance principles. That is why ICOMOS has considered not adequate the comparative analysis. It should have been included, examples from other contexts than the Portuguese within the colonial areas, as well as examples from the renaissance fortresses within Europe as well. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now I will hand over to Barbados.

Barbados

Chair, Thank you very much to my colleague just prior for asking the question, because he started from the standpoint that I am interested in. I am afraid that the explanations provided by ICOMOS still do not satisfy my concerns. Because you see Chair, they have stated that the basis of the comparison, comparative analysis, is drawn from the statement of justification or Outstanding Universal Value from the State Party and on that basis they feel that the comparative analysis needs to be extended beyond the Africa and the Asia region to encapsulate the renaissance principles that would be grounded in European and other such force. My view Chair is that perhaps what needs to be considered is not an expansion so much of the comparative analysis but a reconsideration of the statement of Outstanding Universal Value which can encapsulate the fact that obviously changes would be introduced into the construction and the design of such a Fort, based as it was in a tropical environment, in a different landscape and for different reasons. If that is the basis, we need to have that clearly understood now, rather than deferring the site to the State Party to expand and then still not fulfilled precisely what we are talking about. Because I looked at the comparative analysis, I have had the opportunity visit one of these reports and I would view it as more important to examine what were the changes that occurred to these renaissance principles, these design principles in a different landscape and how were these articulated, both in this report and in the others and how does this illustrate the uniqueness of this particular fortification.

The other consideration Chair and again I would say that I am not entirely satisfied with the response of ICOMOS is with respect to the designation of tensions emanating from the potential for further visitors to place pressure on the site. My belief is that the State Party Kenya has more than adequately demonstrated their capacity to manage visitor pressure. They have the professional capability to put in place the kind of visitor management strategies and plans that will address the issues and they are more than sensitive to the considerations of the community. So I would suggest that these are really the kinds of considerations that we should take into account to reshape the nomination and in that context my preference, and without fear of deferral, is for referral. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Cambodia you have the floor.

Cambodia

Nous voudrions féliciter l'ICOMOS pour son excellent dossier. Nous avons deux questions techniques rapides. Premièrement, y-a-t-il des résultats de la mission de suivi concernant l'érosion et deuxièmement, qu'est-il fait en ce qui concerne l'action corrosive de l'eau de mer sur les fortifications?

The Chairperson

ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Well I wish to answer if it is possible to the issues that have been raised by Barbados and come to the Honourable delegate of Cambodia. I agree with what the Honourable delegate from Barbados has said. In fact there is a part of the, in terms of comparative analysis. There is, in fact another part that has been, let's say described under criterion (ii) which relates to interchange values of the property and the changes that have been done and in fact this part also has not been sufficiently addressed and connected to the physical attributes of the Fortress. That is why ICOMOS has felt that this connection and the demonstration of the interchange values has not been justified. This is also part of the comparative analysis and this has been only partly fulfilled by the comparative analysis but another part was the description and the articulation of the attributes that bear witness to this interchange, and regarding the tension ICOMOS considers that there might be short-term tension in the area subsequently in case of inscription. And certainly the State Party has all the instruments to face these issues and extension, but there is a need for reinforcement of management and overall management and this is also part of the requirements of ICOMOS and of the ICOMOS recommendation that has been encapsulated in our global recommendation.

As for the questions that have been proposed by Cambodia, we did not in fact receive any further information, any follow up about the continuing or the evolution of the coral rock erosion and neither did we have information about the possible corrosive action of the sea. In fact in the monitoring section we have included the requirements regarding monitoring closely the evolution of this corrosion and the evolution of the damages to the coral rock and even an in-depth analysis of the origins and the causes of this erosion should be established in our opinion. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Iraq you have the floor.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chair. Iraq thinks that the qualifications of inscription is there and we support every colleague that has asked for it. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. China you have the floor.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The greatest concern of ICOMOS is the comparative analysis of the site which has not yet demonstrated the Outstanding Universal Value. My question is to the State Party – in what time frame can this comparative analysis be done. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. State Party please.

Kenya

Thank you Mr Chairman. It really depends on what extent of comparative analysis is required. We are not very clear how deep this comparative analysis should be, but we believe that within three to four months we should be able to complete whatever is required of us. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you very much. Estonia would like to thank the State Party for the explanations they have given, especially in regard to the management system and we would like to commend the State Party for the efforts they have taken. However, we do have some concerns as to the Outstanding Universal Value as demonstrated at this stage. We do believe in the potential of this site. This is a very important and interesting site, but we simply think that as a Committee we should base our decisions on information provided to us by the State Party and by the very valuable evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. And, as Estonia is quite new at this table, we certainly believe that we place our trust in the work of the Advisory Bodies and we are by and large supportive of our comments, and in this case, especially as regards the comparative analysis and the Outstanding Universal Value. So we support the deferral in this case. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Mali you have the floor.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je serai très bref. Suite à mes questions adressées à l'ICOMOS et à l'Etat partie, je retiens les éléments suivants. Il y a d'abord des gros efforts consentis par l'Etat partie, parce qu'il y a une volonté politique qui est là, et il existe déjà sur le terrain une structure de proximité qui veille quotidiennement sur le site. Ensuite l'Etat a eu à mettre en place un plan de gestion du site, pour veiller sur la gestion du site. Les populations locales sont aussi favorables à l'inscription du site, mais compte tenu des informations complémentaires à fournir nous estimons qu'à ce stade on ne peut pas parler d'inscription sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. Mais nous sommes pour un renvoi du site pour permettre à l'Etat partie de fournir ces éléments complémentaires et nous apportons également une autre proposition qui consiste à envoyer des experts pour appuyer l'Etat partie en vue de l'élaboration de la VUE de la détermination des critères et pour l'élaboration d'une analyse comparative acceptable. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Switzerland you have the floor.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous pouvons soutenir peut être dans une certaines mesures les propos de la Barbade. Toutefois nous trouvons que la VUE est la clé de voute de toute inscription et à notre avis nous n'aidons pas un site si nous le poussons vers une inscription sans que cette VUE soit réellement et scientifiquement, si j'ose dire, prouvée. Au contraire, nous allons nuire à sa crédibilité dans le futur et c'est pour cela que nous soutenons le defer. Merci.

The Chairperson

The Bureau sees that we are divided on this issue, particularly when it comes to the OUV and the issue of the analysis to be carried out. I am going to ask the Rapporteur to take the floor. Perhaps she may well be able to shed some light on the situation.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision of this nomination can be found on page 15 of the English version and page 16 of the French version of document 8(b). At this moment Mr Chairperson I have not received any amendments to this Draft Decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Fine, thank you. Would the Committee then like to move forward with adopting this decision as it stands. China you have the floor.

China

Thank you Mr Chairperson. China would like to propose a change to paragraph 2. To change the word "defers" to "refers". Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Brazil you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you very much sir. Brazil agrees with the Chinese proposal, particularly in the light that the Rapporteur needs to take into account other changes that will need to be made to this Draft Decision. So I would go for 'refer' rather than 'defer'.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Mexico you have the floor.

Mexico

Thank you very much sir. We need to be very careful about this particular decision. It seems to me that one point has not been yet raised which could in fact be in support of referring the examination of the nomination back to the State Party, but before that I would

like to provide a bit more information. Portugal a number of years ago set up a series of meetings on world heritage of Portuguese origin and there were a number of presentations around the world, not only in India and other places Africa and it seemed quite clear in terms of how important Mombasa and the Fort was to the extension of the European, rather the Portuguese empire, so it seems to me the OUV is quite clear, and has been demonstrated quite clearly. I wouldn't like to get into a lot of detail here, but in my view it's a very important property and when we read this in context, I think it does certainly have OUV. So we think if we were to refer it and so that the analysis can be carried out and this is why the Advisory Bodies and so on that should be satisfactory in terms of the possible nomination of the site. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Jordan you have the floor.

Jordan

Sir, even though ICOMOS admits now that the comparative analysis and Outstanding Universal Value was very clear in context with the Portuguese and European context, but anyhow we go with Brazil and China to refer instead of inscribe.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Barbados you have the floor.

Barbados

Chair, I am very thankful to my Mexican colleague and I simply want to endorse what he has said and that satisfies me in terms of moving this to a proposed referral rather than a deferral. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Nigeria you have the floor.

Nigeria

I am also very happy that we are going towards a referral instead of deferral. However, I want to draw attention to the Committee of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. I think we have been informed by the advisory body that it may be possible to organize a mission within the year if we are going to adopt referral. In which case we need to either delete this paragraph or perhaps relate it to the point that has been raised by the delegate of Mali about the need for an international mission to strengthen the State Party in trying to respond to the point that has been raised. So we either delete this paragraph 3 or probably substitute it with the call for international assistance to the State Party to be able to address the issue that has been raised. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Rapporteur may well have a proposal.

Rapporteur

Indeed the comment concerning the deletion of paragraph 3 is in that case very correct. I note that the proposal at the moment is as follows. Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged, in paragraph 2 the Delegation of China has proposed to amend the paragraph towards a referral. If I may suggest to the Delegation we have a slightly different standard text for referral than for deferral, so I would not just replace the first word but suggest to you

to replace it by the standard text which we use for referred nominations, which would then read:

“Refers the examination of the nomination on the basis of cultural criteria of Fort Jesus Mombasa, Kenya back to the State Party to allow it to:”

Then the small points (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i) would remain unchanged. Paragraph 3 would as was suggested be deleted and paragraph 4 would become paragraph 3, but otherwise remain unchanged. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Barbados you have the floor.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. I am in complete agreement with the proposal made by the rapporteur. I would just however point out that except paragraph 2(b) the conclusion drawn from this change would be there is not to be a significant redefinition of the boundaries in this context. So I would just draw reference to that. That would be compatible with the change that was proposed in paragraph 3. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Let me ask that question from the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

I do not fully understand the comment of Barbados I am afraid. As paragraph (b) seems to refer to comparative analysis and not to the inclusion of other properties, so perhaps you were referring to which paragraph.

Barbados

You are quite right. I withdraw my comment.

The Chairperson

Mali you have the floor.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est juste pour apporter une clarification au paragraphe 2. Madame le rapporteur a parlé du fort Mombasa, il s'agit du Fort Jesus de Mombasa, et non du fort de Mombasa. Dans la lecture nous avons entendu deux fois de Mombasa. Merci.

The Chairperson

O.K. fine. This being said I would like to ask the Committee whether we are in agreement to adopt **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.12** as read out by the Rapporteur. I see no objections. So it is adopted.

Now we will move to **Ngorongoro Conservation Area in the United Republic of Tanzania** and will ask ICOMOS to present this site and if you could try to respect the time limit. Thank you very much.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. The Ngorongoro Conservation Area in the United Republic of Tanzania. This is a re-nomination under the cultural criteria of the property that was inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x) in 1979. Ngorongoro Conservation Area is in the North East of Tanzania and adjoins the Serengeti National Park along its Northern border. Rising from the plains of the Serengeti National Park in the North West, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area extends over the rim of the enormous Ngorongoro crater to the eastern arm of the Rift Valley. This area has yielded an exceptional record of human palaeo-biology, human behavior, palaeo-environments and evolution since the Pliocene covering a span of almost four million years. There are an enormous quantity of fossilized remains which have been excavated and discovered in this area. Within the central part of the conservation area live the Maasai people who migrated south from Kenya into the Serengeti in the early 1800s and moved into this area in 1959. The nominated area of the property is shown here. There is no buffer zone. In terms of categories this is a site. It is also in part a cultural landscape. Sorry, can I go back. There are three key elements to the site. The sites associated with human evolution, the wider palaeo-archaeological landscape and the Maasai pastoral landscape.

First, to look at the human record sites: Laetoli. Many important hominid fossils have been uncovered at Laetoli. However, it is best known for the Laetoli footprint locality which records a fossil record of hominid footprints of three individuals at a time when bipedalism was in a critical stage in human evolution. The footprints have now been reburied after the removal of intrusive tree roots. There is already an exhibition building, as well as the road, in the vicinity of the site in anticipation of increased visitor interests. Perhaps of more concern is a proposal to reopen the footprints and develop a building around them. ICOMOS considers that this is a highly contentious issue as there is a potential for damage or even complete destruction of the footprint site given the very fragile nature of the rocks within which they are sited. We cannot envisage a way that these highly sensitive and exceptional remains could be put on public view.

Turning to the Olduvai Gorge, the discovery in 1959 of *Zinjanthropus* or *Homo habilis* the nickname 'the handyman' who was interpreted to have been the maker of old vynestone tools. This captured the public imagination and is arguably most important discovery ever made in this area and pushed much further back in association of hominids with stone tools. This gorge includes numerous palaeo-anthropological sites which hold the complete sequence of human fossil and artefactual evidence going back over two million years. However, the nomination does not include any surveys of the scope and extent of these sites within the 14 kilometre gorge. Also in the gorge there are herds of Maasai livestock which pass through to access water. And this is promoting erosion of the fossil deposits which means that they are in part under considerable threat. Today, about 75 hominid remains representing various species genre have been discovered at the gorge. What is urgently needed is an inventory of all the finds from Olduvai and elsewhere in the property as these are key associative attributes of this extraordinary landscape. At Olduvai there is also, ICOMOS is made aware of, a proposal to build a memorial on the *Zinjanthropus* Site which, if allowed to go forward, could in our view cause severe and irreversible damage to the authenticity of the site where the remains were discovered.

Nasera Rock Shelter is another important aspect of the site which lies to the north of the property within the Maasai grazing lands where stone tools belonging to the middle stone age were uncovered. This is unfortunately somewhat neglected as the walls of the rock shelter are covered in graffiti and this overlaying faded rock art. The shelter itself is currently used as a corral for Maasai livestock.

The Ngorongoro crater – this area has been a huge focus for big game tourism. It is a natural World Heritage Site as already mentioned and when the area was declared a conservation area in 1959 as separate from the Serengeti National Park, there was an

agreement that this was the area where the Maasai would be allowed to live having being moved out to the Serengeti.

Overall, the nominated site is seen to have a huge potential to reveal much more evidence concerning the rise of anatomically modern humans and modern behaviour and human ecology. The nomination stresses the importance of this wider landscape as potentially rich. However, no details are provided where the richest areas are and which are sensitive and need protection. And in many areas there is a conflict between archaeological sites and overgrazing.

The Maasai cultural landscape – the Maasai are described in the dossier as pastoral nomads. Although at the time the conservation area was formed the Maasai were still pastoralists in sustainable numbers. The reality is now that the much larger community that presently inhabits the area are mostly not pastoralists and cannot support their pastoral lives, just to give you some views of the landscape and the additional buildings which it includes.

ICOMOS considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity can be met for the palaeo-archaeological sites although both are extremely vulnerable. We do not consider that either can be met for the Maasai cultural landscape in terms of the landscape and the settlements. The comparative analysis and the dossier fails to discuss the Maasai cultural landscape. It solely looks at the archaeological remains. ICOMOS does not consider that either of the nominated criteria can be justified for the Maasai cultural landscape although criterion (iv) could be justified for the palaeo-archaeological sites. ICOMOS considers that although legal protection is in place, it is technically adequate. Its lack of enforcement is cause for great concern. There are no boundaries for the archaeological sites and no identification for the landscape areas sensitive for archaeology. As a result the area is under huge stress. There is a need for much more proactive management of the cultural landscape to ensure the protection and ultimate survival of the extensive archaeological record. ICOMOS considers the value of these extraordinary resources without doubt. However, the lack of documentation and the lack of defined areas and the lack of a pastoralism strategy means that management and protection isn't specific enough, which means that many of the sites are extremely vulnerable and to a degree under threat.

We also consider the proposals to create buildings for the Laetolian sites constitute a severe and imminent threat to the property. ICOMOS therefore recommends that the property be inscribed under cultural criterion (iv) and at the same time further recommends that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger in order to help mobilize resources to address the management, conservation and potential threat to development problems. In addition, we recommend further points for the State Party to consider and these are listed in your papers. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I thank ICOMOS for the presentation of Ngorongoro Conservation Area. First I will give the floor to the Rapporteur who is going to explain the structure of the Draft Decision, because I think that that clarification will greatly facilitate the entire discussion process here

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. You have two Draft Decisions on this site in front of you – 8B.13 which suggests that you inscribe the site according to culture criterion (iv) and 8B.14 which suggests to you the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We will consider those two aspects separately and would like to invite you to start discussing and adopting 8B.13 considering its inscription and once this decision has been taken we would then turn to the second decision 8B.14. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I believe it was very clear that we are going to have two different adoption procedures. So the floor is open. I will ask the Members of the Committee who wish to speak to please do so now. I will give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Sweden

Chair, before we open the debate I would like to ask The Chairpersonperson to invite the State Party for new information. Thank you.

The Chairperson

The Secretariat recommends that States Parties be very precise. Perhaps the Delegation of Sweden can say exactly what information they want the State Party to provide that would make the work of the presidency easier.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairman. That is new information on the development in the site after the ICOMOS evaluation and this report we have in front of us. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much I give the floor to the State Party for clarification.

Tanzania

Thank you Mr Chairperson. I only want to elaborate on two issues. One is the issue of the monument which has been stated in the brief from ICOMOS experts. We are saying that the monument has been abandoned completely. We are not going to do any reconstruction or any monument on the site where the Zinjantrophus was discovered. The second clarification is on the person's odour. The president did put up a very technical question. While we were living with the burying of the footprints. He wanted to be shown or to be assured that the footprints are safe under that methodology which was used to conserve them and we are thinking that we shall only open it just to prove that the methodology used to conserve by burying is effective. So it is not question of what we are talking of doing. Of course people will come and view it but it will be only for a short time just as a monitoring mechanism. Thank you Mr President.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The floor goes to the representative of Nigeria.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I would like to thank the Advisory Body once again for the excellent job they have done on this property and congratulate the State Party for this proposal of inscription and fully endorse that this site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Switzerland has the floor.

Switzerland

Thank you Chair. This Ngorongoro archaeological site no doubt has Outstanding Universal Value and Switzerland fully supports the inscription on the cultural criteria. These sites are also very vulnerable today and we feel that there is need for extra inscription. We think that the inscription as a cultural site is fully justified. It will also have to preserve the site. Thank you and congratulations to the State Party.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the representative of Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. Barbados is fully in support of the inscription of this extraordinary cultural site and for the nomination to receive though on the basis of what we would consider to be equitable. We find ourselves in support of the notion of extreme caution and care with respect to the Laetoli footprints and the proposed development surrounding it. But we would like to ask the State Party to clarify whether these plans are so advanced, whether they cannot be withdrawn or reconsidered. My view is that if the issue around conservation cannot also address the issue of interpretation and access then we will have difficulty with a number of other sites in the future. I would like to see whether there is provision for further interrogation of this issue and I ask the State Party to clarify the point. Perhaps it might be best if ICOMOS could address that point first. What their concerns are with respect to the museum building and then ask the State Party to clarify where they are now in their consideration of it. Based on those points chair, I may have some recommendations or amendments to the Draft Decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS has the floor please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. In terms of Laetoli, this is quite a large site and the footprints is one element of what has been discovered at the site. Certainly ICOMOS strongly supports the idea of interpretation so that when visitors go there they are able to understand the full significance of the site. However, in our view and having taken the advice of a considerable number of experts, we do not consider the fragility of this site would allow this to be open to the public or for any sort of building to be constructed immediately in the surrounding area. So I think one has to try and separate the two issues. On how we protect the site, which in our view will need to remain buried but of course with monitoring, but we don't think monitoring should allow the site to be open for several months at a time while people can look at it. I think that there has to be an understanding of the extreme fragility of this enormously important site and the fact that it should remain buried. We have inscribed other

sites on the list where the remains are buried and so I don't think there's presumption against that. But the issue of interpretation is crucial because an understanding of the enormous importance of this landscape in terms of the remains that it has produced is necessary and imaginative ways to achieve that is something that we would strongly support, but not on the sensitive areas in question.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the State Party.

Kenya

Thank you Mr Chairperson. I wanted to clarify on two issues. One is the issue of the museum. Why do we think of keeping the footprints buried. I think as the State Party what was meant as a museum was meant to be an information centre where people could get some information on what happened with the footprints regarding such conservation and the issues that have been take to conserve them. So the information, the museum which is being referred here is actually the information centre and the second issue is the issue of opening. The foot print pathway is seven metres long. We are opening one square metre which would cover only about two footprints. We are opening that one for only one week and we are doing that as a monitoring mechanism but to also to be able to let people appreciate the footprints in that particular short time, but also to give an opportunity to express, also to see how the rock is because nearby, we have other footprints. And if those footprints are on a better rock and people could be able to compare and see the fragility of this particular foot print. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

I thank the State Party and I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

South Africa

Thank you Mr Chairperson. South Africa strongly supports the recommendation to inscribe the site on the basis of criterion (iv) as recommended by ICOMOS. We also further ask the State Party to take cognizance of the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies to strengthen the scientific environmental and cultural values through effective management tools. But further to that we also recommend that they must incorporation tourism aspects within this kind of framework. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Sweden has the floor.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairman. Also Sweden fully supports the inscription of this site and also the endangered listing due to the importance of the site and the fragility of the cultural features which truly have OUV. Thank you sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Brazil please.

Brazil

Thank you Chair. We would like to join our voices to those of previous Delegations and express full support for the inscription, as recommended by ICOMOS, and also express

appreciation for the ICOMOS report for the wealth of information provided. So we are totally in favour of inscription as proposed by ICOMOS based on criterion (iv).

The Chairperson

We have two people on the list. After hearing them The Chairperson would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur so that we could look at the first part, dealing with inscription on the heritage list and then we will look at the second part and now I give the floor to China.

China

Thank you Mr Chairperson. China would like to congratulate the great job done by ICOMOS on this site and fully support the inscription of this site proposed by ICOMOS. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Barbados please.

Barbados

Thank you Chairperson. In reiterating our support for the inscription of this site there is just one small point we would like to make. With respect to the design of the facilities of the site we think these things can be accommodated through sensitive design. It is important to know that sites like these must have access for other people to visit, for business to go on, for interpretation and stuff like that to happen. However, it can be handled with sensitivity to design and therefore we support the inscription and also the design of an information centre for the area. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Clarifications have been requested. The State Party please.

Tanzania

I would want to confirm that whatever will be done will be done in consultation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre so we will not do it on our own. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Ethiopia please.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. I would like also to join those who recommend the inscription of the site and the only reason for the foot to be, it should be somehow more studied. This is not enough reason to put because of the foot print on the endangered list. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Jordan has the floor.

Jordan

Jordan would support the inscription of the site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chair. In our proposed decision we certainly welcomed the idea of ways to present the site and suggest that the State Party explore alternative ways and review them through the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies before any proposals are undertaken. So we do consider that the links can be put up but not in sensitive locations. But turning to the footprints we do feel that this is a crucial issue and certainly in our recommendation we did request the State Party to abandon the proposals for opening the footprints and for constructing a museum on or near that sensitive site. I think this remains one of our greatest concerns that we fully understand the need to look at the footprints in terms of monitoring but we do not consider that there are robust enough and when we talk about the footprints we are talking about all the records that have been discovered in this area. Some are more well known than others, but they are all equally vulnerable. We do not think that those footprints should be exposed to public view and this is an area where I think am not clear that we have that commitment, may I say, from the State Party. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to Thailand please.

Thailand

Thank you Mr Chairman. Thailand fully supports the inscription of the site proposed by ICOMOS. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Iraq please.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chair. We commend very much and appreciate the work of ICOMOS and of course we are with the inscription. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Very well, I give the floor to the Rapporteur. Rapporteur would you present the Draft Decision on inscription on the World Heritage List please.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision can be found on page 1 of the English version and page 1 of the French version of document 8B.Add., and I have received one written amendment by the Delegation of Mali and the amendment suggests to delete current paragraph 5, including its subparagraphs (a) and (b). I repeat the suggestion is to delete the entire paragraph 5, including subparagraphs (a) and (b). The only written amendment I received Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Very well. Thank you very much. Any comments? I give the floor to Barbados.

Barbados

Chair I was going to propose similar amendments. I am very satisfied with what has been proposed. I will endorse that.

The Chairperson

I turn to the Committee. Can we consider the Draft Decision approved, including the amendment presented. Adopted. (Applause) Switzerland would like to speak.

Switzerland

Je voulais juste proposer qu'on discute avant d'approuver la première décision aussi de la deuxième décision de l'inscription sur la liste en danger parce qu'il pourrait y avoir des incidences d'amendements si on va pour une ou l'autre solution. Mais c'est un peu trop tard je crains parce que la décision elle a été adoptée. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the State Party very quickly so that you can comment on the decision taken and congratulations.

Tanzania

Thank you Mr Chairman for giving me the floor. On behalf of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and on my own behalf I would like to thank members of the World Heritage Committee for their decision to inscribe Ngorongoro Conservation Area as a mixed cultural and natural World Heritage Site. This State Party is highly indebted to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for the assistance given and to the experts who prepared the nomination file and to ICOMOS who evaluated the file. The property which has just been inscribed is a unique heritage humanity, it has been a subject of extensive archaeological research and has yielded evidence of human evolution and human environmental dynamics extending over a span of almost four million years to the early modern era. This evidence includes fossilized footprints at Laetoli as associated with the development of human bipedalism, a sequence of diverse evolving hominid species within Olduvai Gorge. The stunning landscape of Ngorongoro crater, the largest unbroken caldera in the world combined with its spectacular concentration of wild life with one of the greatest natural wonders of the planet. Mr Chairman, as we celebrate this historical movement we recognize that the road to inscribing Ngorongoro as a cultural heritage has been a long one. It involved painstaking work which demanded considerable time of many individuals. In this regard, I would like to recognize the contribution of all those who in one way or another were involved in the process that led to its inscription. Further, the State Party would like to assure the World Heritage Committee of its commitment in the implementation in the World Heritage Convention and will thereby continue to provide necessary protection and management of the property in all its aspects, natural and cultural. Finally, I would like to seize this opportunity to invite you all and your friends and colleagues to visit this unique site and enjoy the experience of a lifetime. Thank you very much for your attention. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Once again congratulations and I give the floor to the Rapporteur who is going to present the second part of the decision on the same site. Thank you.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The second part of the decision 8B/14 can be found on page 3 of the English version and page 3 of the French version of document 8B

Add. And before giving you the opportunity to debate this item I would like to inform you that we have received an amendment by the Delegation of Mali which requests to delete the entire Draft Decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous aurions peut-être préféré de traiter l'Etat de conservation et les mesures de conservation dans la décision antérieure, mais vu que là maintenant on a enlevé tout le paragraphe 5 qui traite ces questions très très importantes de ces traces et l'ouverture du trace ou pas l'ouverture, et le monitoring etc. Nous sommes donc d'avis que pour la deuxième décision on maintient l'inscription sur la liste en danger. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Mali.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous avons fait cette proposition on nous basant sur un certain nombre d'éléments techniques. Monsieur le Président l'ICOMOS a eu à nous dire ici qu'il y a des menaces qui pèseraient, c'est au conditionnel, sur la VUE du site. Il s'agit notamment de la construction des musés et d'autres bâtiments. Avant de développer mon propos je souhaiterais poser la question suivante à l'Etat partie. Est-ce-que ces constructions ont été réalisées sur le site ? Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Question for the State Party. I turn to the State Party. Can you give clarification please. Answer the question of the delegate of Mali.

Tanzania

Thank you Chair. As we have already indicated the State Party has not yet constructed any of the buildings in plan. As we have said we will only do that after consultation with the World Heritage Centre if we are to do it. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Mali please.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est juste pour me permettre de progresser dans ma réflexion. Donc moi je dirais, en tant que gestionnaire du site cette fois-ci, qu'il y a de l'espoir sur un site qui vient d'être classé au patrimoine mondial. C'est un site d'une importance historique mondiale, ça nous fait revivre quatre millions d'années d'histoire quand même. Alors, par rapport au futur, même s'il y a éventuellement un souhait de construire d'autres constructions ou alors un musée, moi je ferai les propositions suivantes. Je pense que le site est extrêmement fragile comme l'a dit l'ICOMOS, il est possible de construire sur le site, mais avec un certain nombre de conditions, les conditions qui font que les réalisations faites sur le site n'ont pas d'impact négatif sur le site. Pour être concret, j'aurais souhaité que l'Etat

partie élabore un plan d'aménagement qui se fera en deux parties. La première partie du plan d'aménagement est d'abord urbanistique, qui va déterminer un règlement d'urbanisme, la manière de conservation, toutes les normes architecturales qui sont acceptées pour que les futures constructions intègrent l'architecture locale. Nous pouvons même prendre des maisons qui sont déjà sur le site et les transformer en musées ou alors autres maisons fonctionnelles. Sinon on ne peut pas connaître l'histoire de ce site si on n'a pas d'inventaire, si on n'implémente pas un musée on ne peut pas conserver la mémoire du site. Mon second propos c'est par rapport aux menaces qui pèsent sur le site et qui est essentiellement dû à la présence des populations Maasai, mais aussi aux touristes. Les populations Maasai vivent dans le patrimoine, c'est des populations qui vivent sur leur territoire, c'est bien normal. C'est des gens qui vivent de chasse. Les touristes aussi viennent pour observer mais aussi pour tirer profit du paysage culturel. En la matière nous proposons que la deuxième partie du plan d'aménagement soit une sorte de charte de conduite. Une charte de conduite non seulement pour les populations locales, en terme de gestion de l'espace, de passage des troupeaux, l'exploitation des pâturages, mais aussi en terme de comportement des touristes. Voilà en gros ce qu'on souhaiterait proposer et finalement demander ou alors prouver pourquoi nous voulons l'acceptation de ce paragraphe. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Barbados has the floor.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. My colleague from Mali has outlined the technical basis on which such a consideration might be made. We accept that ICOMOS undertook its role diligently and with due care and caution and expressed those considerations for our review of this nomination. In the debate that took place around the previous decision it became very clear that the State Party totally understood, have reflected upon and have reacted to those considerations and had withdrawn provisions for undertaking a significant exposure and intervention with respect to the Laetoli footprints. That their interest was purely for conservation, that they were examining perhaps a fraction of, admittedly, a fragile site, but lesser acknowledgement that we have been talking about fractions in this Committee, about equally fragile sites. And that has not stopped the State Party from going ahead with their plans. So I would like to suggest that we do accept that with the removal of paragraph 5 and with the undertaking of the State Party to reflect and totally reconsider their provisions for that matter of interpreting on the site that there is no foundation for this second decision and I totally support the decision of Mali and the recommendation of Mali to remove it. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now hand over to the Nigerian delegate.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I had actually wanted to argue in the same way the positions articulated by the distinguished representatives of Mali and Barbados. I would like to add one or two points on this really, because I think as a responsible State Party to the Convention, the State Party has other properties on the World Heritage List and they are very responsible and they have given us assurances that whatever integration they want to carry on the site will benefit from the expert advice of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and also that most of these decisions that are creating these three issues about the development of a museum and the opening of the footprint have been abandoned. They are not going to do these things now and if whenever they want to do them they said that they are going to benefit from the advice of these organizations. So, in view of this, I would also support the position that we should not take away the joy of the State Party,

although of course it has been demonstrated by the distinguished State Party of the United States the endangered listing is supposed to be a mechanism for improving the conservation of the site. However, I don't think we will do them any good if we go ahead to describe this site after just inscribing in on to the World Heritage List to the World Heritage in Danger for the reasons that have been advanced because of the explanation that has been provided by the State Party and also the point that has been raised about development or infrastructure on a site, not necessarily in part negatively on the property. A museum is supposed to be a complement to the site. It is supposed to give some form of interpretation to the site and therefore will complement the site not adversely affected. So, for this reason Mr Chairman, Nigeria fully endorses the position of Mali that this decision 5, Draft Decision 34 COM.84.14 should be deleted completely. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Over to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Thank you Chair. I shall be very brief. Just to clarify because we fully endorse the proposal from our dear colleague from Mali and our idea was indeed that if we have an inscription on the Endangered List this might actually lead to a more efficacy in implementation of this kind of measure. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Now over to you South Africa.

South Africa

Thank you Chair. My colleagues in the committee, I can see some of them are having a change of heart. They were eager to put the site on the Endangered List before we even discussed the matter. But having had the response by the State Party and the positions advanced by Mali, Barbados and Nigeria, I don't want to overemphasize the position. South Africa would go for that position and support it.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I shall now hand over to Australia.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chair. Having heard the explanations from the State Party in relation to the decision not to proceed with the building and have them not uncover the footprints, I think in our view there is probably no need at this point to proceed with the endanger listing. However, we do note that this decision also contains other elements related to protection. Mr Chairman, I propose in the interest of time, if you wish we would be happy to look at the decision over lunchtime, come back with a proposal that takes out reference to endangered listing but retains the other elements of protection and that might assist the way forward.

The Chairperson

The Committee shall take this decision. Thank you. After having heard the comments and ideas of the various States Parties, the Brazilian Delegation fully supports Mali's proposal which was backed up by Nigeria, Barbados and South Africa. Are there any other people who would like to take the floor? I see not. In which case we should look at the monitoring and follow up issues. I think that there was a possibility of negative impact if it goes onto the endangered list and yet at the same time inscribe it in the World Heritage List.

So I do think we need to look at this again, to bear in mind the developments of this and that's why Australia has made the suggestion of looking at this. Bahrain you have the floor.

Bahrain

Thank you Mr Chair. Bahrain thinks this is a very serious issue that we are discussing now and we would like to suggest to retain at least part of paragraph 5, maybe without referring to the desired state of conservation but to allow the mission to take place. We feel that this is very very important to keep it. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Now I hand over to Mali.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous rejoignons les différentes propositions, c'est-à-dire que nous sommes pour le retrait du site du patrimoine mondial, mais nous sommes prêts à contribuer à d'autres paragraphes, tels que les éléments techniques dont nous venons de parler. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now I will hand over to the Swiss delegate.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président, cette solution nous conviendra parfaitement aussi. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Now to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I have in the meantime consulted the Legal Advisers and the Secretariat as well as the Advisory Bodies as to what would be the procedure if the Committee decided to delete paragraph 3 and the implications of paragraph 3 but retain some of the other paragraphs and the advice given to me was that in this case we could add the other paragraphs retained to the end of the previous decision. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I now hand over to the Rapporteur for the Draft Decisions.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. In this case I understood from a majority of Committee Members speaking that they would not like to retain the reference to the inscription of the World Heritage List in Danger. In this case the decision would have the possibility to be added at the end of the previous decision which would make the reference in paragraph 1 unnecessary. Since paragraph 2 is the immediate explication for the decision to the Endangered List, paragraph 2 would seem no longer necessary, paragraph 3 would be equally deleted. On paragraph 4 I may need some further guidance from the Committee but

paragraph 4 seems to correspond to paragraph 5 in the previous decision which has been deleted. So perhaps we should consult the Committee again according to paragraph 4. In paragraph 5 I have noted an amendment of the Delegation of Bahrain to retain the part of the paragraph that does not refer to the desired state of conservation report, so the retained part would accordingly read: "Requests the State Party to invite Joint World Heritage Centre Advisory Body mission to the property to make proposals for a revision of the management system and plan to ensure adequate protection, conservation and management of the cultural attributes as well as addressing the conservation issues regarding the natural attributes addressed in document 7B and the first of paragraph 6 refers in its first part to the state of conservation report under 7B and the report to be submitted for examination by the Committee next year. I don't think that this repetition would pose any difficulty as it is already included in the document and decision we took under 7B. The second part would refer to the desired state of conservation which would then no longer be required, so I assume in this case the committee would prefer to delete the second part of paragraph 6. So the only further guidance I would need to have a complete Draft Decision in front of me is as regards paragraph 4 of the decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Now I hand over to Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. I am in agreement with the proposals offered by the Rapporteur except with respect to the second part of paragraph 4. Because you see Chair really these issues should be taken into the context of the management plan system for the adequate protection, conservation and management of the cultural attributes. I do feel that if you want to explicate these things more clearly you can do that in a combination of the two, but I don't see the need to retain it separately from paragraph 5 as you have revised and articulated. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Over to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

I apologize I did not fully understand the statement made by Barbados. I heard her referring to the second part of paragraph 4, but perhaps the second part of paragraph 6 was intended as I did not present any amendment on paragraph 4 but sought guidance from the Committee as to whether it wanted to retain this paragraph.

Barbados

Yes, Thank you and I was offering guidance and saying that it was not necessary to retain it as the issue was taken up in paragraph 5 as you have revised.

Rapporteur

So I will then repeat with the guidance provided – I see another request for the floor by Switzerland.

The Chairperson

I hand over to the representative of Switzerland.

Switzerland

J'avais une proposition pour le début du paragraphe 4 de laisser quand même une phrase qui pourrait lire « demande à l'Etat partie de continuer à traiter avec extrême prudence les décisions concernant la mise au jour des empreintes de pas de Laetoli etc. Merci .

The Chairperson

Over to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

I would then present to you again the decision 8B.14 which would become the final paragraphs of 8B.13. As I understand it now at this moment paragraphs 1 and 2 would not be retained. Paragraph 3 would also be deleted. Paragraph 4 according to the Swiss amendment would read: "Request the State Party to continue to take extreme caution", no I'm afraid if the State Party could repeat again. My notes do not construct a complete sentence here.

Switzerland

Je suis désolé, on a un petit problème de diversité linguistique. En français j'avais proposé « demande à l'Etat partie de continuer à traiter avec extrême prudence les décisions concernant la mise au jour des empreintes de pas de Laetoli ».

The Chairperson

Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. The English translation I was listening to of your proposal would read approximately as follows: "Requests the State Party to continue to deal with extreme caution concerning any decision taken to open the Laetoli footprints." I see the Swiss Delegation nodding, so I would then read again the formulation "Requests the State Party to continue to deal with extreme caution concerning any decision taken to open the Laetoli footprints." and here the paragraph forward stops. And then paragraph 5 we would retain was a deleted aspect in the centre of the paragraph 5 then would read: Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Advisory Body mission to the property to make proposals for the revision of the management system and plan to ensure adequate protection, conservation and management of the cultural attributes as well as addressing the conservation issues regarding the natural attributes addressed in document 7B and in paragraph 6 we would delete the second half of the paragraph so that the part retained would read: Recalls its request to the State Party to consider under item 7B of the present session to provide to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2011 a report on the state of conservation of the property for consideration at its 35th session. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I ask the Committee Members would they be in agreement with the adoption of the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.13 as amended**. Adopted. (Applause)

So this leads to the adjournment of this morning's session. I would ask your cooperation please. We are very behind. If we want to have any hope of regaining lost time I need you back here and I will now hand over to the Russian Federation.

Russian Federation

If the Secretariat could provide us the exact item by item and in which order we will work after lunch. And then dear colleagues, of course we have a very difficult items ahead and maybe it would be not bad if items which are proposed by the Secretariat to approve with letter (i) which is extension of the sites we have 11 such items can be approved without discussion. So maybe we could approve it without discussion and we save on a lot of time because it is a minimum of four hours which takes for these items which have no problems for approval and recommended without any. So it is up to you but I propose such.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Over to Egypt.

Egypt

Dear Ms Mitrofanova. I don't know if this is a very good idea. Because the list for nominations has already been modified once and now its available for members, for all observer parties, and all Member States. I am not actually convinced that we should deviate from the established order. That is my point of view. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Over to China.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. China would like to support the proposal by the distinguished delegate of the Russian Federation. Thank you.

The Chairperson

The Secretariat has suggested that we adjourn the session now. We shall have some consultations over the lunch break and at the beginning of this afternoon's session we can look at the proposals as to whether we can confirm or modify the timetable. Thank you very much and I apologize. Madam Rapporteur you have some information to share?

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. As a matter of information we would encourage all those Member States of the World Heritage Committee who desire to propose amendments for inscription of sites that have not yet been proposed for inscription by the Advisory Bodies to please hand in the statements of outstanding universal value as soon as possible so that we can send them to the translators and we can have them distributed in the room at the end of the consideration of the items under 8B. The latest at the end of this afternoon session please. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you.

The Secretariat

Merci Monsieur le Président. Juste pour rappeler rapidement les trois évènements qui prennent place pendant l'heure du déjeuner. Nous avons d'abord une séance de questions réponses sur le processus de suivi de l'IUCN dans l'espace IUCN à l'entrée de l'Hotel

Alvorada, ça vous connaissez déjà. Comme d'habitude nous avons le groupe de travail sur l'avenir de la convention dans la salle du bureau de 14 à 15h. Et j'aimerais attirer votre attention sur une présentation spéciale du patrimoine mondial et des musées, présentation qui sera faite par l'ICOM ici dans cette salle plénière de 14h à 15h et qui peut se révéler très intéressante vu les discussions que nous venons d'avoir. Très bon appétit, merci !

Saturday, 31 July 2010

FIFTEENTH

Afternoon session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira
and H.E. Mrs Eleonora Mitrofanova (Vice-Chairperson)**

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson

Good afternoon everyone. I would like to ask you please to be kind enough to take your seats on behalf of this Committee. I hope you have all had a pleasant lunch. That you have had enough time to get a little bit of a rest and that you are now rearing to go. I will therefore ask you all to please kindly be seated. We shall begin this afternoon's work as soon as possible. Now I will be counting on your cooperation for us to make headway as best we can without any prejudice whatsoever of course to the technical discussion that must take place. Let's start with the Arab States - the At-Turaif District in ad-Dir'iyah in Saudi Arabia and I shall ask ICOMOS to take the floor.

ICOMOS

Située dans l'oasis de Ad-Dir'iyah la citadelle d'At-Turaif fut la première capitale saoudienne au cœur de la péninsule arabique. Au 18^e siècle et au début du 19^e siècle elle affirme son rôle politique et religieux au sein du monde arabe et islamique. En termes de catégorie de bien culturel il s'agit d'un site archéologique, il s'agit aussi d'une ville historique dans la catégorie des villes mortes. Le bien est formé de l'ancienne citadelle d'At-Turaif, construite sur un léger promontoire, elle est située dans une boucle de l'oasis déterminée par Wadi Hanifah et un affluent au sud. La zone tampon correspond à l'oasis à proximité du bien et à une portion du plateau continental désertique à l'ouest. A l'intérieur de la péninsule arabique, l'oasis d'Al-Riyadh est l'un des lieux les plus anciennement occupés par l'homme de manière permanente depuis le cinquième siècle. L'oasis est toujours vue à proximité immédiate de l'agglomération de Riyadh. La citadelle à proprement parler a été construite à partir du 18^e siècle quand la tribu des Saoud impose son pouvoir sur l'oasis et sur la région centrale de l'Arabie. Elle en fait sa capitale pendant environ un siècle. C'est une ville fortifiée dont le principe constructif repose sur l'usage de la brique de terre crue, son réseau viaire ainsi que les vestiges de nombreux palais sont bien visibles. Située au centre d'une des régions les plus sèches du monde la citadelle témoigne d'une adaptation constructive à son environnement. Elle comprend les vestiges de plusieurs quartiers d'habitation. Supportée par les Saoud, la réforme religieuse du Waabisme se diffuse dans le monde islamique à partir d'At-Turaif qui devient un important centre religieux et intellectuel par ses écoles coraniques. L'architecture affirme alors un style constructif régional propre, le style Najdi, notamment par ses palais à étages et à cour intérieure par l'usage de colonnes par ses ouvertures d'aération triangulaires. De nombreux détails constructifs sont le signe d'une appartenance au style Najdi, tant pour les murs, les ouvertures que pour l'usage des bois et des décorations, parfois de décor peints. Devenu un centre politique et religieux en pleine expansion le royaume des Saoud fait face à l'empire ottoman au début du 19^e siècle. La citadelle est prise et saccagée en 1818, les remparts sont rasés, ils ont été reconstruits récemment, mais d'une manière peu authentique, comprenant l'usage de la pierre et du ciment. La ville abandonnée a connu une réoccupation partielle qui a modifié parfois de manière importante l'habitat résiduel. Depuis quelques années plusieurs palais, mosquées ou bâtiments ont été reconstruit en adobe, mais ils témoignent de fortes réinterprétations

architecturales loin des originaux. At-Turaif est aujourd'hui l'objet d'un vaste projet de centre culturel d'accueil de parcours balisé et de centre d'expérimentation sur l'architecture de la terre crue. Du point de vue de l'ICOMOS, il s'agit plus de l'utilisation d'un site patrimonial au service d'un projet culturel que d'un programme de conservation respectueux de l'intégrité et de l'authenticité du bien. L'ensemble urbain et palatial proposé est important et il présente des vestiges notables. Mais premièrement, si les conditions d'intégrité du bien sont acceptables en termes viaires et paysagers, elles ne le sont pas en termes architecturaux. Les conditions d'authenticité ne sont pas remplies dans un certain nombre de constructions restaurées. Deuxièmement, l'analyse comparative est pour l'instant insuffisante. En conséquence les critères (iv) et (v) proposés sont insuffisamment étayés à ce stade du dossier et les attributs matériels et supportant paraissent fragiles et menacés. Le critère (vi) repose essentiellement sur des faits historiques et culturels, les attributs exprimant ce critère sont toutefois peu explicites. Outre la fragilité intrinsèques des vestiges en terre crue abandonnée pendant plus d'un siècle et demi, l'ICOMOS considère que les projets d'activité du musée du patrimoine vivant ne correspondent pas pleinement à la conservation de l'authenticité et de l'intégrité des attributs du bien.

L'ICOMOS recommande que l'examen de la proposition d'inscription du district d'At-Turaif à Ad-Dir'iyah, Royaume d'Arabie Saoudite, sur la liste du patrimoine mondial soit différé, afin de permettre à l'Etat partie d'approfondir l'étude comparative, de ratifier la loi sur les antiquités et le plan urbain d' Ad-Dir'iyah, d'abandonner la politique de reconstruction et d'interprétation culturelle des vestiges du bien au profit d'une véritable politique de conservation, de placer la sauvegarde des attributs de l'authenticité et de l'intégrité au centre du plan de gestion, de réaliser un programme de conservation approfondi, de mettre en place un comité scientifique de la conservation du bien, de confirmer la présence sur place de l'autorité transversale de gestion de bien, de renforcer le suivi de développement dans la zone tampon et dans ses environs immédiats. D'autres recommandations ont été formulées par l'ICOMOS, en particulier de systématiser les fouilles préventives afin de documenter les travaux de conservation. L'ICOMOS a reçu une lettre d'erreur factuelle et l'a prise en considération. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Well thank you. Thank you to the representative of ICOMOS for these explanations. I should like to invite now the States Parties to make the comments that they would like to make and I should like to call on the representative of Mexico first of all.

Mexico

Thank you very much indeed says the Mexican representative. Thank you sir for giving me the floor. Well we have paid tremendous attention to what ICOMOS has just said but would like to put a question to them. In the recommendation they made on this nomination, which is in the Draft Decision we have before us, there was an appeal that was made to give up this reconstruction policy and this cultural reinterpretation of the vestiges of the property. This idea of cultural reinterpretation, things are being interpreted differently from what it was originally. Considering the Mexican experience in this area it seems to us that whatever efforts we make in order to rescue our past, these efforts have to be recognized and they have to be bolstered and so we would like to know what you mean by reinterpreting the culture of the area and why is it that on the basis of that you are calling for these efforts to be dropped. In advance, we would like to thank ICOMOS for their clarifications and thanks to you sir for putting the question to them. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Mexico and I should indeed like to give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Il y a en effet deux problèmes distincts. Il y a les problèmes de l'interprétation du bien et une partie du projet muséographique est en effet consacrée à cette interprétation. Elle doit être renforcée, elle doit être au cœur du projet, elle doit être centrée sur la conservation. Il y a également dans ce projet autour de ce projet, toute une série d'autres constructions, d'autres projets culturels, religieux, muséographiques, qui viennent s'ajouter. Il faut une clarification de ces projets afin que la conservation soit bien au centre. Il nous a semblé qu'il y avait dans le dossier que nous avons étudié une forme de confusion entre les différents niveaux. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. Bahrain you have the floor.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Chair. Bahrain acknowledges the professional work of ICOMOS, which has presented many elaborate and convincing evaluations to this session of the World Heritage Committee. However, Bahrain wishes to express its reservations with regard to the evaluation of At-Turaif District in ad-Dir'iyah. Mr Chairman, talking about At-Turaif the Advisory Bodies says, and I will quote, "The site is an architectural and urban ensemble that bears witness to the culture and lifestyle of the fairs of the State, direct ancestors of the modern Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It is also a historic place that contains evidence of cultural, religious and military events on an international scale and of major geopolitical importance. The destruction of the city in the beginning of the nineteenth century is proof that ad-Dir'iyah was developing an influence that challenged the hegemony of the Ottoman Caliphate". There are several similar examples in history and this brings to the issue of the comparative analysis in which a world dimension seems to be lacking. If I may summarize, Mr Chairman, some aspects of the evaluation report, I read that the States Parties argument for Outstanding Universal Value and that criterion (v) and (vi) are valid and indisputable. The historic facts along with the originality of the HND style are according to ICOMOS unquestionable. The conditions of integrity so it says are acceptable and the property has been protected in terms of authenticity by being abandoned for one and a half centuries. ICOMOS feels that the States that the boundaries and buffer zones are adequate. The only issue that is really preventing inscription is that, I quote, "the conservation policy applied" tends to favour the partial reconstruction and that the visitors centre is considered a threat. Bahrain wishes that the question of adequacy and policies and interpretation programmes are considered in a regional cultural context. Bahrain feels that the visitors centre and the conservation policy, which aims only at partial reconstruction of an extremely small and representative sample of the historic buildings approximately and I will say it as 0.3% of the number of buildings. 0.3% of the number of buildings contribute sincerely to the understanding and appreciation of the demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value. The policies of conservation and interpretation are tailor-made for the value perception and visitor expectation in Central Arabia and the alternative policies proposed by ICOMOS could pose a risk of neglect and over time re-abandonment of the site. Bahrain therefore supports the inscription of At-Turaif District based on the Outstanding Universal Value acknowledged under criterion (v) and (vi) and commends Saudi Arabia for a unique nomination to say that captures the spirit of our region. I would like if you allow me Mr Chairman to raise a question to the State Party about the recent information statement about the conservation status for the site. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS and then the State Party. ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Oui, en effet, à propos de l'analyse comparative, nous avons quelques réserves. Elle a été faite dans le monde arabo-musulman, elle présente un certain nombre de cas, mais elle décrit simplement ces cas et il n'y a pas véritablement de mise en évidence de l'originalité du style Najdi, donc pour nous elle n'est pas complètement achevée. Par ailleurs l'architecture de terre et l'urbanisme de terre étant quelque chose d'extrêmement diffusé dans un grand nombre de pays, différentes villes historiques anciennes, mortes, sont inscrites, il serait intéressant qu'une comparaison soit faite entre cette ville importante, cette citadelle importante d'At-Turaif et d'autres villes en dehors du monde arabo-musulman. Merci monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you indeed. Let me now give the floor to the representative of the State Party in question. Saudi Arabia you have the floor.

Saudi Arabia

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Before I give the floor to our Saudi experts let me, because this is the first intervention for the Saudi Delegation, let me have this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Government of Brazil for the warm hospitality and especially for our dear friend the Ambassador of Brazil. Allow me to save the time to give the floor to our expert Dr Al..... to answer the question.

Saudi Arabia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Regarding the question raised by the honourable delegate of Bahrain about the conservation measures taken by the State Party, my Government. I would like to say for the first time that it seems that the ICOMOS evaluation, based mainly on the precedent restoration programme started in 1980. But today, we have established a new policy of conservation, in which the maintaining of the authenticity of the property is our priority. Since for this region two technical manual for the preservation of the site refuted in nomination file. These technical documents were prepared by internationally renowned experts in art and conservation and construction, such as *Craterre*, the famous centre of mud-brick architecture in Grenoble in France. At the same time also our policy based on the preservation of the site takes care of the authenticity and integrity of the site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. Let me give the floor to the representative of China.

China

Thank you Mr Chairperson. China would like to express its appreciation to ICOMOS on the work that has been done on the evaluation of this site. We have also just learnt that some progress has been made by the State Party in meeting the ICOMOS recommendations. We would like again to propose The Chairperson to give the State Party an opportunity to state what achievements have been made in meeting the ICOMOS recommendations. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The State Party, you have been asked to clarify the question put by China. Could I please ask you sir to try do so now.

Saudi Arabia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Regarding the question raised by the honourable delegate of China, allow me please to reiterate that Saudi Arabia is committed to the future conservation policy. The priority of which is the safeguarding of the priority, integrity and authenticity. To this end the Kingdom has put in place an international expert committee in charge of ensuring that conservation is implemented according to conservation guidelines and of monitoring the global conservation process, including the cultural development project and the overall management and interpretation of the property and its buffer zone. It is also prescribed that a higher committee for ad-Dir'iyah was established in order to control all future development and ensure the full protection of the site and its buffer zone. This higher committee, presided by his Royal Highness, Governor of Riyadh Province, includes the membership of high-level representatives from the various authorities involved in the management of the area of ad-Dir'iyah and at the local level also. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I should like to give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Egypt

Thank you Mr Chair. I would first like to appreciate the report from ICOMOS and thank them and really this is a typical case study that we should examine, and we should deeply examine this case study in our Committee. The recommendations of ICOMOS is to defer the inscription of this site according to certain parameters. I am not coming back for the Outstanding Universal Value because the Delegation of Bahrain explained really the importance of the site from the historical point of view, not only on a local scale, but also for the Muslim people all over the world. Also concerning the type of the technology of structures and architectures of using the local material and the local technology at that time, starting from the 15th century and then during the 18th and 19th century. The last concerning that tangibility and events accompanying the history of the site to me that the criteria (v) and (vi) completely fulfils. Regarding the integrity of the site, ICOMOS commends/considers that the conditions of the integrity are acceptable in terms of streets and landscapes but not in architectural terms. I thank again the Delegation of Bahrain that the degradation of some architectural buildings are limited to only 0.3% and to me this is a positive sign. The site a dynamic one, acting with the environment, the nature and even with the living people and we should preserve this and this is a good sign to inscribe and preserve the site. Regarding the authenticity ICOMOS commends that it has been protected by being abandoned for one and a half centuries. This is the first comment that I would like to give and since going further for the conservation, and this is only ICOMOS's interpretation, saying that since 1982 the State Party has regularly carried out archaeological excavations and topographic survey campaigns using the most modern techniques – 3D. This is extremely sure that efforts given and doing by the State Party.

Regarding the last point concerning the conservation law and integrity. I would like to remind the members of the Committee that last year when it inscribed to Saudi Arabia a site, a cultural one and I would like to ask ICOMOS I think that this is maybe a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of information. If Saudi Arabia didn't have a conservation law on what basis did the Committee adopted the inscription of that site last year. I will stop here and I would like to have more information and I think that the State Party give some highlights regarding the legal aspects concerning Saudi Arabia's integrity laws. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je crois qu'il y a une série de points sur lesquels effectivement il faut revenir. A propos premièrement de la VUE. L'ICOMOS ne dit pas qu'il n'y a pas de VUE, elle dit simplement qu'elle est potentielle et qu'elle n'est pas pleinement démontrée. En termes de critères, les critères qui semblent mieux adaptés, qui peuvent être démontrés notamment par une analyse comparative plus approfondie et par une politique d'intégrité un peu recentrée, sont les critères (iv) et (v). Le critère (vi) je le disais tout à l'heure, les supports matériels du critère (vi) semblent très ténus, c'est beaucoup moins évident pour nous. Ça c'est un premier point. Donc il y a une VUE potentielle et il y a à discuter quels critères sembleraient les plus adaptés en cas de complète démonstration de la VUE, ce qui pour nous n'est pas encore fait. En ce qui concerne l'intégrité et la politique de conservation. L'intégrité dans notre rapport nous indiquons qu'elle convenable pour deux choses, la structure viaire du bien, c'est à dire que l'urbanisme est bien lisible et l'intégrité est convenable à ce point-là. Les éléments paysagers sont aussi tout à fait convenables et satisfaisants. Ce qui pose problème c'est l'intégrité architecturale du bien car les travaux qui ont été faits depuis 82, on l'a déjà dit, j'y reviens, ce chiffre de 0,03% m'étonnes beaucoup, il ne correspond pas en tout cas aux documentations photographiques que nous avons eues sur des monuments relativement importants qui ont été restructurés à différents moments à différentes périodes et dont certaines de ces restaurations sont clairement des interprétations et cela rejailit sur l'authenticité évidemment par l'usage de matériaux non conformes. Encore une fois, nous ne disons pas que l'Etat partie n'a pas de politique de conservation, mais nous sommes un peu inquiets par un projet qui a pris une telle ampleur, que la conversation ne nous semble plus au cœur de ce bien, et si nous proposons différer, c'est justement pour que ce dossier soit repensé dans une direction qui permette à la conservation du patrimoine d'être au cœur de ce projet et non pas du tout pour abandonner le lieu ou pour ne rien y faire, ou pour le laisser mourir, mais pour que chaque chose soit à sa place et que au cœur de ce projet nous ayons bien la conservation de ce bien dans des conditions d'intégrité, d'authenticité, parfaitement acceptables par la communauté scientifique. Et c'est de ces inquiétudes dont nous nous faisons l'écho, et c'est ces inquiétudes que nous souhaiterions voir prises en compte par l'Etat partie pour une coopération afin d'arriver à une bonne démonstration de la VUE et à une politique de concertation qui rassemble si possible l'unanimité, en tout cas la majorité des professionnels. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. May I give the floor to the representative of the State Party.

Saudi Arabia

Well concerning the integrity of the site the Government owns the site since 1973. So the architectural patterns are very well preserved, the street networks conserved without any modification and it is clearly visible today that the built structure reflects an original style that is typical of the Najdi region. The site comprises of 30 monuments, palaces, mosques and public baths and hundreds of ordinary houses. The integrity of all these elements stand in good condition. The landscape surrounding the site has been well protected. A large buffer zone protects this landscape integrity. So the question of integrity is that nothing has been added to the site since the acquisition of this site in 1973. There is no new construction on At-Turaif site. So the integrity is very well protected on this site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. May I give the floor to the representative of Cambodia.

Cambodia

Thank you Chairman. Cambodia would like to thank ICOMOS for its report. We also thank the State Party for the additional information concerning its property. Mr Chairman this nomination in our opinion needs to be evaluated in the light of the determining factor the construction material is not stone so conservation conditions are extremely difficult and that's even without mentioning other precarious aspects of the site. Our Saudi Arabian colleagues have called upon experts for conservation mechanisms for earth and construction. We should congratulate them for that and say that the measures that they have introduced respects the integrity of the site and provides safeguarding. Knowing Saudi Arabia you could not say that the country has favoured cultural tourism over conservation. This is a State that is known for its integrity and conserving sites. We recommend that this site be nominated and be listed on the list.

The Chairperson

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

Jordan

Thank you Mr Chair. I would like to thank ICOMOS for the evaluation report and if I may make a general statement concerning this nomination. This is the second nomination for a huge country of Saudi Arabia. The site of ad-Dir'iyah can be singled out among many waste settlements in the Arabian Peninsula. It represents an exceptional example of mud brick large complex and it was compared with sites and settlements in south eastern and northern Arabia, in other parts of the near east and East Africa and I would like to note that I have been working myself on mud brick architecture for the last 25 years. Comparative analysis can be endless, especially when it comes to mud brick architecture and if it can be done within the region and its surroundings I think this would be satisfactory. The examples which exist in countries like Yemen, Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Northern Syria are very explicit. I am sure that the Saudi authorities will continue to undertake professional steps towards safeguarding of the site in its entirety. The fabric ad-Dir'iyah is very special in terms of integrity and authenticity and OUV can be attested in many respects and a number of those have been pointed out by the report of ICOMOS. I would like to compliment the Saudi Authorities for all the efforts made towards this important site. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the representative of France the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous savons toute l'importance qui s'attache au suivi non seulement de la conservation du bien proprement dit, mais aussi suivi du développement des zones tampons et du voisinage immédiat. Alors il a été indiqué que l'Etat partie s'est engagé à adopter des mesures spécifiques pour renforcer le suivi de la conservation du bien et le suivi du développement aussi de la zone tampon et de voisinage immédiat. J'aimerais pour ma part, si c'est possible monsieur le Président que vous accordiez la parole à l'Etat partie, pour qu'il nous apporte des précisions sur ce point.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor now to the State Party to respond to the question from France.

Saudi Arabia

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Regarding the question raised by the Honourable delegate of France I would like to say that the most important element in our monitoring policy is the creation of an international committee from *Craterre* and ICROM and also from certain Arab world to be in charge of controlling all the projects and also to implement the conservation guidelines that we prepared for the site. And also we take consideration to monitor all the conservation process and to control all the development in the buffer zone. And also we revised all the overall policy of the conservation, based on ICOMOS's recommendations. We started consultation with the World Heritage Earth Architectural Programme and UNESCO also for this reason. So we have taken into consideration all the questions of monitoring to protect this site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the United Arab Emirates.

UAE

Thank you Mr Chairman. The UAE is in support of the inscription.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Mali

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je me sens à l'aise Monsieur le Président, comme le poisson dans l'eau. Oui, parce que les sites que nous avons à Timbuktu c'est de l'architecture en terre. Le site auquel nous avons à faire est un bien culturel vivant. Certes, le problème le plus délicat ici, c'est l'élément fondamental, à savoir la terre crue, qui est périssable. Mais pour vous économiser le temps Monsieur le Président, je ne poserai pas des questions relatives à l'intégrité ni à l'authenticité, encore moins à la VUE du site, car ceci a été déjà approuvée, encore moins aux efforts consentis par l'Etat partie en termes de conservation du bien. Mais comme nous avons à faire à une ville vivante, c'est une cité vivante, je souhaiterais savoir le degré d'implication des populations dans la gestion du bien et le système d'inscription du bien. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Iraq now.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chairperson. My country has been building adobe houses and palaces and mosques for centuries and if you go to Iraq now you hardly see any building that exists. To achieve this kind of conservation in Saudi Arabia is an incredible thing to do. I was in Riyadh recently and I went myself to ad-Dir'iyah and I saw with my eyes the great effort that the Saudi authorities did in that place. This is a statement of my seeing in the place itself. But I have informed that the State Party conducted archaeological excavations in eight areas in At-Tarif site before the development works. So Mr Chairman I would like to ask the State Party to give further information. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and ICOMOS would like to add a few comments.

ICOMOS

Juste un point technique pour éclairer le débat. Le dossier au titre des conventions des titres, est un site archéologique et il s'agit aussi d'une ville historique dans la catégorie des villes mortes.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I would like now to provide clarification to the representative of Iraq. I cannot give the floor to the State Party to answer questions that are too general. The questions need to be very specific and very technical. I give the floor to Brazil now.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. The Brazilian Delegation recognizes the extraordinary work that is being done by ICOMOS and we have very carefully read their very comprehensive evaluation report. We can see the conclusions of ICOMOS and its report and it is quite clear in the ICOMOS report that the historical qualities of the site are considered undeniable by the State Party. The originality of the Najdi style of architecture which is architecture that involves both mud-brick and stone, according to the report itself, is a key factor. So the Brazilian Delegation feels that it is somewhat inconsistent to have these undeniable observations on the one hand and on the other hand to arrive at the conclusion that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has not been clearly established. According to what the representative of ICOMOS himself said furthermore, the Outstanding Universal Value of the site has not been called into question. If ICOMOS itself recognizes as undeniable the Najdi architecture with its stone and earthen walls that means that that kind of architecture is original. That meets criterion (iv) for the listing of the property on the World Heritage List. The ad-Dir'iyah is one of the most important sites in Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabians have made this site one of the centres of political power by installing fortifications and palaces historically at this location. Personally I had the good fortune to visit this site on two occasions and I was really struck by the exceptional historical and architectural value of the site. I would say that I also retain a clear memory of the very careful attention paid by the Saudi Arabian authorities to the conservation and protection of this site. I also observed that development in the region has not affected the site in any way. Not only did the State acquire the site in 1982 it has also taken all necessary measures for its conservation and preservation. ICOMOS considers that this is ensemble with planning that enables proper conservation of the site that the structural integrity of the site is conserved. ICOMOS also considers that development outside the site is under control. Information which has reached us from the State Party is entirely satisfactory as far as the Brazilian Delegation is concerned, at least with regard to the measures for conservation of the property. These measures have been explained in detail by the State in response to questions put by the Delegations here in this room this afternoon and the State Party has also made a firm commitment in the context of its policy of conservation and preservation of the property to look after it over the short-, medium- and long-term. The buffer zone has also been the subject of specific attention from the State Party. Therefore, I would congratulate the State Party. Brazil is in favour of listing this site on the World Heritage List. We have no further questions to ask. The Brazilian Delegation is fully convinced that it should be on the World Heritage List. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

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

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairman. To our understanding nominations should be complete at the time of inscription and the OUV should be fully justified. Following the ICOMOS evaluation this is not the case. We believe that OUV needs to be elaborated so that it can be fully justified and that nominations should be reworked and adjusted, especially on conservation and reconstruction. We support the ICOMOS evaluation and goes for a deferral of this nomination. Thank you sir.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the representative of Egypt for a second time and so I would ask that you be brief please.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je m'excuse de prendre la parole pour la deuxième fois, mais en fait je voulais réagir au commentaire de l'ICOMOS. Je remercie vivement l'ICOMOS pour les clarifications données. D'après l'interprétation de l'ICOMOS, et là en fait je m'adresse à mes collègues de la Délégation de Suède, il n'y a pas de doute sur la valeur universelle du site. Les questions que pose l'ICOMOS, c'est par rapport à l'intégrité d'architecture du bien et la politique de conservation. Je ne sais pas, peut-être l'ICOMOS pourra tout à l'heure confirmer. En ce qui concerne l'architecture d'intérieur du bien, c'est une architecture de la terre. Et l'architecture en fait de la terre, par définition c'est différent d'un site à l'autre, parce qu'en fait la matière première, et en fait ça a été construit le site il est complètement différent, le sol est différent d'un lieu à l'autre, et dans ce sens-là, la méthode de construction, et la manière par laquelle on peut renforcer la construction des bâtiments, elle est différente d'une région à l'autre, parce que là c'est la définition de base par rapport à l'architecture de la terre. En ce qui concerne la politique de conservation, l'ICOMOS a exprimé ceci par rapport aux politiques actuelles de la part des Etats, ce qui concerne les reconstructions de certaines parties. Ça c'est une raison de plus pour l'inscription parce qu'en fait la Convention de 1972 c'est pour conserver et aider les Etats parties à protéger leur biens. Et en fait, suite à ce que je viens d'expliquer, les arguments donnés par l'ICOMOS dans le paragraphe 2, ne sont plus acceptables pour nous, et nous demandons la modification du texte dans le sens, pour l'inscription du site. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

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

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman. I think my other colleagues have actually elaborated on the OUV of this property which ICOMOS has said is not in doubt. I would like to thank the efforts that they have carried out and the State Party for the efforts that have been put in ensuring that this site's integrity and authenticity is maintained by the amount of work they have done. Mr Chairman, dear colleagues, I have had the privilege of visiting this site earlier on in the year and I have seen the kind of efforts that has been put there by the State Party to maintain the integrity and authenticity of the site. And I think it has also benefited from an international seminar or workshop that it has organized where the architecture is especially in the Arab and Islamic world was discussed and it has benefitted from these apparently. The dossier has benefitted from this workshop, where I think the comparative analysis was also carried out. But we deeply share in the concern of ICOMOS, especially on the issues relating

to conservation, because conservation is at the heart of the Convention on the protection of World Heritage. Given the explanation that has been given by the State Party and the distinction probably between construction, restoration and other conservation issues, and the nature of the architecture that has been given in all the discussions this afternoon, the issue of conservation certainly will always come up because architecture requires conservation on a continuous basis. But whether this attribute of authenticity and integrity will be compromised in the process of these conservation efforts, year in year out, is probably the major concern of ICOMOS and I share seriously in this concern. But I also want to share in the position of Bahrain that since this OUV has been clearly demonstrated and all the issues concerning conservation has been addressed by the State Party and other discussants, Nigeria would like to propose that this site be inscribed on the condition that we modify paragraph 2 to include four main issues so that these two factors can be addressed – management and conservation. So I would propose that, while we inscribe this site, we ask the State Party to develop a policy that to safeguard the property's attributes, especially its architecture, integrity and authenticity, and strengthen the monitoring of the development of the buffer zone and in the immediate vicinity, as well as to make sure that all projects in relation to the boundaries of this property and the buffer zone enhance the value of the property. Similarly, they should be asked to put in place under the management authority of the property a scientific committee in charge of the refined implementation of the conservation policy and monitoring the conservation process as we have been told by the delegate of Egypt. The material used to stabilize the building material and the architecture varies from place to place. So there is a need for the State Party to put in place a scientific committee that will continue to steady the conservation process and the stabilizing properties that they use in the conservation from time to time. So, Mr Chairman, this is our submission from Nigeria. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will give the floor to Estonia.

Estonia

Thank you Mr Chairman. Thanks to the convincing report by ICOMOS, Estonia is very positive about this nomination. However, we see that there are obvious problems with OUV conservation methods and other things. There is no need to hurry the State Party. Let us give them time to solve the problems first. It would be short-sighted to inscribe a raw nomination. That is why Estonia supports deferral.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse soutient la position de la Suède et de l'Estonie, car la VUE selon nous elle est potentielle, mais elle n'est pas prouvée, il manque une analyse comparative exhaustive. C'est pour cela qu'il nous manque la base de pouvoir soutenir une inscription, donc nous sommes aussi pour le différé. Merci Monsieur le Président

The Chairperson

I give the floor to Ethiopia.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chair. From the discussion of the Committee members and the efforts made by the State Party Ethiopia is in favour of inscribing the property. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and for the second time I am giving the floor to Mali.

Mali

Merci monsieur le Président. Je serai bref. Je remercie l'ICOMOS pour nous faire la distinction entre ville morte et ville vivante, il s'agit d'une ville morte, merci pour la précision. Mais dans chacun des cas, ce qui est important pour moi c'est les matériaux. Ici les matériaux utilisés c'est encore la terre, donc quand on parle d'architecture interne, on parle de matériaux fragiles et périssables, et cela veut dire qu'il y a urgence d'agir sur ces matériaux, sur cette architecture si on veut diminuer ou alors mettre fin à la dégradation de ce site extrêmement intéressant. Alors moi je pense qu'inscrire ce site sur la liste du patrimoine mondial va aider l'Etat partie, non seulement à renforcer le cadre institutionnel, mais aussi à renforcer le programme de conservation du site. Pour cela je rejoins la position du Brésil. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.15 is on page 16 of the English version and page 17 of the French version of the document 8B. I have received amendments from four Member States of the committee from Bahrain, Jordan, Nigeria and Barbados. The amendment of Bahrain is to propose the inscription of ad-Dir'iyah, Saudi Arabia on the basis of criteria (v) and (vi). The amendment of Jordan proposes the inscription on the basis of criteria (iv), (v) and (vi). The amendments of Nigeria and Barbados mainly concern the recommendation paragraphs and they are also a few amendments of Bahrain in those that perhaps Mr Chairperson you would like to focus the discussion first on paragraph 2 and then we could look at the recommendation paragraphs following after that. Thank you.

The Chairperson

It seems to me that the best thing to do would be to first and foremost to consult the Committee and see if the Committee is willing to accept inscription and then depending on - the answer will see on what basis inscription will be done. Rapporteur please.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. Would perhaps read paragraph 2 as suggested by Jordan which would be the furthest removed from the initial Draft Decision. The proposal would be to delete current paragraph 2, because 2 also includes the recommendation and part of them seem to stay at the end. I would rather say delete the umbrella paragraph of 2 and replaces the umbrella by inscribing At-Tarief, Saudi Arabia on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv), (v) and (vi) and then a new umbrella paragraph for the following recommendations would be created as paragraph 3, or rather as paragraph 4 because paragraph 3 would then introduce the statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Chairperson

I would like to know if anyone is against what has just been proposed. Turning to the Committee, are you willing to adopt what was just presented by the Rapporteur? Very well, adopted. (Applause).

Congratulations to the State Party and then I give the floor to the Rapporteur to show us the amendments presented.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairman I note to keep the State Party waiting until we adopted the entire paragraph. So paragraph 2 has accordingly been adopted and decides to inscribe on the basis of criteria (iv), (v) and (vi). Paragraph 3 would then be: "Adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Value" and as we mentioned earlier this statement as drafted by the submitting State Parties would be presented to you in print for consideration at the end of item 8B. Then a new umbrella paragraph which would be under 4 which would then read: "Requests the State Party to" and now part of the following recommendations would be retained and since the amendments to the recommendation are rather complex Mr Chairperson, I would suggest to put this new paragraph 4 on the screen for you.

The Chairperson

Please put the new paragraph 4 on the screen.

Rapporteur

Could the technical team assist us with the decision text please. While we are waiting for the technique to show up on the screen I will very briefly take you through the general context of amendments that have been presented. Bahrain has requested the current paragraph (a) to be deleted. So the current paragraph (a) would be deleted which referred to the comparative study. The current paragraph (b) would accordingly and I can see that the text is now up for you on the screen so you will be able to follow me on the screen. Current paragraph (a) would be deleted as a comparative study. It is no longer necessary after the inscription. Paragraph (b) would become paragraph (a) which is the request to ratify the new antiquities law. Paragraph (c) is suggested to be deleted and reformulated in the following way. I will read the text to you. "Enhance the cultural interpretation

The Chairperson

Could I ask for your attention please. We are in the midst of a voting process and the rapporteur is trying her best to explain all the different paragraphs that will be changed.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. Paragraph (a) had been requested to be deleted. Paragraph small (b) therefore becomes small (a). Current paragraph (c) is suggested to be deleted and to be reformulated with the following wording: "Enhance the cultural interpretation of the remains of the property in the framework of a conservation policy which gives priority to safeguarding the property attributes of architectural integrity and authenticity. Then at the suggestion of Bahrain and Barbados former paragraph (d) which would now become (c) is suggested to be deleted by Bahrain and Barbados and suggested to be replaced with the following text: "Ensure that the management plan and other programmes which guides future action aimed at communicating the value of the property including the living heritage museum project respect the attributes of authenticity and integrity. In the following Bahrain and Barbados suggests to move paragraph formally (f) in front of paragraph formally (e) which would then become paragraph (d) but the text remains unchanged. Former paragraph (e) would stay current paragraph (e) is slightly reformulated and would now read: "Put in place, under the auspices of the overarching management authority of the property a scientific committee in charge of the conservation policy for the property aimed at verifying that it is implemented and monitoring the conservation process. This committee would equally function as an evaluation body for tourism and culture development projects and for management of the property." Then the suggestion is by Bahrain and I assume supported by

the Secretariat as in the practice of earlier cases, to delete paragraph 3 and Bahrain further suggested that the subparagraphs of paragraph 4 can be connected to paragraph 2 as they would have the same umbrella. "Requests the State Party" and would further remain unchanged. So subparagraph 4(a) would become subparagraph 2(g) and subparagraph 4(b) would become subparagraph 2(h).

And then, at the suggestion of Nigeria, four more new paragraphs are proposed but I would turn to the delegate of Nigeria because I had the impression that some of the aspects were already covered in the previous paragraph, so maybe I can ask Nigeria if they indeed want to retain all of the four paragraphs. Thank you.

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman. I think all the points have been adequately taken care of, except for have the issue of monitoring. I don't think I can see it there.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Nigeria. That makes our work much easier. Then according to what you currently see on the screen please disregard paragraphs (i), (k) and (l) as they have just been withdrawn by the State Party and we would retain paragraph (j) which would become 2(i) which reads: "Strengthen the monitoring of the development in the buffer zone and in the immediate vicinity." Thank you very much Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Does any Delegation have any comments on any of these paragraphs or any of the paragraphs with the changes? I turn to the Committee and I want to know if we are ready to adopt the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.15** as it has just been presented, including the items added by Nigeria. Adopted. (Applause).

Very quickly I will give some time to the State Party to speak. State Party please.

Saudi Arabia

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. The site of ad-Dir'iyah became now the second Saudi site in the World Heritage List. As you may remember the first was Madâine Sâlih which was inscribed in Quebec in 2008. On behalf of the Saudi Delegation I would like to thank the respected Members of the Committee, all of them, for their understanding and support and we thank the President of the Committee. Our thanks also goes to ICOMOS for their understanding and accepting our further explanations and modifications with their notices on the site. Dir'iyah village during more than 500 years old was a symbol of the Saudi history. Today, Dir'iyah became an icon for the Saudi history and heritage. Thanks to all of you. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and congratulations to Saudi Arabia and now we are going to turn to Asia Pacific and I ask ICOMOS to present the nomination for the **Australian Convict Site in Australia**.

ICOMOS

Thank you very much. This is a site which involves 11 penal sites among the cells and that also was also built by the British Empire in Australia in the 18th and 19th centuries. Some tens of thousands of men, women and children who had been convicted and transported to Australia were housed in these centres. As a cultural site this is a serial nomination involving 11 convict ensembles. The penal sites are located on the fertile coastal

strip from which the aboriginal populations were chased. These sites are mainly in Sydney and in Tasmania in the South-East but also Norfolk Island and Fremantle on the West Coast.

This is the first site which is a coastal convict and labour site at Kingston and Arthursfeld on the isolated Norfolk Island. The site involves the port and the hinterland which is a natural site and there is no buffer zone. The coastal development and buildings were built by convict labour and then the neighbouring lands were farmed. This is a site which was occupied in several different stages since 1820.

Secondly, you have the Old Government House and Domain in Parramatta in New South Wales, on the outskirts of Sydney. Convicts formed the personnel for the maintenance of Government House and provided the servant roles. Here you had women's accommodation and summary accommodation for gardeners. Here you have high-parked barracks which was a transit zone and is on the outer limits of the central business district of Sydney and this is a site which was part of the Convict complex in the 19th century. Here these sites involved convict labour and labour provided for the construction of the Carney. Here you have another site in the ensemble Brickendon and Woolmers Estates, two neighbouring farm colonies on the Quarry River in the Tasmanian hinterland. Both sides were owned privately. These farms used convict labour under contract to the Government, both men and women. These are still farms but some of the out houses are in a poor state of conservation.

Another site here, Darlington Probation Station, which is at the northern point of Maria Island to the East of the Mainland of Tasmania. Originally this was populated by aboriginal peoples. Here you have a harsh convict settlement involving rehabilitation through hard labour outdoors, timber yards and limestone quarries among the work done. Here you have another penal colony in New South Wales, Old Great North Road, which was established to construct the Great North Road through rocky and rugged terrain. This is a site that is now in a national park. Here the system involved itinerant groups of teenaged convicts. Convicts, often including teenagers, housed in huts built along the road and as they were far from a prison the convicts were often chained together. Here you have another site Cascades Female Factory which is in south-eastern Tasmania on the western outskirts of the city of Hobart. The site includes three of the five original yards of the Cascades Prison. This is a site that has some 2,500 women, excuse me, some 25,000 female convicts Mr Speaker and it was seen as a model site by Great Britain aimed at demonstrating the government's determination to implement penal policies and its social and colonial programme.

Port Arthur historic site and Point Puer (?).... in Carnevan Bay on the South of the Tasman Peninsula in Tasmania. Here you have a Port, a town with numerous places of worker dockyards prison. It is the whole of the Tasman Peninsula, in fact the whole of the Tasman Peninsula that constituted a criminal convict site. This was converted to a civilian township at the end of the nineteenth century reoccupying and converting many of the buildings originally used for convict settlement. This is one of the most visited tourist sites in Australia.

Another site now the Coal Mines Historic Site also located on the Tasman Peninsula in Tasmania on Norfolk Bay. It was abandoned in the late nineteenth century. It involves traces of the original structures and the transport infrastructure. This was a site which was used to rehabilitate convicts until their eventual release into the civilian population.

The next site is Cockatoo Island Convict Site in the Sydney Harbour Area. It involves port facilities and it was later used as the Royal Navy's arsenal in Australia. This site was largely carved out of sandstone. The work of the convicts involved quarrying and dressing the stones. Also building the buildings and the quays and the heavy work involved in building these ship yards.

The final site, Fremantle Prison, which is located in western Australia, established as a free colony, but it developed very slowly and there was a shortage of labour which led to the establishment of a convict station there in 1850. It then became a high-security prison in 1867 and it served that purpose for the State of Western Australia until 1991. Since that point it has been converted into a museum and a historic site. ICOMOS considers that the integrity of these sites is unequal, but overall, acceptable. That the authenticity is satisfactory from a general perspective, that the serial approach is justified, the Outstanding Universal Value has been demonstrated and criteria (iv) and (vi) are justified. ICOMOS considers that the 11 sites are correctly delimited and the buffer zones are suitable. There are many threats to the site but there are a series of indicators that require monitoring, particularly tourist development on the sites. The legal protection of the Brickendon and Woolmers Estates sites has been the subject of a letter of factual errors to the State Party and we have contradictory information on that. We would like to see those sites listed on the National Heritage List in Australia. We believe that that has been the case since 2007 according to some of the information that we have received. There are other management systems and they are unsuitable but need to be reinforced. ICOMOS recommends that this nomination be referred to the State Party with the aim of allowing it to intervene for Brickendon and Woolmers Estates to rectify the poor conservation of the buildings on that site. Other recommendations are contained in the ICOMOS report for specific aspects of each of the sites in the nomination. Thank you very much Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The floor is open for Committee Members. First of all Estonia please.

Estonia

Thank you Chairman. Estonia is very happy about such a substantial and elaborate nomination of such an exciting site. But still we would like to ask clarification from the State Party of Australia about the current status and conditions in the Brickendon and Woolmers Estates. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia has the floor please.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chair. Australia is very happy to confirm in fact that the Brickendon and Woolmers Estates was included on Australia's National Heritage List on the 23rd of November 2007. This fact was included in our nomination and I am not sure why ICOMOS didn't actually pick that up. We have included that also in our letter of clarification to ICOMOS. So I believe that it is not an issue. The other question that was raised in relation to the scheduling of conservation works on buildings at Brickendon and Woolmers Estates. Australia notes that the management plans for these sites were included in our nomination documents and that these plans include schedules for urgent and site maintenance work on both estates. Australia takes these plans very seriously and is therefore very pleased to advise that more than 1.6 million dollars has been spent over the last 12 months in support of conservation work at these sites to address those urgent issues that were identified. These sites will also be supported with additional funding in future years and are on our Ongoing National Historic Sites Grants Programme. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Russian Federation.

Russian Federation

Thank you Mr Chairman. We would also like to know the current situation on site No. 4, but the explanation by Australia quietly satisfies us. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Allow me to give the floor to Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. The foundations of Australian society were laid on a vast social experiment. The forced emigration to the continent of Australia of some 165,000 people during almost two centuries represents the beginning of the modern age of globalization by government agencies. Transportation transformed forever the lives of these, mostly British and Irish convicts and in turn largely destroyed the way of life of Australia's indigenous people. These are the facts, they are inescapable, they are immutable, but we need to recognize them. The parallels with the Caribbean human experience compel us to the conviction that this serial nomination deserves inscription of the World Heritage List. Before us, however, we have a proposal to refer the site back to the State Party, based on apparently factual errors that crept into the evaluation of this site. Clearly, the State Party has indicated that the Brickendon and Woolmers Estates in Australia are already present on Australia's National Heritage List, and have provided significant funding in that regard to ensure the urgent conservation of these sites. But we believe is that there is no reason for us not to inscribe it this time this site and we therefore request that the Committee gives consideration to the Draft Decision that we have revised and presented for your contemplation. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Can we give the floor to the representative of China.

China

Thank you Mr Chairperson. With the new information provided by the State Party China would like to join the other distinguished Delegations to support the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. In addition, this type world heritage site is under-represented in the current World Heritage List. The inscription of the site contributes the credibility of the list. We welcome the proposal by Barbados. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I should like to call on the representative of South Africa.

South Africa

Thank you Chair. Before South Africa can make a statement we just want to verify from ICOMOS that the information given by Australia, if they can verify that and then thereafter we can make our statement.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Oui, en effet, il y a deux points qui sont à prendre en considération. Le premier est le point de vue juridique, il y a eu confirmation par l'Etat partie

qui nous a fourni le document officiel, c'est une erreur factuelle, nous la prenons donc totalement en compte. En ce qui concerne le programme de conservation de Brickendon, nous voulions attirer l'attention du Comité parce qu'il y a un très gros décalage dans l'Etat de conservation au moment où nous avons examiné le dossier, entre ce bien précis et les dix autres. Les informations fournies sont parvenues après le 28 Février. Nous n'avons donc pas eu la possibilité de les examiner. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. May I call on France.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous avons déjà eu par les autres réponses aux questions fournies toutes les informations que nous souhaitons, mais je voudrais souligner qu'il s'agit d'un bien en série et donc, aussi bien l'authenticité, la VUE, que l'Etat de conservation s'apprécie globalement, et même si un des biens peut avoir un état un peu moins bon que les autres c'est une appréciation globale qu'il faut avoir sur l'ensemble du bien et pour nous il apparait que l'ensemble du bien a un état suffisant pour mériter son inscription. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. May I call on the representative of Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Si j'ai bien compris et d'après l'examen de dossier, je pense que le plus important c'est l'état de conservation du site et là en fait je n'ai pas eu beaucoup d'information sur les progrès réalisés depuis le dépôt de dossier, et aujourd'hui, lors de l'examen du dossier. Et le représentant de l'Etat partie a mentionné en fait qu'il y a eu déjà 1,6 million d'investissements dans la conservation. Et en fait est-ce-qu'il y a une estimation sur le projet et le coût total ? ce qui est en fait nécessaire pour avoir une restauration de manière un peu plus effective sur le site ? Surtout qu'en fait un site qui représente l'histoire de deux siècles et s'étend sur plus de 11 spots, 11 localités. Ça c'est une chose. Deuxième point, est-ce-qu'il y a un programme, en ce qui concerne, et là je profite, parce que ce fait s'intègre dans l'objectif de notre Convention de 1970 qui tient compte que les statuts et les développements par rapport aux peuples authentiques. J'ai pas tout à fait aussi entendu de la part des Etats parties s'il y a des programmes qu'ils ont inclus dans le projet de restauration globale. Je vous remercie et je voudrais avoir plus d'informations et de confirmations aussi ne même temps de la part d'ICOMOS. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Let me give the floor to the State Party for the necessary clarifications. Please sir.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chair. If I understand the question, it was whether there was any funding as part of this programme, as part of this nomination for the indigenous people. Not as part of this because they are not. It is not part of this particular nomination. But I would note that Australia has four other sites that are included on the World Heritage List explicitly for the indigenous heritage values.

I believe there is also a question about the spending on Brickendon and Woolmers Estates. As I said the Australian Government has provided 1.6 million dollars over the last 12 months to do the most urgent of the work. I do not have a detailed list of exactly what all of those works were, but in terms of what is that of the total works, as with all historic sites I suspect is you can never spend enough. There is always more to spend, but the \$1.6 million is going to the most urgent works and we have an ongoing funding programme of a bit over \$4 million a year, which is available to support works at that site and other sites. So we will spend what is necessary to make sure that these sites are conserved.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. May I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Sweden

Thank you sir. Sweden supports the views of Barbados and China and others. And we join the decision to inscribe this site on the World Heritage Site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. May I call on the representative of Nigeria.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. We would also like to join the State Party of Barbados who has called for the inscription of this site. We have noticed that the many issues raised by the Advisory Body relate to the issue of legal framework and conservation of some of the important features of the site. And these have been adequately addressed by the State Party and this has been confirmed by the Advisory Body that there has been a factual error regarding the legal framework. However, we notice that there are two other issues that I think are very critical to the inscription of this site. They relate to issue of management and monitoring. We notice that in the report of the Advisory Body we have raised the issue of visitor facilities and the issue of other projects that might impact on the values of the site and an issue of monetary indicators and their frequency. We would like to ask the State Party, even though we agree to the issue of inscription, how they intend to address these two very vital issues of monitoring and management. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Before giving the floor to the State Party, let me tell you that it seems that there is a consensus and may I now call on the State Party please. State Party you have the floor

Australia

Thank you chair. The Australian Government will be working with the site managers of each of the Australian Convict Sites in order to compile and present monitoring indicators as recommended by ICOMOS. These indicators and their frequency of applications will be incorporated into management plans as part of an ongoing review of those plans which is required under Australian legislation to occur every five years. General indicators will also be developed to monitor the Australian Convict Sites as a whole. So, I hope this answers the question in relation to monitoring in relation to, I think there was a question about tourism facilities or something like that. We have individual management plans which apply to each of the sites. Those specify what is appropriate and what is not. We will ensure that all of those plans are fully implemented.

The Chairperson

I would like to ask the Committee whether you feel that you are ready to give the floor to the Rapporteur in order to submit this nomination formally. You are ready for this. Fine, Madam Rapporteur please. Over to you.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. You find the original Draft Decision on page 16 of the English and page 17 of the French version of document 8B and I have received one written amendment by the Delegation of Barbados. The proposal of the written amendment is to retain paragraph 1 as is, to delete the entire paragraph 2, including small subparagraph small (a) and to replace paragraph 2 by the following text: "Welcoming the additional information provided by the State Party". Then the Delegation of Barbados suggests the introduction of a new paragraph 2bis which would then read: "Inscribes the nomination of the Australian Convict Sites, Australia on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi)". Following this paragraph the statement of Outstanding Universal Value would need to be inserted as a new paragraph and then most likely the existing paragraph 3 would become paragraph 5 but remain unchanged with all its subparagraphs from (a) to (j) inclusive. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Are there any comments from any of the Delegations present? Do we all agree? Do you feel we are in a position to adopt the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 16** as presented to us. Thank you very much. (Applause).

Congratulations to Australia on this and you have the floor.

Australia

On behalf of the Australian Government and the State Inter-Territory Governments of Tasmania, New South Wales, Western Australia and Norfolk Island I would like to thank the World Heritage Committee for bestowing this exceptional honour on Australia. We are delighted that the Committee has decided that this essential element of our national story is also of outstanding universal value to all humankind. As a result of the vivid illustration, these 11 sites provided the forced migration of large numbers of convicts, literally to the other side of the world and the tangible evidence they present of developments in global ideas and practices related to the punishment and reform of criminals. Inscription of this serial nomination is the culmination of a huge amount of research, discussion, assessment and planning. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved, including the State Governments, place managers and local communities for their exceptional work and I know they will be very proud and thrilled to hear of the Committee's decision today. Inclusion of these 11 sites on the World Heritage List provides sufficient recognition that these sites are among the world's most special places and more importantly, a part of the inheritance of all humankind for which Australia and the local communities now take on a special responsibility. This is a responsibility that Australia takes very seriously. We know that inscription is only the beginning and I can assure you that we are committed to the ongoing implementation of effective management arrangements that will ensure that these sites are protected and conserved for the benefit of current and future generations of all humankind. Thank you again Chair.

The Chairperson

So congratulations from here and we congratulate the Australian Delegation. Now before we move on to the next item could I just do with a very important issue. We hope that the Committee will show its understanding to The Chairperson and the Secretariat. We are going to have to work tomorrow. If we want to finish our work we going to have to work

tomorrow, Sunday. The Secretariat proposes that we observe a normal working day from 10 until one o'clock and from 3 until 6 p.m. We have done our calculations and it is the only way that the Committee is going to be able to truly finish its work. Is there anyone against this proposal? Now, of course, those of you who are not members of the Committee are perfectly free to go on the excursions. But the Members of the Committee will have to stay and work through their Sunday tomorrow for the greater benefit of World Heritage and I am sure that all of you will understand how important our work is and will therefore be able to understand and accept that modification into our working programme.

Alright we are going to begin our work now, we are going to begin the next site. I apologize there was a slight mistake in the order. What we are actually looking at is **Jantar Mantar, Jaipur, India**. So I give the floor now to ICOMOS to present it.

ICOMOS

Le Jantar Mantar de Jaipur est un site d'observation astronomique construit au début du 18^e siècle. Il comprend un ensemble d'une vingtaine d'instruments fixes monumentaux. En termes de catégorie de bien culturel, il s'agit d'un ensemble. L'observatoire est situé dans le centre historique de la ville de Jaipur dans l'Etat du Rajasthan. La création de l'Observatoire du Jantar Mantar accompagna le projet de la nouvelle capitale du Maharajah Jai Singh II. A la fin des années 1720 la zone tampon a été élargie à la demande de l'ICOMOS, elle comprend l'ancien palais royal, city palace et le palais Hawa Mahal. Les 19 instruments principaux répertoriés, ou groupes d'instruments monumentaux principaux sont construits en pleine air. Disposés au sein d'un enclos, ils sont généralement de grande taille, ils sont destinés à des observations de position à l'œil nu. Ils comportent plusieurs innovations architecturales et instrumentales. Le Brihat Samrat Yantra est un cadran solaire au sol disposant d'un Knemon en forme de mur méridien triangulaire d'une hauteur totale de 22 mètres 6. Il est complété par deux quart de cercles latéraux verticaux, de plus de 15 mètres de rayon. C'est vraisemblablement le plus grand dispositif de ce type jamais construit au monde. Il permet de mesurer l'heure astronomique locale avec une précision de 2 secondes. Cet ensemble scientifique monumental exprime les compétences astronomiques et les conceptions cosmologiques acquises dans l'entourage d'un prince savant à la fin de l'époque Moghole. C'est l'observatoire le plus significatif, le plus complet et le mieux conservé des observatoires anciens de l'Inde.

L'ensemble du Jantar Mantar de Jaipur reproduit de nombreux instruments déjà existants dans les cultures arabo-musulmanes, perses et occidentales. Grands cadrans solaires, cercles ou sections de cercles, astrolabe etc. en leur donnant ici de très grandes dimensions à fin de rendre maximale leur performance. Le Maharajah mobilise en permanence une vingtaine d'astronomes pour effectuer une observation systématique du ciel et les calculs associés. L'observatoire a principalement été utilisé au 18^e siècle. Sur un plan scientifique c'est un programme d'astronomie de position dans le cadre de la cosmologie ptoléméenne et de ces développements arabo-musulmans. Il comprend le suivi des astres et la mise à jour des anciennes tables de zij, la prévision des éclipses et des événements célestes, l'établissement et le contrôle du local, heure du Rajasthan, et l'établissement du calendrier. Rashivalaya Yantra est un ensemble de 12 instruments monumentaux dont nous voyons ici un exemple, dédié chacun à l'étude des coordonnées équatoriales des objets célestes dans l'une des constellations du zodiaque. La prévision scientifique est étendue à la prévision des événements collectifs et aux pratiques astrologiques individuelles de la population. Les maçonneries sont revêtues d'enduits, la situation de plein air a nécessité un entretien important des instruments au 18^e siècle, puis des restaurations notables à partir de la fin du 19^e siècle lorsque l'intérêt scientifique et monumental de Jantar Mantar a été redécouvert. Ces programmes de restauration ont été poursuivis dans les années 2000. Certaines évolutions sont constatées, comme le remplacement des graduations initiales par de nouvelles sur des plaques de marbre. La clôture actuelle est une interprétation architecturale récente. En termes d'authenticité et d'intégrité, l'ICOMOS recommande un bilan des aspects

environnementaux et paysagers du bien et une évaluation des altérations scientifiques éventuelles apportées par les restaurations aux graduations. Sinon cette intégrité et cette authenticité sont satisfaisantes. L'ICOMOS considère les critères (ii) et (vi) n'ont pas été totalement justifiés et que les arguments avancés comme les attributs du bien répondent plutôt au critère (iii) d'une tradition culturelle. Il conviendrait de reconnaître ce critère (iii). Par ailleurs le critère (iv) a été justifié, la VUE a été démontrée. Les principales menaces sont le contrôle du développement touristique, et le développement urbain dans l'environnement proche du bien. Il convient de préciser les mesures de protection s'appliquant à la zone tampon. L'instance transversale de gestion est à instaurer et le plan de gestion doit être promulgué. L'ICOMOS recommande que la proposition d'inscription du Jantar Mantar, Jaipur, Inde soit renvoyée à l'État partie afin de lui permettre de promulguer et appliquer sans délais le plan de gestion, mettre en place une autorité transversale de la gestion concernée du bien et de sa zone tampon, fournir des informations sur les décisions qui seront prises dans les prochains plans directeurs de la ville de Jaipur concernant le bien et sa zone tampon, ainsi que sur les projets de requalification, quartier est de la zone tampon. L'ICOMOS propose également une série de recommandations complémentaires à caractère technique. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much ICOMOS. Brazil you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. We would like to thank ICOMOS for this report and for its assessment and its comments and we welcome those comments. We have read and listened to all of this in great detail and we would like to recap some of our feelings. Now there is a comparative analysis that justifies the inclusion of this property on the World Heritage List. Secondly, the authenticity and integrity of the site have been confirmed. Thirdly criteria (ii) and (iv) are also met. Fourthly, the boundaries of the property are adequately defined. There is legal protection that is currently in force. Sixthly, the state of conservation of the property is satisfactory. Seventh, the management system is adequate. Eight, monitoring is satisfactory. Given all of this Mr Chairman, the Brazilian Delegation is convinced that this property satisfies all of the requirements for inclusion on the World Heritage List. The ICOMOS report recommends referral for three purposes. First of all that a management plan be adopted and implemented. Secondly, that a coordination authority be set up and thirdly information be provided with regard to the master plan for the city of Jaipur. We feel that these requirements are essential. However, we don't believe that this should prevent the listing of the property on the World Heritage List. For all of these reasons the Delegation of Brazil would like, through The Chairperson, to ask for the State Party to provide some additional clarifications with regard to the measures implemented to cover the three requests included in the Draft Decision proposed. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor now to the State Party, India, to give the clarifications that Brazil is calling for. Thank you.

India

We thank you for this opportunity to speak. As ICOMOS has noted already we would like to remind the Committee that ICOMOS recognizes the Outstanding Universal Value of the Janta Mantara Astronomical Observatory in Jaipur. In relation to three points mentioned in the draft document, we had submitted required information to the World Heritage Centre on June 22nd and July 16th 2010 which we would like to summarize briefly.

As for point (a) that is promulgate the plan without delay and apply it and implement a programme of conservation works. In this context we have formally adopted the management plan for Jantar Mantar, Jaipur, under the Department of Urban Development, Local Self Governance And Housing Rajasthan. The programme of conservation works is being implemented as per the management plan.

As for point (b) that is set up as part of the management plan and overarching authority for the property in order to facilitate coordinated management of property and its buffer zone. Our response is the Government of Rajasthan has a sign – an overarching management authority for the implementation of the management plan. This is our main development and management authority. An existing body, with an established history of undertaking and managing conservation projects in Rajasthan.

For point (c), that is, provide information about the decisions to be taken up in the upcoming master plan of the city of Jaipur. Our response is that the Government of Rajasthan has included the property and its buffer zone as a special heritage zone in the Jaipur Master Plan 2025. In July 2010, the property, its buffer zone and its management plan are included as essential parts of any development plan for the area. Thank you sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Ethiopia.

Ethiopia

Thank you Mr Chairman. As mentioned by the State Party we note that (a) the management plan for the property is in place, (b) an overarching management authority is in place and (c) the condition to include it in the master plan of the city is subscribed. So hence, we propose the inscription of Janta Manthra, Jaipur. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to South Africa now.

South Africa

Thank you Chair. South Africa wishes to congratulate the State Party on the nomination of the significant astronomical observation site built in the early eighteenth century as a World Heritage Site. South Africa believes that this nomination would add credibility as part of the strategy to develop a more representation to the World Heritage List once it has been inscribed. And based on the information also that has been submitted by the State Party, South Africa supports inscription on criteria (iii) and (iv). This is a clear cut case Mr Chairperson and I hope and believe that we are not going to spend more time on it in order to save time.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor now to Jordan.

Jordan

Thank you Mr Chair. We would like to congratulate the ICOMOS and the State Party and we would like to propose inscription of the nomination of Jaipur. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. France I give you the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais à mon tour remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport d'évaluation qui nous a été présenté. Cet observatoire est tout à fait exemplaire des types d'observation à l'œil nu. Il est du point de vue de la Délégation française tout à fait exceptionnel. L'analyse comparative est très détaillée et elle montre qu'il est véritablement de VUE et cela a d'ailleurs bien été reconnu par le rapport de l'ICOMOS. L'ICOMOS a demandé le renvoi pour des problèmes de gestion ; nous avons écouté avec beaucoup d'attention les informations fournies par l'Etat partie et elles sont tout à fait de nature à nous rassurer. Nous sommes donc favorables à une inscription dès cette session sur la liste du patrimoine mondial et je me permets de suggérer Monsieur le Président, puisque je n'ai pas entendu de voix discordantes, que nous puissions peut être passer aussi rapidement que possible à l'examen du projet de décision dans le sens de l'inscription. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

There is a second State Party that is proposing that we should move immediately to the Rapporteur. I see no objections to the immediate presentation of the Draft Decision. Rapporteur you have the floor.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson the Draft Decision is on page 17 of the English version and page 18 of the French version of document 8B. I have not received any written amendments, however I have understood from at least two State Parties that they would like to amend the Draft Decision to avoid an inscription. I see France nodding so I have considered this the amendment of France and according to this paragraph 1 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 2 - the chapeau paragraph would be separated from the subparagraphs and would be replaced by a new paragraph 2 which would read: "Inscribes the Jantar Mantar Jaipur, India on the World Heritage List under criteria (and here I would need guidance from France if they want to retain all three criteria proposed by the State Party) 2, 4 and 6". Then a new paragraph would be inserted, paragraph 3: "Adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Value" and as in all the other cases we will distribute the statement to you for adoption at the end of the discussion under item 8B. Then we would create a new umbrella paragraph, paragraph 4, which would read: "Requests the State Party to" and then following the former subparagraphs of paragraph 2 small (a), small (b) and small (c) and paragraph 3 according to my understanding would remain unchanged. Thank you very much Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Are there any comments? ICOMOS recommended criteria (iii) and (iv).

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I have revised paragraph 2 as amended by France which would read: "Inscribes the Jantar Mantar Jaipur, India, on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (iv)." Thank you.

The Chairperson

Are the members of the Committee happy with the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 17** as presented by the Rapporteur. It is approved. Thank you. (Applause)

And, so I give the floor to the State Party.

India

We thank The Chairperson, Secretariat, Advisory Bodies and each and every Committee member for supporting this inscription. We are extremely happy that now the world joins us in celebrating this contribution of India's 18th century astronomical knowledge. India as the State Party gives its commitment to cherish and protect the Outstanding Universal Value of Jantar Mantar, Jaipur. Thank you once again. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Congratulations to the State Party, India, and thanks the Delegation.

We are now going to move on to the next site and I give the floor to ICOMOS to present **Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble in Ardabil in the Islamic Republic of Iran** and please if you would like to congratulate India be rapid and discreet so that we can continue with our work.

ICOMOS

The nominated property consists of a rare assemblage of medieval Islamic architecture, spanning from the early 14th to the 18th century. In terms of categories, this is a group of buildings. The Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble lies in the centre of Ardabil, in Northern Iran. The shrine originally was built by Sheikh Safi al-Din as a Khānegāh that is a place where his followers could gather to live and study. The use of the space has been here maximized so that in a relatively small area several functions are contained and the property includes different buildings like bazaars, public baths, religious facilities, houses and offices. The ensemble worked initially as a small self-contained and self-sufficient city. Under the Safavid Dynasty the Khānegāh acquired political and national importance as the shrine of the founder of the dynasty and it was enriched with several works of art expressing the Sufi spirituality. Sheikh Safi al-Din Shrine also known as Allah Allah Dome is a cylindrical structure covered by a crescent shape double shell dome ornate with elaborate inscription. Shah Ismail Shrine is a square room covered by a double shell brick dome decorated externally with coloured tiles and internally with delicate temperers. The Shāhnishin is an alcove which is part of a wider and more complex structure. The Dār al Huffāz or Qandil Khānā – This is a rectangular covered space where verses of the Koran were memorized by the faithful. The Chini khānā is the Khānegāh properly and there is a square-shaped structure at the floor level which is covered with a double shell dome and is richly decorated in its interior. It also houses a very precious collection of chinaware. The Sāhat or courtyard has at its centre a poly lobe pool symbolizing the 12 Imams of the Shiite faith. The Dār al-Hadith was a place for religious instruction as well as the reception of the guests. The courtyard still houses a fountain in the middle for the ablution of the faithful and the Shahedgah was a burial place for the Sheikh's disciples. All these structures were connected by a path articulated in seven steps to reach the Sufi al-Din Sheikh Shrine which is the core of the shrine itself, symbolizing the seven stages of Sufi mysticism. They were separated by eight gates representing the eight attitudes of Sufism. Integrity and authenticity have been met. Also thanks to the additional information that the State Party has provided upon the request of ICOMOS three of the four proposed criteria have been justified, while criterion (vi) has not been provided with arguments that demonstrate the universal relevance of the property for associative reasons. Attributes conveying the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property of the special layout of the shrine, all the structures included in the protection ensemble, the entire range of decorative elements of the buildings, the seven step path through the eight gates of the shrine.

The main threats to the property derived from the environmental conditions affecting the condition of the coloured tiles and from the visitors who are affecting the agromatic parameters and the internal paintings. Conservation approaches are adequate but several

issues that require long-term reasons to be tackled with need to be continually addressed. The protection is adequate as well as the management system. They both integrate the measures established through legal and planning provisions. Daily management is ensured by the Iranian Cultural Heritage and the Craft Tourism Organization Base that has been established for Sheikh Ensemble Protected Monument and the Multidisciplinary Steering Committee identifies priorities and goals. ICOMOS considers that the nominated property exhibits an exceptional architectural and artistic quality and originality in responding to both spiritual and functional needs. And therefore, recommends inscription on the basis of criterion (i), (ii) and (iv). ICOMOS has also made a number of recommendations and for details please see page 131 of the evaluation volume provided by ICOMOS. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

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

Iraq

Thank you ICOMOS for the report. Considering the importance of the property as an example of the medieval Islamic architecture from the time range from the 16th to 18th century and following that ICOMOS considers that Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble in Ardabil exhibits both the exceptional architecture and artistic equality and originality in combining both spiritual and financial needs and for recognizing of the OUV. So we support the ICOMOS decision to inscribe the site in the World Heritage List. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Well, taking into account that ICOMOS recommends that listing on the World Heritage List I would like to know if there are any Delegations who are opposed to listing. If not, we will save some time by moving directly to the Draft Decision. If everybody agrees with ICOMOS's evaluation we will do that.

Rapporteur

Page 17 of the English and page 18 of the French version and I have not received any amendments. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I am asking the Committee can we now move to a vote? Can we approve the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.18** ? All right it is approved. (Applause) The Chairperson would like to add its congratulations. We congratulate the State Party Iran and we now give the State Party the floor.

Iran

Thank you Mr Chairman, distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee, ladies and gentlemen. Let me first, on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the people of Ardabil who are now enthusiastically waiting to receive the news of the inscription of Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble in the World Heritage List and indeed the entire Delegation of my country to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee thank the distinguished members of the Committee, the Director and the staff of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for the inscription of this very important historic ensemble in the prestigious World Heritage List. The Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble in Ardabil in Ardabil comprising of nearly 30 different parts was originally built as a microcosmic city of bazaars, public baths and squares, religious facilities, houses and offices. It was the largest hanavar (?) for a spiritual retreat in Iran during the reign of Safavid rulers. This ensemble was of special political and national significance as the most prominent

shrine of the founder of the dynasty. It evolved into an exceptional sacred work of architecture and art from the 14th to 18th centuries and a centre for religious pilgrimage and ritual. The Sheikh Safi al-Din Khānegāh and Shrine Ensemble is of the utmost significance as an artistic and architectural masterpiece and also an exceptional demonstration of the fundamental principles of Islam. Mr Chairman, I would like to reiterate the commitment of the Iranian Government and indeed the Iranian people to the protection of the World Heritage Site in Iran and hope that soon there will be occasion for all of you to visit Iran and this very significant historic site. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and we will now go on to the next property the **Tabriz Historic Bazaar Complex also in the Islamic Republic of Iran**. I give the floor to ICOMOS who will present the details of the Tabriz Bazaar.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The nominated property consists of three elements. The extant continuous core of the Grand Bazaar, the Goh Machid and the surviving parts of three small bazaars which were once connecting the Mosque with the Grand Bazaar and the *Sorkhāb Bāzārchasī*. I hope I have not made a mistake with the pronunciation. It is one of the oldest in Tabriz. It is the fourth serial nomination of three groups of buildings.

Tabriz is located in Northern Iran in the province of East Azerbaijan along former important trading routes which explains the long lasting central role that has been played by Tabriz in the region. The nominated property here you can see it highlighted in colour and the buffer zone is delimited by a blue line. There is an additional landscape zone for protection that is provided by the Iranian legislation which is not illustrated here.

Tabriz has a long history. The peak of its economic and social life spanning from the 14th to the end of the 17th century. Travellers, such as Marco Polo and Ibn Battuta, accounted its richness and importance as the trading centre in the known world. To function, the bazaar made use of a variety of spaces and was based on a highly structured social and professional system. The totality of these elements, together with the functions they performed, and the professional organizations that are working in the bazaar, has made the nominated property into a very special form of environment.

Saras khan are large complexes with the court surrounded by one or two storied buildings for storing goods and lodging people. Timches have similar functions as Saras but without accommodation facilities. Rastes (I'm just checking if the pictures are there, the right ones) are the basic elements of the Bazaar. A double row of shops aligned along a rough and covered linear path. Dalans are covered alleys connecting to rastes on the interior and exterior of the buildings. Bāzārchās, (sorry I have passed the arches) which is an important element because they are inter-sectioned between two perpendicular rastas. Here you have one of the images. Excuse me for the mistake. The land area covered alleys connecting to rastas as I said before bāzārchās are small bazaars usually serving a neighbourhood. Often they were built near entrance gates and connected peripheral spaces with main bazaars. There are also other buildings and functions performed in the area like religious functions performed by mosques, here we have two examples, schools, religious schools and libraries, as well as mausoleums and gymnasiums. The comparative analysis justifies consideration of the serial nomination property for inscription in the World Heritage List. Condition for integrity and authenticity have been met although there is a tendency to over restore the buildings that need to be addressed. The relevant attributes of the property are the layout of the Bazaar with its network of structures and the rhythm of covered and uncovered spaces. The religious, educational and cultural buildings integrated into the Bazaar, the bridge structures of the building and their intricate lines, the social and professional organization that sustained the functioning of the bazaar.

The proposed boundaries of the nominated property and the buffer zones are adequate. Major threats to the nominated property are the seismic activity and not appropriate maintenance and upgrading intervention to the commercial buildings. Protection of the cultural heritage is adequate and is granted through an interrelated system of legal provision and planning instruments. Inventories and technical and structural documentation needs to be continued due to the threats provided by the seismic activity of the area. The state of conservation of the property is adequate but some maintenance programmes need to be implemented. The management framework overall is adequate and is based on the integration of protected measures, existing planning instruments, a SWOT analysis that is being provided by the State Party, as well as priority goals. The nomination dossier illustrates, in an extensive and detailed manner, the physical structure as well as the functioning of the Tabriz Bazaar and its significance over the centuries as a trading centre along one of the several itineraries of the West-East route. ICOMOS therefore recommends inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). There are a number of recommendations that are being made by ICOMOS and you can find them on page 141 and page 143 of the ICOMOS evaluation volume. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Since this case is similar to the previous one and ICOMOS recommends inscription on the list I would ask if there is anyone who is against it. Otherwise we will ask the Rapporteur to present the Draft Decision. Since there is no opposition I will give the floor directly to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 19 in the English version and on page 20 of the French version of document 8B and I have not received any draft amendments.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I turn to the Committee. Are we in a position to approve the **Draft Decision 35 COM 8B. 19** presented by the Rapporteur? Approved. (Applause)

Congratulations to the representative of Iran and I give the State Party the floor to comment on their approval.

Iran

Mr Chairman, distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee, I am indeed privileged to have the opportunity of addressing this very important gathering for the second time. Let me then, once again, on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Iran and indeed, the people of Tabriz, who so devotedly followed the case of the Bazaar and its nomination to the World Heritage List and indeed, so willingly are waiting to receive the good news of inscription in the World Heritage List. I thank the distinguished members of the Committee, again the Director and the staff of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their role and cooperation for the inscription of this very significant cultural property in the prestigious World Heritage List. Indeed, the Tabriz Historic Bazaar complex, consisting of a series of interconnected covered brick structures, buildings and enclosed spaces for different functions is among the most significant example of its kind, still in function and used by the people and the merchants. The closely interlinked social and professional organization of the Bazaar with the architectural fabric allows its functioning and makes it into a single integrated entity. Although fortunately there are still a number of historic bazaars remaining in fact in Iran, such as the ones in Isfahan, Kashan, Teheran and Yaz, but the Bazaar in Tabriz can still be singled out even within this collection of valuable cultural assets. We are sure that the Iranian people and in particular, Tabrizees, would be immensely happy and proud of this

inscription and will do everything they can in order to help in protecting this newly declared World Heritage property. Thank you. (Applause).

The Chairperson

Congratulations to the people of Iran and to their delegates here present. Shall we move on very quickly to the next property, the **Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site in the Marshall Islands** and I give the floor to ICOMOS. Could you please give us a detailed presentation.

ICOMOS

Thank you very much. In 1946 as the Cold War began the United States of America recommenced nuclear tests and to do so chose the Atoll of Bikini in the Marshall Islands in the Pacific Ocean. Sixty-seven nuclear blasts were conducted on the Marshall Islands between 1946 to 1958. They had major physical, human and social consequences.

This is a site under cultural property. Bikini Atoll is in the north western part of the Marshall Islands archipelago in the north western part of the Pacific Ocean. It is made up of a group of islands and they are all linked together partially by a long annular coral reef. The buffer zone is a five-mile nautical mile line. At the time of the Second World War the Bikini Atoll was inhabited by just over a 1,000 people. They had a Micronesian lifestyle based on fisheries and agriculture. The Marshall region was indeed a strategic area during the war in the Pacific when the Cold War started between the two major military blocks. The American army considered recommencing nuclear tests. Bikini was chosen because it was an isolated area and the inhabitants were displaced in March 1946 and moved to the neighbouring atoll of Rongelap and so the equipment for blasting and observation was then positioned on the island.

Less than a year after Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed two nuclear tests were conducted, in July 1946, in the Bikini Lagoon. The first blast was aerial. It was a simulation of an attack on a fleet in war order. There were 20 odd ships, some of them were Japanese and some American. They had survived the Pacific War. There was the Saratoga aircraft carrier and several submarines. The second blast was underwater. However, not all the ships were sunk by the first bomb and so were able to see the impact of nuclear blasts and the medical impact on persons and effective radionuclides. Today, a major part of the vestiges in Bikini are made up of some fleet. Some fuel is still on the vessels and the Saratoga aircrafts still have their bombs that were not detonated. Now, in 1952, the very first Hydrogen bomb test was conducted on the theme nuclear fusion bomb. This was done on the Bikini Atoll. Unimaginable levels were reached. We are looking at more than 10 megatonnes of TNT. The Bravo blast that was conducted in 1954 was the strongest so far. It was not properly conducted and several islands were destroyed. It led to a two kilometer wide and 18 metre deep crater. Japanese fishermen and all the inhabitants of the atolls suffered from irradiation. The international community was deeply moved and this led to the end of American nuclear tests in 1958.

The radionuclides left behind after the blasts have a short lifespan and so in the 1970s new agricultural enterprises were commenced. However, these did not succeed because of the radioactivity. Bikini was once again evacuated. The maritime environment demonstrates a reconstitution of the biological and geophysical balance, the coral reefs, for instance, and there is a lot of diversity among the species in the lagoons. In the 1990s, efforts were made to develop tourism. ICOMOS believes that the property proposed for inscription meets the conditions of integrity and authenticity and it meets criteria (iv) and (vi) and thus OUV has been clearly demonstrated.

The meteor threats the property faces are due to climate change. This is a coral atoll, but and I said this earlier, I want to emphasize that there are still stocks of bombs in the

vessels, in the ships that have been sunk. You must remember that these fleets were being used for war. Furthermore, there are illegal metal extraction activities. We must also protect the vestiges on land. The concept of conservation is a peculiar one here because what we are looking at is a slow return to previously existing natural balance subsequent to a very violent attack on nature by human beings.

The management system is satisfactory, but it needs to be further developed and strengthened in specific areas. The whole issue of hosting the visitors, interpretation, the peace museum and the documentation centre. Documents are extremely important in demonstrating the value of this property. ICOMOS proposes that the nomination of Bikini Atoll be referred to the State Party so that the State Party can conduct a new victory and provide proper protection for the land-based property, which is a part and parcel of the property as a whole. ICOMOS has formulated specific recommendations. It has also received a letter and factual errors have been taken into account. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much ICOMOS and I give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Australia

Thank you very much to the Advisory Bodies for an excellent report and for the excellent nomination by the State Party. Clearly Bikini is an iconic location, very well known for both the events for the subject of this nomination, but also for other references as well. It is clearly a place that has, in the terms of this Committee, Outstanding Universal Value. And it is pleased to see that the nomination document outlines that there is exceptionally good governance support from the Marshall Islands to support that. Mr Chairman, we note that in the evaluation by ICOMOS there is only one reason that is given why this property should be referred and that is that there is a suggestion that the State Party should draw up an inventory of land-based properties. Through you Mr Chairman, we would like to put a question to the State Party of whether or not they have had the opportunity to do that inventory and thus to satisfy the only condition that was outstanding in between them and actually inscription upon the list. And finally, Mr Chairman, in closing I should have no doubt that Australia should declare an interest in this property having had the opportunity, the very fortunate opportunity, to provide support to the Government of the Marshall Islands. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will give the floor to the State Party.

Marshall Island

Mr Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee and thank you to Australia for the question. Mr Chairman, the Government of the Marshall Islands is very pleased that ICOMOS recognizes the Outstanding Universal Value of Bikini Atoll. We welcome the recommendation from ICOMOS to draw up an inventory of the land-based artefacts from the nuclear testing on Bikini Atoll and to ensure that they are monitored and protected adequately. To this end, we have made significant progress on these issues already. A professional preliminary survey of the land-based artefacts has been conducted. We have commenced a formal process of listing these properties on the national historical register and expect this to proceed rapidly. Finally, the approach to monitoring has been extended to also include land-based parts. We are a small Pacific Island country and due to the remoteness of Bikini Atoll, the difficulties of transport to the site and of access to appropriate expert, may take some time to complete the land-based inventory and the monitoring arrangement. In the meantime, however, the remoteness and the control access are already in place which means that there is no immediate threat to these artefacts. This

will be the first resort site for the Marshall Islands and an important culture site for the Pacific Islands. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you very much for having outlined and asked the question that is the only impediment to the inscription of this site. I don't see that anyone who has examined the dossier and who has examined their memory of human history could have any doubts as to the relevance and importance of our work in recognizing both the destruction of a culture and the resilience of human spirit and I believe it is the duty of the Committee to inscribe this site tonight. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Egypt has the floor.

Egypt

Merci monsieur le Président. En fait l'Égypte rejoint l'Australie et Barbade pour remercier l'ICOMOS pour le rapport. Néanmoins nous avons quelques questions. Nous avons en fait un doute sur le critère (iv) en ce qui concerne la VUE. En fait, si j'ai bien compris, l'ICOMOS a seulement en fait basé sur l'ensemble technologique et pour l'Égypte je ne crois pas que l'ensemble technologique rempli bien le critère (iv). Je comprends tout à fait ce qui concerne le critère (vi) pour le bien. Deuxième point sur l'intégrité. Je pense que, et là en fait je m'adresse à travers vous à l'ICOMOS, à apporter un peu plus d'informations en ce qui concerne l'intégrité du site. Nous voyons aussi que les conditions, avec une réserve de, après la recommandation, le commentaire de l'ICOMOS, et je reviendrai sur ce point, sur quelles valeurs, sur quelle base, ils ont accordé l'intégrité du dossier. Je vois que le site, l'ICOMOS appui sur les richesses de faune et moi je pose la question pourquoi l'IUCN n'était pas impliqué pour proposer un site mixte. Il y a d'autres points que moi j'aimerais bien attirer l'attention de la part des membres du comité. C'est un site qui a présenté un champ d'essais nucléaires, et je n'ai pas vu que le dossier n'a contenu aucune étude sur l'impact de la radiation. Parce que l'inscription si j'ai bien compris et d'après l'ICOMOS a eu une certaine influence limitée du tourisme, l'inscription ça va vraiment augmenter ce paramètre, et là l'inscription nécessite que ce dossier contienne une étude d'impact sur les êtres humains avant que soit une évaluation au niveau de pollution par rapport aux faunes. Et voilà le commentaire que je voulais apporter. Donc l'Égypte propose la modification du projet de décision dans le sens de différer et non refer. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Merci monsieur le Président. Alors en ce qui concerne l'intégrité, puis je reviendrai aux critères après, il y a une somme d'éléments à prendre en compte. Les éléments physiques des bateaux coulés, c'est-à-dire un patrimoine subaquatique, qui est une flotte complète de plusieurs dizaines de navires de premier rang et de l'ordre de centaines de bateaux secondaires. C'est un ensemble complètement unique, un témoignage tout à fait unique. Deuxième éléments, les éléments terrestres sur lesquels l'ICOMOS a insisté et qui sont tous les éléments construits pour gérer l'explosion nucléaire et son contrôle, et qui sont

évidemment dégradés par le temps, mais qui sont tous présents et dont les significations sont pleinement lisibles. Troisième élément c'est l'impact physique sur l'île, c'est un impact que l'on peut qualifier de paysage culturel puisque deux îlots et une partie d'un autre ont été détruits, laissant un trou artificiel, une baie artificielle liée à l'explosion nucléaire elle-même, c'est un témoignage tout à fait unique. Donc les phénomènes physiques, les attributs, les éléments constitutifs de l'intégrité sont bien présents et sont tout à fait représentatifs d'un site de tests nucléaires. Il n'y a donc pas d'ambiguïtés pour l'ICOMOS, il y a peut-être des problèmes de conservation très spécifiques pour ce lieu, mais c'est un peu une autre question. En ce qui concerne le critère (iv), offrir un exemple éminent d'un type de construction ou d'ensemble architectural ou technologique ou de paysage illustrant une période ou des périodes significatives de l'histoire humaine. Nous sommes bien dans une période significative de l'histoire humaine, c'est le début de l'équilibre la terreur qui marque toute la deuxième moitié du XXe siècle à l'échelle mondiale. Et nous avons là un ensemble matériel qui illustre effectivement ce type à la fois de technologie militaire par leurs effets, par leur présence, mais aussi une période tout à fait significative de l'histoire humaine par ce paysage relativement unique. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I now give the floor to the representative of Bahrain.

Bahrain

Thank you Mr Chair. We have read this nomination to say with a great interest and it has touched us deeply. The nuclear bomb test site at Bikini Atoll has indeed changed the human history and has become a strong metaphor of the nuclear age and the Cold War. At the same time the contrast of the paradise setting and the dark history highlights the paradoxes of a human history and the strong ability of nature to regenerate a moment of hope. This can be seen as a unique example for eco-system regeneration. After a major destructive event including the extreme exposure of radio activity. Bahrain strongly welcomes this nomination which will place another small island developing State on the World Heritage List. We think that the requested aspects like the setting up of a diver group and provision of the number of inhabitants are administrative details which should not prevent an inscription of this site. We would further like to take this opportunity to encourage the State Parties to the Convention to provide international assistance to the Marshall Islands in the identification and removal of dangerous materials still present in the marine part of the property. Thank you very much Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse considère que cette candidature est très importante. Il est fondamental aussi de nous rappeler aussi des moments sombres et violents de l'histoire humaine. Il n'y a pas beaucoup de biens de ce type sur la liste et dans le cas présent la contradiction comme l'a dit notre collègue du Bahrein entre un paysage aujourd'hui visuellement idyllique versus un passé extrêmement violent, dont témoignent de nombreuses vestiges matériels et paysagers est très particulier. Ce qui convainc la Suisse de ce site, et aussi, cela a été démontré déjà le fait que le site peut représenter également le début du mouvement dans le monde contre l'essai nucléaire militaire et pour la paix. La Suisse est toutefois préoccupée concernant les navires au fond de la mer qui persistent et qui contiennent encore l'essence et les explosifs et nous espérons qu'une inscription pourra aider à remédier à cette situation. La Suisse soutien donc également l'inscription de ce site, et pour vraiment être précis dans toutes les règles, nous pourrions éventuellement demander

que l'inventaire et les autres conditions soient remplies d'ici deux ans. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

All the members of the Committee who spoke so far are in favour of inscription on the World Heritage List of this property and so it seems to me that we are close to a consensus and I will give the floor to the three people who are on the list. But I would ask that if you are in favour please be brief or avoid speaking so that we can move quickly to adoption. Mali

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je reviens sur le fait que cette catégorie proposée est rare car c'est une référence historique dans le monde. J'ai écouté l'Etat partie, j'ai écouté également l'ICOMOS. L'Etat partie a dit qu'il n'y a pas de menaces, mais l'ICOMOS reconnaît qu'il y a cette menace. Et parmi les menaces citées par l'ICOMOS il y a le changement climatique. Mais le changement climatique est mondial, ce n'est pas seulement à ce site. Le second c'est par rapport au stock de bombes et je pense que je ne reviendrai pas sur les aspects techniques, l'intégrité, l'authenticité, la VUE, qui sont vérifiés. Je rejoins le groupe de Barbade et de Bahreïn qui propose l'inscription sur la liste du patrimoine mondial et à côté de cela je ferai un appel à la communauté internationale pour que des études et des sondages soient menés par rapport au stock de bombes, car cette étude peut s'étendre sur une longue durée. Donc on peut procéder à l'inscription tout en engageant le processus d'étude sur le stock de bombes. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Nigeria has the floor.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Actually Nigeria wants to support the inscription of this site and as you have advised I think we should save time by going straight to the Draft Decision. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. May I call on Egypt please.

Egypt

En fait l'Egypte est opposée à l'inscription du site et donc en fait moi je reste sur ma position. J'ai pas eu d'informations de la part d'ICOMOS en ce qui concerne l'étude d'impact et de risque en cas d'avoir un flux de tourisme sur le site en cas d'inscription. Je souhaiterais avoir une réponse de la part d'ICOMOS. Y aura-t-il un risque significatif sur les personnes en cas d'afflux de tourisme ou non et il existe cette étude d'évaluation, ou jusqu'à aujourd'hui il n'y a aucune étude qui a été menée de la part du comité international, c'est-à-dire de la part des Etats parties. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Il y a je pense plusieurs aspects à considérer. Le premier c'est que les Iles Marshall et notamment l'atoll de Bikini sont extrêmement isolés pour l'instant et pratiquement sans liaison aérienne donc la question ne se pose pas d'une manière immédiate. D'autre part la conservation du site entraîne de la part de l'Etat partie une conservation du bien et un contrôle des constructions. En ce qui concerne les risques que pourraient courir les touristes sur place, qui est un peu une autre question bien entendu, il y a la question de la radioactivité que j'ai peu abordée. Aujourd'hui nous sommes plus de soixante ans après les explosions, les durées de vie moyennes des éléments radioactifs font que beaucoup d'entre eux, la plupart d'entre eux sont restés, seul le césium 137 aujourd'hui pose question de la part le remplacement du calcium dans la chaîne alimentaire. Donc il faut prendre des précautions alimentaires que connaissent bien les gens des Marshall et ceux qui vont assez régulièrement à Bikini, c'est-à-dire, il ne faut pas se nourrir exclusivement avec de la nourriture, des légumes par exemple qui seraient produits sur place, il faut faire attention en buvant de l'eau, il vaut mieux boire de l'eau en bouteille. Mais ces précautions sanitaires sont valables dans d'autres pays du monde, donc à ce niveau-là il n'y a pas de danger particulier. Par contre, et la situation est bien connue sur le plan nucléaire, il n'y a pas de souci, la situation que j'ai évoquée, que plusieurs des membres du comité ont reprise, c'est le risque d'explosion des bombes, nous sommes dans le cadre d'une flotte de guerre, à la fin de la seconde guerre mondiale, je ne vous rappelle pas les puissances considérables des bombes conventionnelles de l'armée américaine à cette période-là. Le danger peut être réel et également le fioul dans un porte avion comme le Saratoga, il semblerait qu'on ait à peu près les deux tiers de ses réservoirs pleins, c'est un véritable ras de marais au niveau du lagon. Donc il y a là effectivement des mesures à prendre, mais elles ne nous ont pas semblée de l'ordre de l'Etat partie, elles nous semblent vraiment de l'ordre de l'assistance internationale. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Let me give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie l'ICOMOS pour l'information qui est apportée. Donc pour conclure, je pense que l'ICOMOS ne pourra pas confirmer l'impact et le risque de la radiation sur les êtres humains en cas d'augmentation du nombre de visites sur le site. En ce qui concerne le risque par rapport à l'alimentation, je peux comprendre que ça représente un risque effectif, et ça c'est le deuxième paramètre. Troisième paramètre, on parlera de l'explosion de la part de bombes qui exposent actuellement dans le bassin autour de l'île. Je peux comprendre les Etats membres du Comité qui souhaitent l'inscription du site pour ses valeurs universelles soient au niveau des critères (vi) ou (iv), et toutes les conditions remplies par la convention. Mais je pense que c'est un site qui sera pour la première fois, et l'ICOMOS pourra confirmer, inscrit à ce critère et caractère. Et dans ce sens-là, je pense à une étude d'impact qui doit amener à inclure dans le dossier d'inscription. Je voudrais avoir une confirmation de la part d'ICOMOS. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Well, then let me give the floor to ICOMOS again.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Si je comprends bien la question c'est une étude d'impact du tourisme que vous voulez voir.

Egypt (interrupts).

Si vous me permettez c'est une étude de risque global en ce qui concerne sur les êtres humains, sur l'environnement, le faune, on parle de 60 ans en arrière par rapport aux essais, et l'impact au niveau scientifique est encore à l'étude pour l'instant. Comment peut-on confirmer un impact sur l'environnement et sur les êtres humains avant de mener un peu plus de recherche à ce point ? Merci.

ICOMOS

Le dossier comprend des éléments scientifiques tout à fait importants, un suivi des questions nucléaires a été effectué notamment par l'aide américaine jusqu'à la période présente et véritablement le seul élément dangereux est le césium 137 au jour d'aujourd'hui. Les éléments dangereux à courte durée de vie n'ont plus de taux de présence significatif aujourd'hui et c'est en fait non pas une action directe de ces éléments, mais c'est par le biais de la chaîne alimentaire et de leur fixation dans le corps humain, notamment à la place du calcium donc dans le squelette qu'un risque peut être encouru, mais il faut vivre, il s'agit surtout du point de vue des gens qui pourraient vivre de manière permanente dans l'île et non pas d'un touriste qui y passe, même un mois, le risque là est à peu près nul. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I would like to give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Australia

Thank you very much Mr Chair. Australia's view are ambiguously that this view should be inscribed and we thank ICOMOS very much indeed for its very clear clarifications on the issues that have been raised. Mr Chairman, the people of Bikini, the people of the Marshall Islands have been living with some of the results of what has taken place, what is before us for inscription, for the past 50 or 60 years. Clearly they are capable of managing the various risks that may apply and as ICOMOS has noted those risks are very low indeed. In relation to tourism Mr Chairman, this is something I think on all of these issues it would be appropriate to seek the views of the State Party, but to put into perspective what we understand to be the case. The case is that no more than 20 people approximately on the island at any one time. That is roughly the number of people sitting on the podium at the moment to occupy a full island. Clearly the impact of this would be extremely small. In relation to food, again I think we can seek clarification through the State Party. But when those approximately 20 people who are not there consistently but only occasionally. When they go they don't pick food from the island they bring it with them so the impact is likely to be somewhat small. But maybe we could confirm this through the State Party. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. Let me give the floor to the State Party for the necessary clarifications.

Marshall Islands

Mr Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee on this issue. We understand that the extent of radiation on the site is the remaining symbol of fear that nuclear weapons produce. In terms of monitoring radiation there is actually a resident station of the US Department of Energy on Bikini Atoll and they are continuously monitoring the radiation of this site. People can go and stay there. It is perfectly safe to walk around, to stay there for as long as they want. There is no problem at all with Gamma radiation, which is the type of radiation you can absorb from the environment. The reason why people are not living there now, the Bikinians, is that in the 1970s there was found to be a high level of cesium 137 in the soil. And because of the potassium poor soils in coral atolls the cesium is taken up to the food chain. So if you are to live there for a long period of time and eat vegetables grown there you will accumulate cesium 137 at a higher than background level. When tourists go to the atoll all the food they eat is imported to the atoll. They don't eat any food grown there. Can I also add that marine fish, all fish in the marine environment are completely safe to eat. There is no residual radiation in the marine environment. If I could take the opportunity also to address the unexploded ordnances, there was a study carried out by the US Navy and US Parks and Wildlife Service in 1989 and at this time their advise was that the risk to divers on the ship and the ecological risks from these issues was acceptable. However, this was 20 years ago and the State Party agrees with ICOMOS that a new expert appraisal of the risks of the unexploded ordnances and the fuel oil in the sunken vessels at Bikini atoll is a priority. We will require a significant level of international support to carry this out. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you so much. I would like to give the floor to the representative of Barbados.

Barbados

Thank you chair. I believe that the questions that have been asked has been answered sufficiently. It is clear that the State Party, with the assistance of its neighbours, Australia, and with other governments have taken the precautions necessary. I want to thank the State Party Egypt for asking these questions, because clearly, he is expressing a huge amount of concern about both the Marshall Islanders and with respect to potential tourists. But I think we have had sufficient information and we are satisfied that the participation of both tourists and native islanders can be conducted safely and in complete harmony with the environment with which they live. And it is clear that the State Party has put the necessary provisions in place to manage the possible and remote dangers more than adequately. I think it is time to move to the decision. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The Chairperson agrees and should like to give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is to be found on page 20 of the English version and page 21 of the French version. I have received the draft amendment from the Delegation of Barbados which concerns paragraph 2. The proposal is

as follows. Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 2, once again the umbrella paragraph would be separated from the recommendation under small (a) and the newly inserted text for paragraph 4.2 would read as follows: "Inscribes the Bikini Atoll nuclear test site, Marshall Islands on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi)." Then a newly inserted paragraph 3 would start with "Adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Values" and like in all other cases this would be distributed to you for adoption at the end of the agenda item. Then paragraph 4 would be a new umbrella paragraph for the recommendation to follow, and if I understood correctly the Delegation of Switzerland suggested an amendment that this umbrella paragraph would include a time period of two years. They are nodding so I take this for given. Then the umbrella paragraph would read "Requests the State Party to within two years..." and then the subparagraphs would follow starting with subparagraph former 2(a), draw up an inventory and so on and would be followed by the subparagraphs under 3. So subparagraph 3(e) would become then 4(b), set up a divers group for (c), (d), (e) and (f) including the other paragraphs and paragraph currently 4 would become then paragraph 5 but remain unchanged. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Madam Rapporteur. Now I turn to the Committee and I should like to ask you ladies and gentlemen whether you are in a position to adopt the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 20** submitted by the Rapporteur. It stands adopted. (Applause). I wanted to congratulate the Marshall Islands representatives and the population of the Bikini Atoll and also thanks to the representative of Bahrain for having brought out the significance for humanity of this particular gesture to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List. Thank you all indeed. It is the first site of the Marshall Islands and I should like to give the floor therefore to Marshall Islands for their comments.

Marshall Islands

..... (Greetings in native language).....Mr Chairman. On behalf of the people of Bikini Atoll and the Government of the Marshall Islands I thank the Committee for granting this great honour to the Marshall Islands. Bikini Atoll is distinctively twentieth century heritage, standing testimony to the dawn of nuclear age, the start of Cold War and the era of nuclear colonialism. Inscription on the World Heritage List will help the world to remember the story of Bikini Atoll an my hope is that it will be a way for my people to reconcile with their own difficult past. This would not have happened without the help of many people and I would like to thank in particular all the experts who helped with the preparation of the nomination, as well as the Australian Government in order to get this inscribed in the World Heritage Site and for the important financial support. This is a very proud day for the Marshall Islands. (Applause)

Thank you very much indeed. Congratulations to you. And let me give the floor to ICOMOS for the nomination of the **Historic Villages of Korea Hahoe and Yangdon in the Republic of Korea.**

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. We turn to the historic village of Hahoe and Yangdon. These two villages are 90 kilometres apart and in the South-West of Korea. The two villages and their landscape settings are seen as the two most representative historic clan villages in Korea. They were founded in the 14th and 15th centuries and subsequently expanded to their present size in the late 18th and 19th centuries. Their layout and citing, sheltered by forests and mountains and facing out onto a river and open fields reflects the distinctive aristocratic Confusian culture of the early part of the Joseon Dynasty. The landscapes and mountains, trees and waters around the villages framed in views of pavilions and retreats were

celebrated for their beauty by 17th and 18th century poets. In terms of category of cultural property, this is a serial nomination of six sites.

First of all to turn to Hahoe village – this is situated on the upper reaches of the Nan Don Gan River where it loops around Mount Wa San. The river water allowed the region to prosper from huge rice production from the early Joseon period. The nominated area consisted of the village, the cultivated fields and the lower slopes of the mountain behind. Also in the nominated area is the Byeongsanseowon Confucian Academy three kilometers to the east of the village and joined by a buffer zone. The village centre is a small mound on which is the house of the head family house and spread around the village are Yang bang or aristocratic houses with tiled roofs and surrounding each of these are clusters of commoner's houses with thatched roofs. The village is set to reflect Feng shui principles in its overall orientation within the landscape. So the village consists of the houses of nobility, the commoner's houses as well as study halls, pavilions and Confucian academies and the landscape of beauty around the village.

The Yang bang houses or nobility houses are timber framed with tiled roofs. On the left is one of the larger houses in the village, built in the 16th century by the clan's founders. And one on the right from the 17th century. There are examples of 18th and 19th Yang bang houses and these demonstrate the slow evolution over the village but within the similar methods and materials of buildings. Around the Yang ban houses are numerous commoner's houses which were one store, much smaller and built of mud over a timber framework with thatched roofs. Within the villages are study halls, away from the houses where scholars, who were meant from noble families built separate pavilions, retreats where the scenery could be enjoyed or study halls for lectures and so on. There are also Confucian academies. The Confucian Academy was a private educational institution was set up exclusively for a man who had achieved outstanding learning and virtue. There are two in Hahoe village.

Then we come to the landscape. The beauty of the landscape, surrounded on three sides by the river, inspired numerous poems, notably in the 17th and 18th centuries, many of which celebrate the theme of 16 beautiful sceneries. Yangdon Village, if we now turn to, the dwellings in the village are in five dales within the fault of densely forested hills with the Yang ban houses half way up the slope and surrounded as in the other village by commoner's houses. The Yangdon cluster includes two academies located some 4 and 8 kilometres from the village. Like Hahoe the villages are harmoniously related to its landscape. It also includes Yang ban houses, including the one on the left which is one of the few not to have undergone extensive remodelling of both villages. And as in Hahoe the overall layout of the village and the houses demonstrate seamless development from the 17th to the 19th centuries. And like Hahoe there are commoner's houses surrounding the Yang ban houses, some of which such as this one has been restored. There are also pavilions and Confucian academies. In connection with the landscape, this is not as beautiful as Hahoe and there are nearby infrastructural developments such as railways and roads and a bridge, has to a degree affected the setting of the village.

The integrity and authenticity have been met although they are vulnerable in relation to the conservation of individual structures. The comparative analysis shows very clearly the specificity in Korea of this village manifestation of Confucian culture. ICOMOS considers that criterion (iii) and (iv) have been justified in terms of the way the ensemble of vernacular buildings is an exceptional testimony to this Confucian cultural tradition. We are happy with the boundaries protection and conservation.

The main threats to the property are fire and over visiting and we do consider that the best possible fire protection systems should be put in place. The one question and the one cross that you see on that screen is related to management. As this is a serial nomination there is a need, under the terms of the Operational Guidelines, to put in place overarching management between the two sites. At the moment there are individual management systems in place. As a result of the lack of that management ICOMOS

recommends that the nomination be referred back to allow this coordinated management system to be put in place and we further make recommendations on four points. However, I would just like to finish by saying that ICOMOS understands that the State Party has reacted quickly to our recommendations and has indeed recently put in place integrated management for the two villages. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed says The Chairpersonperson. I should like to give the floor to the representative of China.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. According to the ICOMOS evaluation the nominated property has the capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. Criterion (ii) and 4 are justified. The conditions of integrity and authenticity are also met. But it referred the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to put in place a coordinated management system. We have learnt that the State Party of Korea has already provided additional information regarding the establishment of the coordinated management system. I would like to ask The Chairpersonperson to give the opportunity to the State Party to clarify this. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the State Party for the necessary clarifications.

Republic of Korea

Thank you Mr Chairperson for this opportunity to speak. The State Party of the Republic of Korea is grateful to ICOMOS for the excellent presentation on Korea's World Heritage nomination, Historic Villages of Hahoe and Yangdong. We are aware of how crucial it is to have a coordinated management system in place. In this light we have done very quickly what is needed to establish and implement the system. In January 2009 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by all responsible authorities to establish the system for the nominated property. A year later, January 2010, based on this MOU the system called the Historic Village Conservation Council was launched. This Council consists of 25 members including 8 representatives from the two villages. Subsequently, the Council held its first meeting on 30 April and made a series of decisions for the future of the nominated property, including sustainable tourism strategy. We are very delighted to have some of the Council members in this room to witness this historic movement. So therefore we consider that the recommendations by ICOMOS have already been complied with. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I should like to give the floor now to the representative of Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je peux être très bref, de ce que vous avez entendu de la part de l'ICOMOS et aussi de l'Etat partie, toutes les conditions sont remplies et nous proposons donc d'inscrire le site. Merci monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I call on Sweden please.

Sweden

We make the same statement as Switzerland. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Madam. I should like to call on Mexico.

Mexico

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson says the delegate of Mexico. Mexico welcomes the statement given by the Advisory Body on this nomination. We believe that these villages, and I happen to have been lucky enough to actually have had the opportunity to go there, these are among the oldest clan settlements in Korea, among the very oldest. And the visual integrity of the area, its vitality, the production that you can still see there, are a magnificent example of vernacular architecture in Asia, so obviously we support inclusion in the World Heritage List with the recommendation, that is already being clarified by the State Party obviously, that the original community should also be included in all of the conservation projects, not just where the dwelling units are concerned, but also the surrounding landscape. That's part and parcel I believe of the overall protection plan that has already been mentioned. Thank you very much Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mexico. I would like to give the floor to Australia now.

Australia

Thank you Chair. Australia joins the other parties in being very pleased to see the quick action by the State Party and putting in place a coordinated management system for the two sites. Australia therefore strongly supports inscription and actually has submitted a revised Draft Decision to this effect. We have included in that Draft Decision a new paragraph which actually asks for the State Party to report back later on the actual implementation of that coordinated management system. But in doing so we do not in any way want to delay inscription. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Nigeria please.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I think it has to be said that the only thing that stands between the State Party of Korea to the inscription of this site is having the coordinated management system in place and we have been informed that the State Party has put that in place and this has been communicated to the Advisory Body and the World Heritage Centre. What we would like to know in order for this site to be inscribed. This is the only missing link and it has been provided. So what has been provided is satisfactory. The Advisory Body has confirmed that they have acted accordingly. But is it satisfactory? I would like to hear the comment of the ICOMOS before we can just rush for inscription. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Could I consult ICOMOS please. Is this response satisfactory? If the response is positive I'll give the floor to the Rapporteur to give the Draft Decision.

ICOMOS

As the Committee Members are aware we do not evaluate material that comes in after a certain date. But we are aware of what the State Party has provided and indeed ICOMOS has discussed this with the State Party while we have been here in Brasilia. So on the basis of what they have told us and on the basis of what we knew was anyway being planned we are indeed satisfied with what they are now explaining to you. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Thank you to all of you. We seem to have a consensus so I will give the floor to the Rapporteur to present the Draft Decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The original Draft Decision 8B.21 is on page 20 of the English version and page 21 of the French version of your document and I have received the draft amendment by the Delegation of Australia. Following this draft amendment, paragraph 1 of the original Draft Decision would be retained. Paragraph 2 would be deleted and replaced by the following wording. Inscribes the nomination of the Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong Republic of Korea on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi). A new paragraph 3 following this paragraph 2 would read: "Adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Value", and as we mentioned you would receive it in due time. Then the Delegation of Australia recommends to delete the entire paragraph and replace it by the following wording: "Requests that the State Party report back to the World Heritage Committee by 1 February 2011 on the implementation of a coordinated management system for the two component sites as prescribed by paragraph 114 of the Operational Guidelines". And Mr Chairperson I believe that the Advisory Body may want to comment on this selection of criteria proposed by the Australian Delegation.

The Chairperson

Yes, I will give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

The property was nominated under criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi). In our evaluation we consider that the property met criterion (iii) and (iv) only. I don't know whether the Australian Delegation would like to take account of that.

The Chairperson

I will consult the Australian Delegation on that.

Australia

Chair, just to avoid prolonging, Australia could amend that to just have three and four, consistent with the Advisory Bodies. Thank you.

The Chairperson

With that modification now I will ask the Committee whether you accept the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 21** with the modification just made by the Australian Delegation.

Good, it is approved. (Applause) And so I give the floor now to the Delegation from the Republic of Korea and we offer our congratulations to you.

Republic of Korea

Thank you Mr Chairperson. We are delighted to witness this historic moment for the inscription of the Historic Villages of Korea. With your permission let me introduce Mr Lee Hon Moo, Head of the Korean Agency for Cultural Heritage.

Thank you Chair. As Head of the Cultural Heritage Administration of the Republic of Korea I am very pleased with the successful inscription of the Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong on the World Heritage List. On behalf of the Korean Government and all of the Delegations here I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who made contributions to the inscription. My special thanks go to the Committee Members and ICOMOS who recognized the Outstanding Values of the two villages. It is a great honour for us to have another site inscribed on the Old Heritage List and we are well aware of the duties and responsibilities following the inscription. Our Government will do its best in preserving the Historic Villages of Korea: Hahoe and Yangdong as a World Heritage Site and improving its surroundings. I believe that this is a celebrate moment owed to me and all of you. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now we will move to the following property which is the **Imperial Citadel of Thang Long – Hanoi in Viet Nam.**

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président, la cité impériale de Thang Long fût édifée au 11^e siècle sur les vestiges d'une ancienne citadelle chinoise, concrétisant l'indépendance du royaume du Dai Viet. Les édifices de la cité impériale et la zone archéologique 18 Hoang Dieu expriment une culture originale du sud-est asiatique. En termes de catégorie de bien culturel, il s'agit d'un ensemble, il s'agit aussi d'un centre-ville historique dans la catégorie des cités historiques vivantes et d'un site archéologique dans la catégorie des villes mortes.

La ville est localisée dans la partie amont du delta du fleuve Rouge, à l'ouest d'un de ces méandres principaux. Le site archéologique est la partie située à gauche du chiffre 1 sur la carte, à la droite de la cité impériale, ainsi que ses accès sud et nord, matérialisant son axe historique principal. L'ICOMOS a demandé une zone tampon qui entoure complètement le bien proposé. L'espace archéologique 18 Hoang Dieu a été mis à jour et fouillé à partir de 2002, dans le cadre des travaux de construction de l'Assemblée Nationale. Le site archéologique a révélé la longue chronologie des lieux sur environ 13 siècles d'histoire du VIII au XIX siècle. Il comprend de nombreux vestiges, fondations de constructions, éléments hydrauliques, espaces de circulation et un important mobilier archéologique. La cité impériale est aujourd'hui un ensemble bâti à caractère politique et administratif provenant essentiellement des XIX et XX siècles, mais différents vestiges de construction ou murs de fondation témoignent de son existence depuis le XI siècle. Le palais King Tian fût édifé au début du XV siècle sur les fondations d'anciens palais des XI et XII siècles. Ils formaient la partie principale de la cité interdite, lieu de résidence et symbole du pouvoir impérial. Démoli, il a été remplacé par un autre bâtiment au moment de la période coloniale. Il conserve une double volée d'escaliers, au garde-corps de pierre représentant deux dragons impériaux ainsi que des éléments de fondation. Le palais actuel comporte essentiellement des bâtiments construits à la fin du XIX siècle et des aménagements liés à la présence du gouvernement du Viet Nam et de son état-major dans la seconde moitié du XX siècle, le bâtiment D67 et son bunker notamment. La porte Duan Mon était l'entrée protocolaire sud de la cité interdite. Elle présente des parties originales du XV siècle, mais elle a été fortement

restaurée au XIX siècle. Construite en pierres et en briques, elle comporte cinq portes centrales en arche de taille différentes et aux rôles sociaux distincts. Le palais Hoa Lu ou palais de la Princesse est situé à l'arrière de l'ancienne cité interdite, il repose sur des vestiges remontant au XI siècle, fortement endommagé, il a été reconstruit à la fin du XIX siècle en suivant les principes symboliques des palais vietnamiens anciens. Le bien possède d'autres éléments monumentaux associés à la restructuration de la forteresse au début du XIX siècle par la dynastie de Nguyen. Au moment où elle perd son statut de capitale impériale au profit de Hoa, une ville plus centrale. La tour du drapeau est représentative de la restructuration de la citadelle vers 1805, dans l'esprit de la fortification européenne. C'est devenu un musée de l'armée et un lieu symbolique de la République du Viet Nam. Avec la colonisation française Thang Long retrouve son rôle de capitale administrative et militaire régionale, de nombreux bâtiments sont alors construits dans un style colonial néoclassique. Au sein d'un espace bâti relativement dense et contenant des bâtiments d'intérêt secondaire, nous trouvons des espaces publics caractéristiques, soit des restructurations du XIX siècle, comme le jardin du palais Hoa Lu, soit du XX siècle comme l'hippodrome. Le bâtiment D67 construit en 1967, au Nord du palais King Tien, fût le centre politique et militaire du Nord Viet Nam pendant la seconde guerre d'indépendance.

L'ICOMOS considère que les conditions d'intégrité ne sont pas satisfaisantes, les conditions d'authenticité ne sont véritablement réunies que pour la dimension archéologique du bien, mais sur un espace pour l'instant réduit, et pour les constructions de la fin du XIX siècle et du XX siècle. L'intégrité et l'authenticité sont insuffisantes pour les monuments, les vestiges bâties des périodes plus anciennes. L'analyse comparative dans son état actuel ne justifie pas d'envisager l'inscription du bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. Tout en apportant des éléments notables et très importants pour l'histoire du Viet Nam, les arguments présentés n'ont pour l'instant pas démontré la VUE du bien, ni justifié les critères avancés. L'ICOMOS considère qu'il existe des menaces de développement constructif, tant publics que privés. La délimitation du bien est à reconsidérer, soit pour présenter un site archéologique plus complet et à part entière, soit pour une approche plus consistante d'une cité impériale.

L'ICOMOS recommande que l'examen de la proposition de l'inscription du secteur central de la cité impériale de Thang Long à Hanoi, Viet Nam, sur la liste du patrimoine mondial, soit différée afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de reconsidérer la définition du bien, renforcer et étendre l'étude archéologique, compléter l'analyse comparative, renforcer et approfondir la réflexion sur les notions d'authenticité et d'intégrité du bien, revoir la zone tampon, promulguer et mettre en œuvre le plan de gestion, y inclure un programme de suivi du bien. L'ICOMOS a également formulé des recommandations complémentaires, l'ICOMOS a reçu une lettre d'erreur factuelle et l'a prise en considération. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor now to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you Chairman. The Delegation of Brazil considers that this particular case, the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long in Hanoi does present certain inconsistencies between the opinion of ICOMOS and the conclusion concerning Outstanding Universal Value for the site. In the report from ICOMOS as well it is clearly reflected, it states very clearly that the Citadel satisfies various essential and indispensable criteria for the recognition of Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS recognizes that the Thang Long Citadel constitutes a unique synthesis between the various Asian cultures represented and this regard it is unique. With regard to the time period during which it was used as a political and administrative centre. Something which we don't see in other imperial centres. This is all stated in the report. ICOMOS considers that there is tangible evidence that this site was used for more than 13 centuries. ICOMOS considers that this property which is being nominated for listing

also has very high archaeological authenticity demonstrating the very long use of this site, the site of the Citadel of Thang Long. This is a site which demonstrates the confluence of various influences, not just from China to the North, but also the Sampaõ Kingdom to the South and this is expressed through perhaps cultural interchanges that gave shape to the original culture in this Red River Valley area. The Citadel of Thang Long and the archaeological site are evidence of a long cultural tradition of the Viet people, and there has been continuous use and presence of these people in the Red River Delta from the 7th century onwards. The citadel located in this city in Hanoi has such a significant amount of history as described by ICOMOS. A great deal of cultural and national significance which is quite exceptional and goes beyond the borders of Viet Nam. We can even talk about characteristics of inestimable value associated with this site for current generations and future generations and not just talking about Asia but for the world as a whole. So, I believe that Outstanding Universal Value resides in this fact and ultimately the Brazilian Delegation would like to take this opportunity to ask through you, Mr Chairman, for clarification from the State Party with regard to the integrity of the property. The Delegation of Brazil would like to ask the State Party, Viet Nam, whether the integrity of the property could be assessed differently if the Imperial Citadel was the only property being incorporated into the nomination rather than extending it as it is currently presented.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Brazil. Could I give the floor now to the State Party to respond to Brazil.

Viet Nam

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman taking the floor for the first time, let me, on behalf of the Vietnamese Delegation, extend to you and your colleagues our sincere thanks for the quality of the reception extended to all the Delegations attending this session. Mr Chairman, concerning the questions proposed by the distinguished delegate of Brazil, the Vietnamese Delegation is of the view that indeed, there is a discrepancy in the understanding between ICOMOS and my country, the proposing State. ICOMOS believes that this is the proposed site, which is the Citadel as a whole. But, indeed, what we propose is the most central part of this citadel, which is the most important, which is most representative section, which is the most part h that has been studied by various scholars of different countries. And, it is also the part that is most preserved and we would like to claim the three key areas to ensure that OUV as well as integrity. No.1 is the longevity of the culture, spanning more than 13 centuries. No.2 is the continuous, and without interruption our seat of political power, ranging from local political power becoming a political power seat for independence day and thirdly because of the huge cultural layering in the vestiges and underground of this site. So, if we focus only on central sections of the Imperial City then we believe that the integrity of the site has been very well established. Thank you Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to France.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais en premier lieu manifester l'intérêt de la Délégation française pour le projet d'inscription de la cité impériale de Thang Long qui intervient au moment où la ville célèbre son millénaire. La dimension symbolique de ce projet, 13 siècles de présence continue, l'illustration de la formation et du développement d'une Nation indépendante sur plus de mille ans, l'existence d'un échange d'influence considérable, ayant façonné une culture originale, comme l'a évoqué le haut représentant du Brésil, dans la basse vallée du fleuve Rouge, tous ces éléments contribuent à faire du secteur central de la cité impériale de Thang Long un lieu à la fois exceptionnel et de portée

universelle. Les atouts de ce projet d'inscription sont nombreux et la Délégation française souhaiterait mettre en valeur deux aspects. Le premier a trait à l'authenticité du bien proposé. Elle est prouvée par la dimension archéologique dont tous les volets n'ont pas encore été exploités et sont extrêmement riches de promesses, et pour les constructions également de la fin du XIX et du XX siècle. Ce caractère authentique sur ces deux volets ne doit pas être minimisé. Le second aspect a trait à l'engagement de l'Etat partie qui a proposé le dossier de candidature, en matière de protection, de conservation et de gestion des biens. Des mesures actives de conservation du site et des biens sont d'ores et déjà appliquées en particulier depuis 2005. Une autorité de gestion est déjà en exercice, le centre de la préservation des vestiges a entrepris des efforts considérables qui mobilisent des moyens financiers et humains importants. La Délégation française estime que ces atouts, qui sont tous mentionnés dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS doivent être davantage valorisés que ce n'est le cas. C'est pourquoi mon pays s'exprime en faveur de l'inscription du secteur central de la cité impériale de Thang Long sur la liste du patrimoine mondial, et souhaite que le comité prenne une décision en ce sens. Je souhaiterais toutefois poser une question à l'Etat partie et avec votre autorisation Monsieur le Président. L'ICOMOS semble inquiet que la superficie du bien candidat soit insuffisamment importante pour exprimer la valeur universelle de la citadelle de Thang Long. L'Etat partie pourrait-il nous apporter quelques précisions sur ce point ? Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much France. Can I give the floor to the representative of the State Party to respond to France to answer this question.

Viet Nam

Je remercie Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Président concernant la question posée par le distingué délégué de la France, la Délégation du Viet Nam souhaite apporter une précision aux distingués membres du Comité. Le bien candidat est la partie centrale de première importance de la citadelle impériale, c'est l'axe central de la cité interdite, composante la mieux conservée et aussi c'est la résidence et le lieu de travail des dirigeants nationaux, des rois, des généraux supérieurs de l'Indochine, de l'époque française, et ainsi que des commandants en chef de l'armée populaire du Viet Nam. Et c'est pour ça que nous croyons qu'il demeure toujours le lieu du pouvoir central, tandis que les autres secteurs de la citadelle impériale ne sont pas aussi importants sur le plan du pouvoir. C'est pour cette raison que notre pays a décidé de ne pas inclure comme bien candidat d'autres structures que l'ICOMOS souhaite recommander d'inclure. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Could I now give the floor to Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. En entendant l'explication de la part de l'Etat partie et le point soulevé de la part des Délégations du Brésil et de la France, cela confirme notre opinion profonde, la proposition remplit complètement les critères (iv) (v) et (vi). Cela ne pose aucun doute sur l'intégrité et l'authenticité du site. En ce qui concerne l'authenticité du site, l'ICOMOS propose que l'authenticité du site est partielle parce qu'elle ne tient pas compte de la partie qui a été construite au cours du XIX siècle. Je ne vais pas entrer plus dans les détails, mais je peux comprendre, je n'ai pas eu accès au dossier d'évaluation, que c'était très mal rédigé, d'ailleurs cela paraît tout à fait évident dans l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS. Mais ça c'est l'erreur, je reviendrai sur intervention que j'ai faite hier, des organes consultatifs en ce qui concerne les ressources humaines et l'aide à apporter pour les Etats parties. Je

voudrais, une question directe aussi par rapport au représentant de l'ICOMOS, est-ce que vous connaissez bien le site, et vous avez des doutes sur ses valeurs universelles ou non ? Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Could I now give the floor to ICOMOS to respond.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. En ce qui concerne la connaissance du site, nous avons rappelé que l'ICOMOS a envoyé une mission d'évaluation constituée par un expert particulièrement compétant dans le domaine et venant de la région. Le rapport qu'il nous fournit est un des éléments très importants de notre analyse et nous attachons particulièrement à travers ces missions de terrain à avoir un point de vue indépendant et professionnel sur les questions d'authenticité et d'intégrité. Je pense que j'ai répondu à votre troisième question. Sauf à remettre en cause la compétence de l'expert envoyé par l'ICOMOS.

En ce qui concerne la VUE, bien entendu il y a des rapports extrêmement favorables dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS, mais nous ne les isolons pas de l'ensemble de l'évaluation, c'est trop facile d'extraire une phrase et d'oublier le reste. Bien sûr le potentiel de VUE existe et nous le reconnaissons, bien sûr ces échanges culturels entre le monde chinois et les civilisations du sud-est de la péninsule d'Indochine sont reconnues par l'ICOMOS par ses différents experts dans ce processus collégial et nous le disons sans la moindre hésitation. Mais une autre question se pose maintenant, c'est précisément de savoir si l'ensemble qui nous est proposé dans les différents domaines où il nous est proposé est suffisamment significatif pour supporter cette VUE, et en apporter la démonstration complète. Alors l'archéologie oui, une fouille sur le site 18 Hoang Dieu, c'est le numéro dans une rue, c'est une parcelle de terrain, qui est une partie seulement de cette parcelle, qui est consacrée à la construction de l'Assemblée Nationale. Bien sûr depuis 2002 et surtout 2005 des fouilles extrêmement prometteuses saluées par tous les experts de l'archéologie du sud-est asiatique, bien entendu, mais sur une parcelle de terrain seulement, donc les conditions d'intégrité sont-elles reconnues, non. Il faut avoir une vision plus large, un programme archéologique devrait apparaître, il ne figure pas dans ce dossier. Donc du point de vue de l'archéologie, une évaluation professionnelle conduit à dire qu'il faut une vision plus large, territorialement plus large, une compréhension de cette cité, à travers différentes méthodes archéologiques qui ne sont pas forcément des fouilles, d'ailleurs traditionnelles, qui peuvent être d'autres types d'exploration des sous-sols. En ce qui concerne l'intégrité urbaine, bien sûr les éléments sont là, la continuité historique évoquée, saluée également par l'ICOMOS sont présents, mais les vestiges monumentaux construits entre le XI siècle et la reconstruction de la citadelle en 1805 sur un modèle européen, sont relativement faibles. Ce sont essentiellement deux volets d'escaliers avec de magnifiques dragons, c'est un fait, et une série d'éléments qui sont d'ordre des fondations ou d'éléments simplement muraux, donc peut-être d'ailleurs une articulation entre le bâti et l'archéologie. Ces points nous ont semblé ne pas avoir été suffisamment développés, ne pas avoir une vision d'ensemble, c'est pour cela que nous demandons à l'Etat partie, non pas de dire, il n'y a pas d'intégrité ou d'authenticité potentielle, mais de reconsidérer ces concepts d'intégrité et d'authenticité, et d'avoir une vision plus large de ce que doit être l'avenir de ce bien. Certes un anniversaire extrêmement important, nul n'en doute, mais est-ce de cela dont nous devons décider. Je ne le pense pas.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now, as a point of organization as agreed we are going to stop our work now at 7 p.m. and we will be back at 8 p.m. for reasons of organization. I now give the floor to the Secretariat for two points of information to share with us.

The Secretariat

Thank you Chair. We would just like to inform all the participants that you are invited to the launching of the World Heritage magazine here in Brazil at 7 p.m. right here at the entrance. Second announcement – please confirm your participation at the walks and the visit of the city that we are having tomorrow. Go to the cultural activities office.

Brazil

Chair, with all due respect, the Delegation of Brazil suggests that we finish this item because interrupting half way in my view will be prejudicial to the discussion on the item. So I suggest that we conclude the discussion on this item. I would ask the Delegations to be brief, but please let us conclude discussion on this item. This is Brazil's proposal sir. Even if we sacrifice some time I crave indulgence of Delegations, I would ask them to make brief comments. Thank you. I

The Chairperson

I had already examined the possibility with the Secretariat, but the organizers recommend that we stop now and we start where we stopped and so we cannot possibly continue now. We are going to have four hours later and so I think that the break will work out for us.

[Break]

The Chairperson

We have the quorum and we are going to start. The next speaker is Sweden.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairperson. We see this site as a very important contribution to the heritage of Asia with a potential of outstanding universal value and we would like to see a more elaborated dossiers in the years to come that takes into account the recommendations given by ICOMOS. We support accordingly the Draft Decision of deferral. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. You have the floor sir.

Estonia

Thank you Mr Chairman. While reading the ICOMOS report I really felt a very critical tonality of it. So in the end I was rather surprised to find only a deferral and according to the nomination file I really feel that there is a lack of valuable architecture in this site. But on a more general note we are not comfortable with the idea of inscribing a site, recommended for deferral by the Advisory Bodies, to make several requests to the State Party in the Draft Decision and to ask for the state of conservation report next year. Don't we have enough of such reports to review at each session. It seems to be much better to wait until the State

Party has met its burden to fully demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and to prepare a nomination file that meets all the criteria defined by the Convention. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. Switzerland you have the floor please.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse soutien pleinement ce qui vient d'être dit par l'Estonie. Je suis aussi désolé d'être répétitif mais la situation l'est aussi. Là encore la VUE n'est pas pleinement démontrée, et par conséquent et conformément aux règles dans les orientations, nous ne pouvons pas soutenir d'inscrire ce site, nous demandons qu'il soit différé. J'aimerais d'ailleurs souligner aussi que la Suisse fait pleinement confiance et apprécie beaucoup la grande qualité des évaluations des organisations consultatives, merci monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you Switzerland. Thailand you have the floor.

Thailand

Thank you Mr Chairman. Thailand would like to ask a question from the State Party if you may give me permission. The nominated property is claimed to be the meeting point of confluence of different cultures so why doesn't the dossier make a comparative analysis with similar sites like Korea and India. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. State Party you have the floor Madam.

Viet Nam

I would like to thank the distinguished representative from Thailand. Concerning the questions proposed by the Delegation of Thailand relating to the comparative analysis during the process of nomination, we believe that our nomination is on the basis of a long history 1,300 years of existence of a political power in this Forbidden City. Therefore we have tried to focus the comparative analysis with all the cities across the group with a similar background and criteria. Namely we should need to have longevity in its history of existence. That is why we did compare some imperial city like Chan-an in China and Nara in Japan and in a number of other countries as well. With regard to the palace in Korea and in India, actually we did make a comparative analysis with another 17 cities across the group with similar background and we did submit that comparative analysis to the ICOMOS expert. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Cambodia, there is no representative from Cambodia. The next speaker is Mali. You have the floor.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie l'ICOMOS pour les documents extrêmement intéressants et consistants. Je remercie également le centre du patrimoine mondial pour les efforts consentis dans la qualité de la rédaction de ces éléments et je remercie aussi l'Etat partie pour un certain nombre d'efforts. Mais Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi d'identifier un certain nombre de points. Je pense qu'il y a eu d'abord dès le début un problème d'incompréhensions ou alors le cadre conceptuel du bien n'était pas bien

entendu de la part de l'ICOMOS, de la même manière que de la part de l'Etat partie. Parce qu'au début on pensait que c'était toute la citadelle qui était proposée comme bien, alors qu'il y a eu une réaction de l'Etat partie qui explique et qui précise qu'il s'agit du secteur central. Effectivement dans l'intitulé présenté par l'ICOMOS, l'intitulé est « le secteur central », alors notre réflexion s'étend essentiellement sur cette partie, ce n'est pas la peine de revenir la dessus. Il a été dit que cette partie est la partie la mieux maîtrisée, la mieux définie, la plus représentative, et c'est elle aussi qui représente une VUE. Mais nous voulons d'abord évoluer d'abord sur un autre point, c'est par rapport à la gestion. Nous avons là à faire à un exemple de gestion intégrée où le bien appartient à l'Etat, mais il y a aussi une forte implication des populations à travers la création de ce qu'on a appelé le comité populaire de Hanoi. A côté de ça il y a aussi des efforts consentis par l'Etat qui a eu à délocaliser un certain nombre de foyers, notamment 28 foyers, pour pouvoir protéger l'endroit et le site. Et il y avait aussi sur le site des établissements du ministère de la défense qui ont été délocalisés. Tout ça c'est pour mettre le site dans les conditions idéales. Et par rapport à la catégorie du site, certes nous sommes dans le cadre d'un ensemble, mais cette situation Monsieur le Président, me rappelle l'inscription de Tombouctou au patrimoine mondial. On avait proposé l'inscription de toute la Medina de Tombouctou sur la liste du patrimoine mondial, et après étude de l'ICOMOS il nous a été recommandé d'aller progressivement, d'inscrire les biens ou alors les sites sur lesquels il y a des éléments précis, les sites qui répondent au processus d'inscription. C'est ainsi qu'au lieu d'inscrire toute la médina de Tombouctou, on a choisi 3 mosquées et 16 mausolées. Je pense qu'à l'instar de cette inscription on peut procéder de la même manière pour le site dont nous discutons. Il s'agit d'inscrire d'abord le secteur central qui renferme l'ensemble de ses valeurs. Et je voudrais aussi au passage signaler qu'une des recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS c'est de fournir d'amples informations sur les sites archéologiques. Là aussi il y a une volonté politique affichée de l'Etat dans la mesure où l'espace qui a été prospecté ça vaut parfois l'espace original. L'Etat partie est passé de 18 000 hectares à 33 000 hectares (interrompu par le Président).

The Chairperson

Veuillez conclure s'il vous plait.

Mali

Donc, tout cela pour dire que nous sommes favorables et nous recommandons la nomination de ce site.

The Chairperson

Merci beaucoup. Je m'adresse avec votre permission, si on peut respecter le temps réservé à chaque intervention, et aussi l'ICOMOS de leur part, si vous voulez bien respecter le temps accordé à l'ICOMOS. Le suivant est le Cambodge, vous avez la parole.

Cambodia

Merci Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Président je tiens tout d'abord à remercier l'ICOMOS de la précision de son évaluation et ses recommandations. Nous devons également reconnaître que depuis la mission accomplie par l'ICOMOS la citadelle Thang Long à Hanoi, l'Etat partie a pris les mesures pour garantir l'intégrité du site et d'améliorer les conditions de gestion. C'est pourquoi je soutiens l'inscription du bien sur la liste sur la base des critères (ii), (iii) et (vi).

The Chairperson

Merci beaucoup Cambodge. Le suivant, Chine.

China

Thank you Mr Chair. We thank you very much for the work done by ICOMOS. ICOMOS recognizes the significance of Thang Long archaeological site. It has been a political centre continuously functioning for the last 700 years and it will come to its 1,000th anniversary this year. The archaeological site is unique in the region of South-East Asia and secondly from the introduction we know that the surrounding area is a government administrative area. To withstand the archaeological excavation to the surrounding areas seem almost impossible. Thirdly, the existing architecture, the French colonial buildings and the military headquarters buildings during the Vietnamese War. They are also an important part of the Vietnamese history as witness to these crucial parts of history. They have equally high significance. We think the site meets with criteria (iii) as well as the authenticity and integrity. Above all, since this property has already been listed at the highest level, protected cultural heritage by the Vietnamese Government its protection and conservation is legally guaranteed. Therefore we would go with the inscription of the site. I totally echo what has been expressed by my colleague from France and Mali. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Madam. The next speaker is from Iraq.

Iraq

Thank you so much. We as well support our colleagues from China and the others with the decision.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Barbados you have the floor Madam.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. Chair we have been listening with a great deal of interest to the exchange with respect to the comparative analysis and the justification for the statement of outstanding universal value with respect to the site and it seems to me it is quite a problematic issue because you see the approach that has been taken by the Advisory Body in respect of the site doesn't seem to me to have quite captured what is the essence of the site for the Vietnamese people. Yes the evaluation does speak to the various levels of civilization and the exchanges amongst those different groups at certain points in time and it does express the longevity of the site over 1300 years I believe. What I think it fails to capture, however, which I think is the fundamental basis for all of this is that the Thang Long stands for a great deal more than a physical building. It is the intangible values which are missing in terms of the expression of the Outstanding Universal Value and indeed, the basis upon which we should be examining this site. So, while the evaluation has been quite meticulous in capturing the physical basis I do not think it captures the conjunction between the tangible and intangible aspects. And this is critically important if we are to understand how it is that the Vietnamese people over such a long period of time valued, recognized, acknowledged on an ongoing basis the centrality of the symbol to their daily life, to their military life and to their imperial life over a long period of time and that took us into the twentieth century, so I think the basis of the evaluation has been flawed and I think that we would be doing the State Party a disservice if we did not take into account the intangible aspects that relate to this site. So I hope we can take that into consideration Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you Barbados. Mexico you have the floor sir.

Mexico)

Thank you very much Sir. I will be brief. We agree with other members of the Committee who believe that the OUV has been proven, clearly demonstrated, particularly in the light of the responses provided by the State Party. It is our view that those were very satisfactory responses and then later the representativity of the site, we couldn't agree more, and so we would like to see this site inscribed on the list. Thank you sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Russian Federation you have the floor sir.

Russian Federation

Thank you Mr Chairman. The Russian Delegation highly appreciates the work done by ICOMOS and the information presented by them. But at the same time my Delegation would like to make the following remarks with regard to the nominated site of the central sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long in Hanoi. This site for more than a thousand years was a meeting point of human architectural and sculptural values. It had been added by creative and regional town planning construction technology and landscape design. The site has been the actual seat of national political power for over 1,000 years and therefore they have the unique testimony of the evolution of the Vietnamese civilization in the formation and development of a monarchist state in South-East Asia and East Asia. It is not only imbued with a cultural expression but is also tangibly associated with events of outstanding universal significance. Its Outstanding Universal Value is essentially based on three key features: longevity, continuous centre of power and presence of a laid record of vestiges. As documented in the nomination this year, there is sufficient precise attributes in the central sector, both underground and above ground, to support the case for OUV. With this regard we have presented, tabled the amendment to the draft resolution where we propose to inscribe this site to the World Heritage List. We presented this amendment together with other 15 co-sponsors and one remark of not technological, but emotional character. This year our Vietnamese friends and colleagues celebrate the 1000th anniversary of Hanoi, such anniversaries take place only once in ten centuries and it happens this year. I think the Committee shouldn't lose its chance to support our Vietnamese friends in their celebration by the inscription of this site, very interesting site, into the World Heritage List. Our friends deserve it, so I urge the members of the committee to support this draft amendment. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Russian Federation. With your permission and I asked our Rapporteur that we received an amendment for the Draft Decision with the demand of inscription by 16 members of the Committee. So I would like to give the floor to our Rapporteur and go directly to the examination of the Draft Decision. Any objections regarding that? I see none. Rapporteur you have the floor.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 21 of the English version and page 22 of the French version of your document 8B and I indeed I have received one draft amendment which is submitted by the Russian Federation, Brazil, China, France, Australia, Egypt, Mali, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Jordan, Iraq, United Arab Emirates, Mexico, Thailand and South Africa. The draft amendment retains the current paragraph 1. It suggests to replace the umbrella paragraph of paragraph 2 or rather delete

the umbrella of paragraph and replace it with the new paragraph 2 – Recognizing the efforts and the progress made by the State Party since the ICOMOS site mission in extending archaeological excavations and guaranteeing integrated and unified management. Then the amendment suggests introduction of a new paragraph 3 - Inscribes the central sector of the Imperial City of Thang Long, Hanoi, Viet Nam on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi). Accordingly, there would be a new paragraph 4 – Adopts the following statement of outstanding Universal Value – which would be distributed to you for adoption at the end of this agenda item. Then the proposal suggests a new umbrella paragraph under No. 5 which reads: “Recommends the State Party should” and then proposes to delete former small 2(a), it retains small (b); it deletes small (c) and small (d); it retains small (e) and modification which would then read “Give consideration to a wider buffer zone for the property and make sure that the management routes for private construction projects are observed”. Equally small (f) would be modified and that part of the paragraph is suggested to be deleted and the remaining paragraph would then read: “Implement the overall management plan and make sure that the associated specific programmes are implemented in line with the overall plan. Small (g) would be retained, paragraph 3 would be deleted as we have done in earlier decisions and former 4(a) and 4(b) would be removed up under the new paragraph 5 and would there be retained as new small (h) and new small (i) but completely kept in their current content. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you Rapporteur. Are there any objections regarding the inscription and the adoption of the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.22** ? . I see none. Congratulations to the State Party. (Applause)

Viet Nam

Mr Chairman may I have the floor.

The Chairperson

Yes you may.

Viet Nam

Thank you Mr Chairman. The year 2010 is of great significance to the Vietnamese people and the Hanoians in particular. The entire people of Viet Nam is celebrating 1,000th anniversary of Thang Long in Hanoi. The Committee decision to inscribe the Central Sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long is the most meaningful and much awaited birthday present for the entire Vietnamese people. By putting this site on the World Heritage List the Committee has not only accepted the Outstanding Universal Value of the site but has witnessed more than a 1000 years of history of independent Viet Nam ever has been continuous as a political power until now. But ladies and gentlemen, most importantly, you have helped the people of Viet Nam to pay tribute and gratitude to our ancestors who have created a civilization in this Red Centre River. Until this very moment in Viet Nam a memorial service is being conducted in favour of the inscription. I understand that inscription is not only the end of the process of four years of operation for this nomination, with the involvement of so many people, experts, scholars, and also politicians, heads of state, head of government who watched this nomination. We understand that this is not the end of the process of our responsibility this is the beginning of our responsibility and implementation of a whole range of commitment. Indeed we have implemented half way of the recommendations put forward by ICOMOS. Ladies and gentlemen the Vietnamese people are grateful to you at this historic moment. I would like to thank all the members of the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS and especially all the experts, Vietnamese and foreign alike, who are here present and who are not being able to be present here. But their thoughts are with us and I would also like to thank all those who have made this possible. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

I want to thank and congratulate the representatives of the State Party and this is the 900th inscription on the world Heritage List. Congratulations.

The next property to be examined is in the **The Republic of China. The Historic Monument of Dengfeng in “The Centre of Heaven and Earth”** and I will now be handing over to ICOMOS for the details of the nomination of the Dengfeng Monuments in the Centre of Heaven and Earth.

I was wondering whether I could call the meeting to order. Committee members may we continue please. I shall hand over to ICOMOS now so that we can hear the details for the nomination for the Historic Monuments of Dengfeng in The Centre of Heaven and Earth. Over to you ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. The Historic Monuments of Dengfeng in The Centre of Heaven and Earth is situated in Henan province which is shown on this map. There are eight clusters of buildings around the locality of Mount Songshang and adjacent to Dengfeng city. This map shows the groups of buildings with to the north some of the peaks of Mount Songshang, one of the sacred mountains of China and to the south Dengfeng City. There are seven groups of buildings clustered between the mountain and the town and one, the observatory, is separated to the south west. This briefly shows you the relationship between the buildings and the mountain and the city. This nomination was referred back at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in order to allow the State Party to re-examine the relationship between some of the nominated sites and the mount and Mount Songshang and to consider what the overarching rationale for them as an ensemble was to be. There are eight groups of nominated buildings and I will look at each of them very briefly.

The first group are Han Que gates. These are five early Han dynasty Que gates or temple gates of three sites. These particular gates were constructed in 123 AD and flanked now demolished temples. They are decorated in low relief and their vivid pictures include dance troupes visiting them from the Roman Empire. They are nominated with the footprints of the now vanished temples which once they led to. The third set of gates is one of a pair built in 118 AD that flanked the entrance to Taishi temple which was used for sacrifices to the mountain. The Taishi Temple has been rebuilt, many times since the 5th century and its buildings now mostly date from the 19th and 20th centuries in what is known as the official architectural style and is now known as the Jong Gway Temple. This just gives you a view from the Mountain above looking back over the temple towards the city and within the temple a view of two of the buildings.

The second group of buildings around the Songway Pagoda, which is nearer the slopes of the mountain. This pagoda was built in the 6th century for an emperor on the site of his temporary palace. None of the contemporary buildings survived and it is now surrounded by much later buildings built in the Ching Dynasty. The temple is noted for its ancient trees, some of which are said to date from the Han Dynasty. The design of the pagoda with its parabolic contour and tubular form was extremely innovative at the time of its construction.

The third complex is that of the Shaolin Temple. This is to the north-west of the site and is notable for its pagoda forests of 241 pagodas, each built to commemorate an eminent monk and for the Tushu Temple built to commemorate the first patriarch of the Chan sect of Buddhism in 1125. The Tushu Temple is noted for its beautiful flowing relief carvings which you can see here. And here are some examples of the pagodas erected between the 6th and the 19th centuries.

The next cluster is the Quishan Temple originally built in the 12th century and repaired frequently since, but many of the main timber elements survived. It is associated with a noted astronomer and this gives you some idea of the exterior and interior.

The fifth group of buildings is the Songyang Academy of classical learning, created in the Tan Dynasty and the surviving buildings date from the 17th century. When built, this was one of the great academies of classical learning from the Song Dynasty disseminating Confusian ideals. Within the grounds is a Cyprus tree that is possibly one of the oldest in the world, reputed to be 4500 years old. You can see it on the bottom left of that photo.

Finally the sixth cluster is the Dengfeng Observatory some 15 kilometres from Dengfeng town, built in the 13th century and purported to be one of the 27 built under the orders of Kublai Khan. Only this and one in Beijing survived. This extraordinary building is a creation of the astronomer Go Shu Jing in the late 13th century to measure the solstices as a means of establishing an accurate calendar. And his was almost as accurate as ours today. I think there's a five seconds difference. To the south of the observatory is the Jugong Sundown platform that was said to commemorate the spot from where the centre of Heaven and Earth was established. This nomination was referred in order to establish how the collection of buildings could be perceived in relation to each other and to the mountain. In the original nomination and the first revised dossier, the link between the margin and the buildings, built under the patronage of emperors over many dynasties were spelt out in terms of power and influence of the mountain in constitutional and religious terms. The latest dossier has changed the focus of the link between the various buildings to the link with Dengfeng. The area as the Centre of Heaven and Earth, this ensemble is now said to reflect the power of Dengfeng as a cultural centre, as one of the earliest capitals of China and with the idea of Dengfeng as a centre of Heaven and Earth. This concept was partly an astronomical concept, but also linked to the centre of imperial power, and Mount Songshan was seen as the physical marker of the Centre of Heaven and Earth. ICOMOS has carefully considered how the nominated buildings can be said to reflect this concept. The Observatory and the Quishan Temple can be linked directly to ideas in astronomical terms. For the remaining buildings these can be said to reflect the way the area is perceived to be the Centre for Heaven and Earth and attracted imperial patronage over many centuries which are reflected in the buildings. ICOMOS, does however consider that this intellectual idea that overarches the nominated series does need to be explained more clearly at the individual buildings in order that their links can be very clearly understood. ICOMOS considers that the property justifies criterion (iii) and (vi) and we are happy that the integrity and authenticity have been met. We don't have any issues with boundaries protection, conservation and management.

In summary, we would like to recommend that this site is inscribed on the list on the basis of criterion (iii) and (vi). We further recommend that the State Party give consideration to extending the buffer zone to coincide with the boundary of Mount Sonshan National Park, something that was suggested by the State Party, and secondly to provide adequate interpretation of the property to ensure that this link between the component site and the concept of Heaven and Earth is very clearly understood. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Is there anyone from the committee that would like to take the floor at this stage in relation with this nomination. If I don't see any requests for the floor and no comments as concerns inscription of this site. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you Chair. Estonia fully supports the inscription. Thank you. (Applause)

The Chairperson

I shall hand over to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Mr Chairperson I almost felt that we had adopted the Draft Decision without my intervention. The Draft Decision 8B.24 is on page 21 of the English version and page 22 of the French version and I have not received any written amendments.

The Chairperson

Members of the Committee, may we consider that this **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.24** can be adopted. Adopted. Thank you. (Applause) I see that the Republic of China is delighted. You have the floor China.

China

Thank you Mr Chairman. It is my pleasure to extend our heartfelt thanks to the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and all those who have helped us with this nomination. The inscription of the Historical Monument of Dengfeng in the Centre of Heaven and Earth on the World Heritage List means not only the honour and international recognition of our conservation efforts in the past, but also our further commitment to protect this cultural property in line with the spirit of World Heritage Convention. Now the government of Henan Province has accomplished broadening the buffer zone boundary of the heritage property according to the recommendation by ICOMOS. We will endeavour our best for the conservation and the management of the heritage property in the future. I would like to take this opportunity to extend our warmest invitations to all of you to visit China for this new born World Heritage property in the Centre of Heaven and Earth and the other cultural properties as well. Thank you.

The Chairperson

My congratulations again to the Peoples Republic of China. Congratulations! Now let us move to the following site which is **Sarazm in Tajikistan** –. I invite ICOMOS to present the details of this proposed nomination. You have five minutes ICOMOS. I should ask the technicians to please bring up the slides on the screen. Thank you.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Il s'agit d'une inscription différée par le Comité en 2007 afin de confirmer les valeurs et l'importance du bien, d'étendre les dispositifs de protection des fouilles, de réduire leur nombre et de mettre l'accent sur des méthodes non invasives, enfin de mettre en place une unité de conservation du site. Le site archéologique de Sarazm témoigne d'une sédentarisation précoce en Asie centrale du 4^e millénaire avant J.-C. à la fin du 3^e millénaire. Il montre une proto-urbanisation évoluée et un premier développement de liaison marchande à grande échelle. En termes de catégorie de biens culturels, il s'agit d'un site, il s'agit aussi d'une ville morte, dans la catégorie des villes et centres villes historiques. Le site archéologique de Sarazm est situé à l'ouest du Tadjikistan, non loin de la frontière avec l'Ouzbékistan. Le bien est la partie centrale blanche, constituée des fouilles les plus significatives. Il est entouré d'une première zone tampon spécialement protégée en bleu, correspondant à des fouilles plus anciennes et à un espace de circulation. La zone tampon en jaune indique les parties dépendant des communautés villageoises, la partie en rose indique des terres agricoles de statut public. Sarazm est situé sur un emplacement stratégique dans la vallée de Zeravchan. Elle est au débouché d'une importante région montagneuse et à l'entrée d'une plaine qui s'ouvre largement vers l'ouest. Voici différentes

vues générales du bien et de la zone tampon. Au sud, la route nationale borde la zone tampon.

Au Nord et à l'ouest les villages d'Avazali et de Shahibnazar sont constitués de constructions basses. Une série de trois toitures plates, protège aujourd'hui les sites de fouilles les plus fragiles. Une partie des fouilles anciennes a été comblée afin de protéger les vestiges restant. Une série de fouilles archéologique a été opérée depuis 1979 sur 13 sites principaux. Elles ont permis de bien comprendre les différents niveaux d'occupation ainsi que l'urbanisme de Sarazm. Les résultats récents confirment l'importance de l'urbanisation et les fonctions de production artisanale destinée à des échanges diversifiés, parfois à grande distance. L'occupation proto-urbaine de Sarazm s'est faite à partir de la première moitié du 4^e millénaire avant J.-C. Elle s'est poursuivie de manière continue jusqu'à la fin du 3^e millénaire. Le peuplement consiste en des zones bâties dédiées aux habitations, à des zones de stockage et à des espaces ouverts. Sarazm ne présente pas de plans clairement définis, l'ensemble proto-urbain qui ne possédait pas d'enceintes de protection s'étend dans différentes directions sans délimitations clairement mises à jour. La ville a ensuite été abandonnée pour être fortuitement redécouverte au XX^e siècle. Sarazm comprend également des édifices palatiaux et de culte, tous sont essentiellement en briques de terre crue d'une grande variété de taille, de forme et de mise en œuvre. Les toits étaient plats avec des poutres en bois couverts par un réseau de branches et de roseaux supportant une ou plusieurs couches de terre argileuse. Un cercle funéraire particulièrement riche atteste d'une occupation importante vers 3500 ans avant J.-C., ainsi que de rites en lien avec l'Asie centrale.

Les techniques et les matériaux des parures funéraires montrent les échanges avec le Moyen Orient et avec l'Océan Indien. Les ressources de Sarazm provenaient d'abord de l'élevage et de l'agriculture irriguée dont quelques vestiges subsistent, mais elles proviennent surtout d'un important artisanat dans la poterie, cela à toutes les époques, mais aussi de la transformation et du travail des métaux à l'âge du bronze, ainsi que de l'exploitation des richesses minérales des montagnes voisines, avec la turquoise, le lapis-lazuli, les agates etc. Les activités artisanales ont fait de Sarazm un centre d'échanges commerciaux à longue distance particulièrement précoce. L'importance du bien et ses valeurs ont été confirmées par les recherches récentes. Des techniques de sondage géophysiques ont été utilisées avec profit.

L'ICOMOS considère que l'intégrité du bien est acceptable, mais elle est encore mal définie, par méconnaissance des limites exactes de l'urbanisation. L'authenticité est satisfaisante, le bien répond au critère (ii) et au critère (iii) et la VUE a été démontrée.

L'ICOMOS considère que les menaces principales pesant sur le bien sont le risque d'un développement des constructions et des chemins mal maîtrisés et bien entendu la pression des éléments naturels. Les délimitations du bien sont satisfaisantes et correspondent à l'état actuel des connaissances. Les travaux de conservation réalisés à ce jour sont satisfaisants. Ils marquent une progression qualitative conforme aux recommandations du comité. Ils doivent être poursuivis et systématisés. Un système de gestion est en place, mais il demeure fragile et insuffisamment présent sur le bien lui-même. L'ICOMOS recommande que Sarazm, Tadjikistan soit inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (ii) et (iii). Différentes recommandations complémentaires à caractère plus technique sont proposées par l'ICOMOS dans ses évaluations. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much ICOMOS. Would anyone like to take the floor for any comment? Over to the rapporteur.

Rapporteur

The Draft Decision is on page 22 of the English version and page 23 of the French version of the document. I have not received any written draft amendments. However, the Advisory Bodies have asked me to notify you that the last part of paragraph B should be slightly reformulated as to the version you have in print. After the settlement of Sarazm and would then read: and to further the knowledge in relation to the recent discoveries, especially in relation to metallurgy and metal working handicrafts other than ceramics. So the replacement text would be: ... “and to further the knowledge in relation to recent discoveries”. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I wonder the Committee would agree to the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 25** as read out by the Rapporteur. Can we agree that this can be adopted. Adopted. (Applause) Now I hand over to the State Party for a few words.

Tajikistan

Dear Mr Chairman, distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan and the National Commission for UNESCO, I would like to express my gratitude for inclusion of the site of Sarazm to the World Heritage List. Sarazm is one of the very ancient heritages of humanity that existed around 6000 years of history and was witness to several development and wars that destroyed traditions and monuments. In this regard the safeguarding of the historical heritage does not only have historical and tourist importance, but also it has intellectual significance. I would like to thank the Members of the Committee, headed by Mr Bandarin and the experts from ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM for their significant activity in this important job. Also many thanks to Brazilian site for hospitality and good organization of the event that is giving positive results and wish the Brazilian people prosperity and success. I believe that the inclusion of Sarazm in the World Heritage List is one step forward to the significance of the historical heritage of Tajikistan and will close bilateral cooperation between Tajikistan and UNESCO. Thank you very much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much for those most appreciative comments and now I would like to give the floor to our Rapporteur with respect to this site.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. Mr Chairperson I hope that the State Party is still listening despite the congratulations going on because I still have the duty to ask the State Party if they would consider the proposed name change for the site acceptable. If perhaps somebody could indicate to the State Party that I am trying to address them at this very moment.

The Chairperson

The rapporteur would like to consult on the possible name change. Thank you very much says the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

.... by the Advisory Body in paragraph 4A as acceptable to the property. The property was proposed as Sarazm, the alternative names proposed are “proto-historic settlement site of Sarazm” or “Proto-urban site of Sarazm”. Would any of these two options be acceptable to the State Party.

Tajikistan

Yes, it is acceptable.

Rapporteur

Which of the two would you prefer or would you allow the rapporteur to choose one of the two.

Tajikistan

“Proto-urban site of Sarazm”.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. This is the first site to be listed from Tajikistan. Let us have a round of applause for Tajikistan. (Applause)

Let's move on to the next property ladies and gentlemen. And this is the **Major Mining Sites of Wallonia in Belgium** and I would like ICOMOS to provide details on this particular site.

ICOMOS

Les sites miniers présentés sont les mieux conservés de l'exploitation charbonnière en Belgique du début du XIX siècle à la seconde moitié du XX. Ils témoignent tant de l'exploitation minière que de l'architecture industrielle de l'habitat ouvrier, de l'urbanisme et des valeurs sociales et humaines de leur histoire. En termes de catégorie de biens culturels il s'agit d'une proposition d'inscription en série de quatre ensembles. Situé le long du sillon X qui va de la frontière française à la frontière allemande, les quatre sites miniers sont d'ouest en est 1) Grand Hornu près de Mons, 2) Bois du Luc, 3) Bois du Cazier à Charleroi et 4) Blegny-Mine près de Liège.

Le charbonnage et la cité ouvrière du Grand Hornu comprennent 12 éléments principaux, au sein d'un ensemble industriel urbain et architectural fortement intégré. Il a été conçu dans les années 1810 par le fondateur du charbonnage Henri de Georges et l'architecte Bruno Renard. Les parties industrielles centrales furent réalisées entre 1816 et 1832 et l'habitat ouvrier qui l'entoure a été mené à bien durant la première moitié du XX siècle. L'ensemble participe au projet utopiste des débuts de l'ère industrielle en Europe. L'Etat de conservation est variable allant de situations hors d'eau à des ruines. Le centre d'art contemporain de style résolument différent s'intègre de manière satisfaisante dans l'ensemble patrimonial existant. L'ensemble industriel est encadré par la cité ouvrière représentant un ensemble important de 450 maisons étroitement associées au projet patronal initial. L'unité d'apparence a été perturbée par les restaurations contemporaines et les adaptations fonctionnelles des propriétaires pour l'essentiel d'anciens mineurs.

Le charbonnage et la cité ouvrière de Bois du Luc comprennent 22 éléments bâtis ou ensembles bâtis répertoriés, dont la majorité a été construite entre 1838 et 1909. Toutefois le charbonnage est l'un des plus anciens d'Europe remontant à la fin du XVII siècle. Le vaste site industriel a été en grande partie démoli lors de l'arrêt de la mine en 1973. Il avait à de maintes reprises été restructuré et complété d'installations techniques nouvelles autour de la fosse St Emanuel. Celle-ci dispose encore de nombreux éléments techniques et industriels dont certains remontent au milieu du XIX siècle. C'est aujourd'hui un ensemble muséographique.

La cité des carrés ou Bosquetville a été entreprise en 1838 suivant un plan viaire symétrique en croix et une rue de ceinture. Il délimite quatre ensembles bâtis. Les façades sont régulières et homogènes sur deux niveaux tout au long des rues, gérée par une société d'habitat social l'ensemble urbain est dans un excellent état de conservation extérieure. Bois du Luc comprend également un quartier nord et un quartier nord est développé à partir de la fosse du Bois. Ils sont marqués par un important habitat individuel et collectif de la seconde moitié du XIX. Le charbonnage de Bois du Cazier correspond à une exploitation minière du XIX siècle, mais dont les composantes actuelles sont de la fin du XIX siècle et surtout de la première moitié du XX. Le bien proposé pour inscription est formé de 26 éléments répertoriés. Le site industriel est installé autour des puits de mine Saint Charles et Foraky suivant une organisation rationnelle de l'espace. Il exprime un paysage industriel minier caractéristique, scandé par trois façades à pignons, les ateliers en ligne parallèle, les chevalements, et non loin les terrils, aujourd'hui recouverts de verdure. La structure des ateliers et des bâtiments exprime la fonctionnalité minimaliste propre à la période de restructuration du site, il ferma définitivement en 1967. L'histoire de ce charbonnage est marquée par la dernière grande catastrophe minière de l'histoire européenne en 1956 accompagné de 262 victimes dont une majorité de mineurs immigrés. Le charbonnage de Blegny-Mine est exploité depuis le XVIII siècle, il a toutefois été reconstruit à plusieurs reprises notamment à la suite de destructions intervenues pendant la seconde guerre mondiale. Le bien proposé par inscription comprend treize éléments répertoriés dont quelques-uns sont anciens au milieu d'une structure industrielle minière typique du milieu du XX siècle. L'exploitation houillère a été en activité jusqu'au début des années 1980, les équipements de surface ont été conservés. Le site fut rapidement reconverti en musée de la mine. Blegny-Mine illustre le développement industriel et minier des charbonnages en Europe occidentale au cours du XX siècle. C'est l'un des derniers carreaux de mines à avoir été en fonctionnement en Europe occidentale. Il a conservé ses éléments techniques monumentaux, ses terrils et leurs équipements ainsi qu'une part significative des galeries souterraines.

L'ICOMOS considère que le bien répond dans son ensemble aux conditions d'intégrité d'une façon satisfaisante. Mais certaines lacunes sont à noter. Le bien répond également à un niveau suffisant d'authenticité. L'approche en série est justifiée par une sélection de sites pertinente et complémentaire. Le bien proposé répond aux critères (ii) et (iv) et la VUE a été démontrée. Toutefois l'ICOMOS considère que les menaces pesant sur le bien lui-même sont faibles. Par contre une pression du développement urbain existe dans les zones tampons non prises en compte par la protection. Les mesures de protection en vigueur sont d'un niveau trop inégal suivant les sites et en l'état elles ne sont pas satisfaisantes. La conservation est d'un niveau trop disparates entre les différents sites et elle doit être complétée, coordonnée et planifiée par la mise en place d'un plan de conservation pour l'ensemble du bien. Le système de gestion ne comporte pas d'instances clairement définies de coordination et de coopération entre les différents sites composants le bien en série.

L'ICOMOS recommande que l'examen de la proposition d'inscription des sites majeurs de Wallonie, Belgique sur la liste du patrimoine mondial soit différée pour permettre à l'Etat partie de clarifier la situation de propriété de Blegny-Mine et de contractualiser la concession de sa gestion, de revoir la zone tampon à Bois du Luc, de rendre effective une protection des composantes du bien par des mesures systématiques d'inscription sur la liste des monuments historiques et des sites culturels protégés de Wallonie. La protection doit être coordonnée entre les différents sites. Afin de formaliser et de promulguer un système de protection harmonisée des zones tampons en rapport direct avec la valeur universelle du bien, de mettre en place un plan de conservation pour l'ensemble du bien, d'officialiser et de rendre effective une structure de concertation et de coordination de la gestion conformément au paragraphe 114 des orientations. D'autres recommandations plus ponctuelles seront faites par l'ICOMOS. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. The floor is open. France you have the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je prends rapidement la parole pour exprimer le soutien de la Délégation française à l'analyse qui a été faite par le rapporteur de l'ICOMOS et notamment la qualité de cette analyse très fine et extrêmement complète. Je voudrais profiter Monsieur le Président si vous m'autorisez, de cette intervention pour porter une clarification concernant le travail des organisations consultatives et faire une intervention quelques peu solennelle. Je crois que nous ne pouvons pas laisser planer la moindre ombre sur la qualité des travaux des organisations consultatives et sur la compétence des personnes qui les intègrent. Nous pouvons ne pas partager leur avis, mais au nom de la Délégation française, et je crois traduire le sentiment des Etats membres du comité. Je souhaite exprimer mon profond respect à l'égard de leur travail.

The Chairperson

Switzerland you have the floor.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais me faire l'écho des paroles élogieuses prononcées par le délégué de la France. Ayant eu l'occasion de travailler depuis le début de cette session, de manière relativement étroite, avec les organisations consultatives. J'ai pu apprécier comme lui l'indépendance d'esprit, la compétence et l'objectivité de leur approche toujours guidée Monsieur le Président par la promotion de l'esprit de la convention. Je partage donc personnellement, comme d'ailleurs les experts suisses qui m'entourent et qui l'ont déjà relevé, la confiance de la France dans le travail remarquable des experts des organisations consultatives. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Sweden you have the floor.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairman. I also endorse the comments of the distinguished delegate of France has spoken about and expressed. The Advisory Bodies are doing a great job and work and we really rely on the high-quality expertise. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Egypt you have the floor.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. L'Egypte n'a aucun doute sur la qualification et la qualité du travail de la part des organes consultatifs. Les organes consultatifs ont contribué à la définition de normes et de standards pour l'évaluation et les procédures, le règlement de la convention et nous appuyons, soutenons le travail des organes consultatifs. Ce que l'Egypte

a essayé de montrer, peut-être de manière maladroite, et qu'en fait il y a une différence entre l'évaluation à la ligne selon un système bureaucratique d'évaluation sur le dossier qui est présenté par certains Etats qui n'ont pas tout à fait les ressources ni les capacités building pour établir, former un dossier et qu'il faut tenir compte et appuyer, donner l'aide à cet Etat à arriver à être aux normes, aux standards d'évaluation des organes consultatifs. Voilà ce que je voulais ajouter. On a eu des propositions de conversation bilatérale avec les représentants des organes consultatifs. Je pense qu'on a eu une conversation assez constructive. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Egypt. We have a property, we have a clear recommendation from the Advisory Body. If I see no further request for the floor I am going to turn it over to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

The decision is on page 24 of the English version and on page 25 of the French version of document 8B and I have not received any amendments.

The Chairperson

I would like to check with Members of the Committee as to whether or not they agree with this **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B. 27?**. Adopted. (Applause)

The next property is the **Episcopal City of Albi in France** and I am going to give the floor to ICOMOS with respect to the Episcopal City of Albi in France.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The nominated property contains the core of a medieval town which expresses in its urban, architectural and building fabric its long and contentious histories from the Middle Ages to the present day. In terms of category, this is a group of buildings and is also an inhabited historic town. Albi lies on the southern western edge of the Massive Central in the Midi-Pyrénées Region. Albi developed on the left bank of the Tarn River since ancient times throughout in the Middle Ages when it became an important seat of power and trade. The townscape is marked by the imposing masses of the Sainte Cécile Cathedral and the Episcopal church the Palais de la Berbie. The old bridge, the Saint Salvi Collegiate church. The four medieval quarters surrounds and completes these prominent complexes. The Palais de la Berbie was designed and built as an Episcopal fortress, starting from the 13th century after the Catholic church suppressed the Albigensian heresies and restored its control over Albi. The palace housed the seat of the inquisition and the prison for the Albi region. The vertical enclosed aspects of the edifice together with the intensive use of bricks gives the structure an oppressive appearance. In the 16th and 17th centuries its military aspects was softened and some buildings were replaced and gardens created. Sainte Cécile cathedral is a fortified church with tall vertical walls and narrow openings. Semi-circle buttresses form vertical ribs and reinforces its verticality. The cathedral conveys a sense of fortress of faith. Internally the cathedral was later profusely decorated and its striking contrast with the exterior. The building has been restored at the end of the 19th century by César Daly in the spirit of the de Luc.

The Saint Salvi Collegiate Church lies in the heart of the district of the same name and forms a counterpoint to the Cathedral. Its architectural reflects a long continuum of building campaigns from 10th to the 15th century and it is the largest Romanesque building in the region. The Old Bridge (*Pont Vieux*) was built over the Tarn during the first half of the 11th century at the crossroads of the Massive Centrale route to the Grande Valley and the

East West road along the Massive Central foothills. Here we have Castleviel quarter that coincides with the older settlement, the ancient Celtic *Oppidum*. Combes Quarter was the commercial centre of the medieval town while Saint Salvi has been for long remained an autonomous part of the town close around the Collegiate Church. Castleviel developed a contemporary with the direction of the Cathedral and here we have some examples of the well-developed bricks as building materials. Different examples of structures and techniques of use.

Further, we have images of the urban structure before and after renovation work that has reinforced the integrity and the urban quality of the town. Despite certain alterations to the historic fabric of the old city and the cathedral, the integrity of the nominated property has been retained and the conditions of authenticity are satisfactory. Two of the three criteria proposed have been demonstrated. But criterion (ii) has not been justified according to ICOMOS in that Albi bears witness to having been a regional stage for cultural interchange but not a perceivable influence on the other centres of art in France and Europe.

Boundaries of both the nominated properties and the buffer zones are justified and adequate. Protection is ensured through several laws that afford protection to the monuments and the urban fabric of the nominated property and the buffer zone. Conservation is ensured through annual maintenance and restoration programmes.

Management framework is provided by existing plans and regulations and these have been consolidated into a management plan. Coordination among the institutions in charge of the protection and management is provided by a Property Committee that has been established in 2009. The monumental and urban elements of the Episcopal City of Albi bear witness to an undertaking which is both temporal and spiritual after the suppression of the Carthar heresy by the Roman Catholic Church. This has been materialized in monumental and urban structures which are representative of the period and has demonstrated to maintain their validity through the centuries. ICOMOS therefore recommends inscription on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v). ICOMOS has also provided some recommendation about this proportionate constructions and the necessity to develop indicators for tourist development. You can see the details in page 280 of the evaluation volume for ICOMOS. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you says our Chairman. The floor is open. Cambodia you have the floor.

Cambodia

Merci Monsieur le Président. La cité épiscopale d'Albi en France constitue un ensemble urbain éminent et de valeur exceptionnelle. Le dossier qui présente ce bien est remarquable, tout autant que l'analyse de l'ICOMOS qui souligne en particulier l'intégrité et l'authenticité du paysage urbain d'Albi, ainsi que le bon fonctionnement du dispositif de protection de cette cité médiévale. Nous appuyons chaleureusement l'inscription de ce bien sur la liste, sur la base des critères (iv) et (v).

The Chairperson

If there are no further requests for the floor I am going to pass the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 24 of the English and on page 25 of the French version of your document and I have not received any draft amendment. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Members of the Committee, would you agree then to adopt this **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.28?** Adopted. (Applause) I would like to congratulate France and I would give the floor to the French representative to make comments.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaiterais remercier les membres du comité pour leur soutien à l'inscription d'Albi, les organisations consultatives pour leur appréciation positive et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. C'est un sentiment d'émotion et de fierté que j'éprouve en cet instant. Certes Albi est une ville et un site magnifique de VUE, comme la communauté internationale vient de le reconnaître. Certes Albi travaille depuis des années à sa conservation. C'est un effort de la communauté tout entière, un engagement de long terme qui a permis aujourd'hui cette inscription. Mais surtout Albi est une ville qui illustre au plus haut degré le devoir de solidarité. Albi en effet a développé des coopérations décentralisées avec la ville d'Abomey au Bénin. Et j'ai le grand honneur d'avoir à mes côtés et le maire d'Albi et le maire d'Abomey en cette occasion. Ils donnent ensemble un magnifique exemple de coopération sur le patrimoine. Si vous me le permettez je céderai la parole au maire d'Albi qui est à mes côtés.

Mayor of Albi

Les Albigeois remercient la communauté internationale pour la reconnaissance et l'inscription de la cité épiscopale au patrimoine de l'humanité. Vous nous permettez avec émotion de partager des valeurs, de partager le meilleur du talent des hommes, une universalité de la beauté. Les remerciements vont aussi au Brésil. Le musée national consacre une exposition à Lucio Costa. Sur un panneau un dessin de Costa, cinq lignes verticales, une flèche sur celle du milieu, et à côté Costa a écrit argotique. Costa a symbolisé la cathédrale d'Albi et sa valeur universelle. Nous vous en remercions.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Congratulations to the French Delegation and the Mayor of Albi. Now we shall continue with our work. Our congratulations to the French Delegation for this fantastic inscription.

The next property is the **Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht, Netherlands** .I would like ICOMOS to present the details of the nomination.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. L'ensemble urbain historique du quartier des canaux à Amsterdam a été conçu à la fin du XVI siècle et mené à bien au cours du XVII. Projet de ville port entièrement nouvelle à partir d'un réseau hydraulique fait de programmes immobiliers successifs, c'est une urbanisation modèle à l'apogée des provinces unies. En termes de catégorie de biens culturels, il s'agit d'un ensemble. Il s'agit également d'une ville historique dans la catégorie des cités historiques vivantes. Le bien présente un ensemble cohérent de quartiers construits successivement en trois phases principales autour de la ville médiévale. Le district urbain central forme la zone tampon. Un réseau de canaux en arc concentriques fourni l'infrastructure principale complétée de canaux et de voies radiales. Ces canaux ont été creusés simultanément pour le drainage, pour le transport fluvial et maritime, ainsi que pour l'organisation rationnelle de l'urbanisme. Le long des quais les alignements présentent une succession de maisons individuelles aux façades à pignons caractéristiques, mais

toutes différentes. Elles étaient simultanément consacrées à l'habitat familial, au commerce en rez-de-chaussée et à l'entrepôt des marchandises dans les étages supérieurs. Le bien comprend un ensemble de ponts et de dispositifs hydrauliques de contrôle des eaux. Les ponts ont généralement conservé leur forme architecturale des XVII et XVIII siècles. Les écluses les plus importantes ont été modernisées. Bien que situées en dessous des eaux marines la ville n'a jamais été inondée. Il s'agit de l'extension ex-nihilo d'une ville portuaire et commerçante à la tête du négoce international de son époque. Elle est dirigée par des élites marchandes qui en assurent la planification rationnelle sur plus d'un siècle. Les perspectives visuelles et le paysage urbain ont généralement gardé une excellente authenticité à deux exceptions notables, la transformation de la Vesperstraat en voie rapide d'accès au centre-ville et l'apparition de silhouettes d'immeubles contemporains élevés au Nord-est. Les éléments de modernisation urbaine inévitables restent généralement discrets et acceptables.

Les transformations de l'habitat ont essentiellement concerné l'intérieur des bâtiments. Les entrepôts des XVII et XVIII siècles ont été reconvertis en appartements ou en bureaux au XX siècle tout en respectant les façades à pignons et leurs ouvertures. De nombreux édifices religieux s'intègrent dans les espaces lotis et dans les alignements de l'urbanisme. Ils témoignent de la grande diversité des croyances qui au XVII et XVIII siècles firent de la Hollande un pays de tolérance et un des berceaux de la démocratie européenne. D'une manière générale, le bâti a été bien conservé et convenablement restauré dans le respect des façades extérieures. Il comprend aujourd'hui 4000 maisons et édifices classés monuments historiques. Amsterdam et tout particulièrement son quartier des canaux illustre l'épanouissement économique et culturel des Pays Bas au XVII et XVIII siècles, ainsi que son influence internationale. La ville a paru comme la concrétisation de la cité idéale sur un territoire à priori hostile à l'homme. La principale agression visuelle de ces dernières années a été l'apparition d'immenses panneaux publicitaires sur les façades en cours de restauration, le district urbain d'Amsterdam a entrepris une politique de contrôle drastique de la publicité privée et s'engage à la faire disparaître. Les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité sont remplies pour la plus grande partie du bien. L'ICOMOS considère que le bien proposé pour inscription remplit les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité. Il répond aux critères (i), (ii), et (iv) et la VUE a été montrée. L'ICOMOS considère que les principales menaces pesant sur le bien sont le développement des immeubles urbains de haute taille dans son environnement ainsi que les affichages publicitaires agressifs. Malgré une complexité évidente tant du bien lui-même que des formes d'interventions, la conservation a été efficace jusqu'à ce jour. Le système de gestion du bien est satisfaisant. L'ICOMOS recommande que la zone des canaux concentrés du XVII siècle à l'intérieur du Singekgracht à Amsterdam, Pays Bas, soit inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (i) (ii) (iv) et la VUE a été démontrée. L'ICOMOS considère que les principales menaces pesant sur le bien sont le développement des immeubles urbains de haute taille dans son environnement, ainsi que les affichages publicitaires agressifs.

Malgré une complexité évidente tant du bien lui-même que des formes d'interventions, la conservation a été efficace jusqu'à ce jour. Le système de gestion du bien est satisfaisant. L'ICOMOS recommande que la zone des canaux concentrique du XVII siècle, à l'intérieur du Singelkgracht à Amsterdam, Pays Bas soit inscrit sur la liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (i) (ii) et (iv).

L'ICOMOS a formulé d'autres recommandations à caractère plus ponctuel ou plus techniques, en particulier de poursuivre l'application des mesures de suppression de l'affichage publicitaire agressif et de fournir un rapport précis de la situation pour examen lors de la 35^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. L'ICOMOS a reçu une lettre d'erreur factuelle et l'a prise en considération. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The floor is now open, if there are any States Parties that wish to express any comments about this nomination. I shall pass over to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 8B.30 is on page 25 in the English version and on page 26 of the French version of document 8B and I haven't received any written amendments.

The Chairperson

I should now consult with the Committee. Can we consider that this **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.30** can be adopted? Approved. Adopted. (Applause) I congratulate the Netherlands Committee for the inscription of this property and I now hand you the floor.

The Netherlands

Allow me to pass the microphone to the City Counsellor of Amsterdam.

City Counsellor of Amsterdam

Thank you Mr Chairperson. On behalf of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the City of Amsterdam and of its population, consisting of 178 nationalities I want to express that we are very proud that we are listed on the World Heritage List. We see it as a recognition of an area during 400 years there was an atmosphere of spiritual freedom, cultural expression and a lot of economical development. We are sure that that atmosphere will be continued in the future. And in so doing that we contribute to a sustainable city. I want to just that we fully want to comply to the advice ICOMOS has given us and by the way we want to thank ICOMOS for its superior work in its documents about the city. We also want to state that we fully want to comply with the management plan that we put forward and that we are very glad to do that. My last point that I want to make is that our Ministry of Culture and the City of Amsterdam are very willing to cooperate with any country, area or city to exchange vision and knowledge about cultural heritage. Finally my last point I all want to invite you to a small reception with drinks afterwards when you are ready downstairs in the Foyer. Thank you all very much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Congratulations to the Netherlands and thank you to the Mayor of Amsterdam.

Congratulations to the State Party the next nomination is regarding **Darwin's Landscape Laboratory in the United Kingdom** and I give the floor to the Advisory Body.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairperson. This property, under a different name Darwin Downe and with different boundaries was assessed by ICOMOS in 2006 and 2007 and was not recommended for inscription. The State Party (interruption by The Chairpersonperson – Would you please keep silent)

Darwin Landscape Laboratory under a different name Darwin Downe and with different boundaries was assessed by ICOMOS in 2006 and 2007 and was not recommended at that time for inscription. The State Party withdrew the nomination before being examined at the 31st World Heritage Committee at Christchurch in 2007. The nominated property is located in the UK in the London Borough of Bromley, South-East of London. It includes Darwin House where he lived and worked and the surrounding landscape

that he used as his study object. The nominated property is a site and it is also a cultural landscape. The nominated property includes the farmed and semi-natural landscape and the variety of habitats near Downe that Darwin observed along the 40 years. After he returned from his 5 years long travel on the *Beagle*, visiting many sites that stimulated his ideas.

The buffer zones gives the two areas frequented by Darwin which have undergone major changes. Here in this picture you can see the most relevant environment and places of the nominated property observed by Darwin for his research on the left picture, while on the right one Downe Estate with the feature mainly stepped up or transformed by Darwin for his study purposes. We have the farm landscape here near the Downe and Cudham valleys. The network of access and paths and lanes that were used by Darwin to circulate in the area, the woodlands and hedgerows, the grasslands and meadows, the forests, the wetlands and then we pass Downe House, the external part, with the experimental bed, the old study and the greenhouses and here we have the verandahs with the climbing plants and then the Great Pucklands Meadows and then finally Downe village.

With respect to integrity ICOMOS knows that the nominated property does not cover the entirety of the landscape laboratory used by Darwin in his scientific work. Downe on its own does not represent Darwin's work. The integrity of the site is further affected to a certain extent by the intrusion of modern infrastructures and authenticity is not to be considered met by the property. As noted in ICOMOS's previous evaluation the features of Downe House related to Darwin's work were recreated for educational purposes after his death. In terms of the wider landscape, changes in farming methods have caused continued erosion of the tail end and threatened today the biodiversity of the site.

In terms of comparative analysis ICOMOS observes that Darwin's scientific work was influenced by his travels around the world and that there are already several world heritage natural properties that could be associated with Darwin's ideas, because they were started by him. And additionally there is already one natural world heritage property on the list – the Galapagos Islands – the OUV of which contains explicit reference to Darwin. ICOMOS notes that criterion (iii) is used when property bears tangible testimony to a cultural tradition through their materiality has modified by humans. Darwin mostly observed parts of the nominated property and only a fraction has been modified intentionally by him to carry out his experimentation.

As for criterion (vi) while Darwin's ideas and theories are not in question and the universal value, the nominated property alone does not exhibit the imprint of Darwin's thinking in a visible and tangible way. The Committee has limited the use of this criterion in order to avoid listing of all places associated with famous people and therefore the two proposed criteria have not been justified, and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property on its own has not been demonstrated.

The boundaries of the nominated property as it is proposed by the State Party are adequate. Increase of buffer zone may be helpful for protection. The protection, conservation and management measure are adequate but the threats to the property are not easily removable due to the strong and not reversible trends in urban growth, abandonment of agriculture and modifications in farming methods. ICOMOS recognizes the significant efforts made by the State Party to achieve a better representation of the cultural heritage of the world in the World Heritage List. However, the World Heritage Convention is not a Convention to inscribe famous people, but it is a property based convention. The association with ideas of universal significance including scientific ideas needs to be reflected by tangible evidence which in this case does not appear sufficient and cannot be said to be reflected by the property only. The nominated landscape laboratory is only one of the several laboratories that Darwin used to develop his theories and it cannot be disconnected from the other places that Darwin studied and its value cannot be seen only in relation to the values of the others. The World Heritage Committee has given a definition and interpretation for criterion (iii) and 6(vi) with the intention to limit their scope. Extension and their interpretation of scope should

only be done after careful examination of the implication and therefore, ICOMOS recommends that the nominated property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The State Party has sent a letter containing factual errors and ICOMOS has taken into account these errors, but nevertheless the recommendation remains the same. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS and I now invite the Members of the Committee to express their comments. Sweden you have the floor Madam.

Sweden

The only nomination of a landscape which was subject of study and experiments in the house and garden leading to the development of a biological scientific theory of fundamental importance. It is also bearer of tangible evidence for the understanding of this theory. We also believe, on the contrary to ICOMOS, that the number of such other nominations would be very small if one talks about scientists in biological sciences of global reputation. We see this nomination very much as a test case for inclusion of heritage of biological sciences in the World Heritage List. The advise not to inscribe will probably mean that fundamental aspects of the heritage of science related to specific sites never can be included in the World Heritage List. We would therefore ask ICOMOS if the concept heritage and science and scientists work and theories as it is reflected and reserved in a site would be impossible to present in the future. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Sweden. Barbados asked for the floor. Just for the second time would you mind giving the floor to Barbados and after that to ICOMOS. Thank you very much. Barbados you have the floor.

Barbados

Barbados wishes to congratulate the State Party for its excellent work in constructing such an extraordinary nomination. By offering a site such as Darwin's Landscape Laboratory the State Party has provided the Committee with a unique opportunity to expand the horizon of the history and advancement of scientific fort within the context of the World Heritage Convention by giving careful and conscientious consideration to what is essentially a test case for the recommendations presented of the World Heritage Science and Technology Workshop to assist in the advancement of a global strategy for representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. We also wish to thank the Advisory Bodies for their diligent and painstaking work in the conduct of their evaluation. I regret to see however that we cannot accept the deductive basis from which they have drawn their conclusions. Which would tend to suggest that the site has no OUV present nor that it justifies the proposed criteria on which this would be based. Why do we say this. We would like to offer our thoughts to our colleagues as to why we believe that the Committee cannot and must not support the narrowly argued precepts advanced by ICOMOS as a basis for such a pre-emptory dismissal of this site from our consideration. Time does not allow for detailed deconstruction of all these precepts, however, we feel that the Committee would be failing in its work if it did not take the time to consider some of the major arguments advanced and Mr Chair to allow the State Party to refute these through clear explanation of their consideration of these points. ICOMOS in their evaluation has observed that it has consciously avoided recommending places linked to famous men and women when those places do not have outstanding universal value in their own right. And later on ICOMOS concludes that the value of the property derives specifically and solely from the association with Darwin's merits. However, in our reading of the dossier we are absolutely clear that this was simply not the basis advanced for the justification of this site. Instead States Parties indicated that firstly, Downe's house and its associated gardens and lands as well as the

surrounding farmed landscape provided a scientifically and strategically selected locale which became Darwin's Landscape Laboratory and within which he was able to test his theories based on regular, meticulous, systematic and sustained observation of natural phenomenon over a long period of time. And thus provided the tangible context with his original scientific thought.

Secondly it is that the location and the permanence of the site which afforded Darwin the opportunity to reflect on his ideas and develop his theories through both his writings and his continuous and comprehensive communication with colleagues all over the world during the four decades of his association with the site. Downe thus provided the crucible (The Chairperson interrupts – Would you complete please – I would be very strict.) I am sorry chair I need to finish these details.

Downe thus provided the crucible in which as is stated to test worldwide opinion of his developing theories from Downe. Thirdly and most compellingly Darwin's Landscape Laboratory is the property where the modern scientific study of natural life was pioneered with the development of the theory of evolution by natural selection and from which emerged such formidable works of science including the origin of the species and thus for us represents one of the greatest and most lasting testimonies to the value of international scientific cooperation, particularly in the context of modern thinking (Chairman – would you please complete) of biology and biodiversity. Chair, if you do not allow the explanations that I am advancing then we cannot take into account the work that was advanced by our own Experts Group which concluded that to include systems of knowledge which may have historical, traditional, indigenous and/or contemporary. These typically included predictive ideas, modes of explanations based on observations of nature or deductive discoveries that are logical or radical in their own terms and can be validated and are open to change and refutation through further observations. We believe that this site clearly (The Chairperson interrupts – I think that the Members of the committee have the file, would you please conclude your intervention. Thank you very much.) Yes Sir, I will in this way. We believe that this site clearly illustrates the justification precisely in the kinds of observation of nature met here and thus we do not accept the kind of circular logic or conceptual basis which ICOMOS has advanced to determine that only the visible manipulation of nature for predetermined reasons could justify the application of criteria which were of course developed primarily for constructed heritage in the various forms. We thank you Chair for allowing us this opportunity to take these points into consideration. I have arguments but I would like Chair for you to invite the State Party to offer its advancement on this.

The Chairperson

I listen to you. Would you precise a technical question that you address to the State Party. I will give the floor to ICOMOS to reply to Sweden.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairman. First of all ICOMOS does underline that there are already properties that have been inscribed for scientific association and merit and secondly, that the Convention in itself includes reference to science. That means that the Convention allows already inscription of sites that are related to science. In this particular case the assessment that ICOMOS has carried as a conclusion as a suggestion not to inscribe the site is related to the fact that the property which is the thing we have to evaluate in this case is not the only place that Darwin has used as his landscape laboratory and therefore does not reflect in its entirety Darwin's work. We are not discussing Darwin's merit or the universal significance of his work, but this property mainly reflects biographical aspect of his way of conducting research. He has been travelling for five years around the world on the Beagle and visited many places, some of which are already on the World Heritage List for their natural merits and this place has been quoted and cited by Darwin himself in his diaries. That is why ICOMOS has believed that this particular site, Darwin's Landscape Laboratory, should not be

inscribed. This does not mean that any further proposal that can be put forward by the State Party or other State Party that are related to biological science and want to demonstrate the association their relevance of the sites in relation to this aspect of science could not be inscribed. This is not the position of ICOMOS. ICOMOS has assessed this specific property and this is the result of the assessment. I hope I have answered your question.

The Chairperson

Thank you madam. Barbados please.

Barbados

Chair, the arguments advanced by ICOMOS I understood these. What I also understood was that the difference in way science was observed cannot be interpreted as being extended to each of the sites he visited. So I would like you Chair to ask the State Party to give us the understanding of the fundamental basis of their comparative analysis of this site. Because this is a critical point alongside the way in which they have approached the physical phenomena that were observed. Thank you.

The Chairperson

State Party you have two minutes to reply.

United Kingdom

Thank you Mr Chairman. First of all I would like to say that this nomination is about a place with a clear and tangible link to an idea of Outstanding Universal Value. This is not about Darwin the man. We think that this is the only nomination likely relating to Darwin's work. Since this is a place where he carried out most of his work. While he spent five years (Chairperson interrupts – Excuse me, would you just reply to the questions asked by Barbados. Thank you very much) Thank you Mr Chairman, I believe I was doing so, while he spent five years at the outset of his career travelling around the world and indeed gathering data from 1842 until his death 40 years later he spent most of life in the area proposed for inscription. And it was here that his detailed, meticulous observations in the landscape, together with his experiments in the house and garden which enabled him to develop his theory of evolution, which now underpins modern thinking on biology and biodiversity. This is unlikely to be the only nomination for a landscape as the subject of study leading to the development of biological science and scientific theory. But we believe that the number of such other nominations would be very small. For example, the rise of systematic biology on which Sweden is working. On his return to England Darwin set out a list of questions he wanted to answer. In his questions and experiment. A list that he wrote in London in 1839 a field work and other inquiries he wanted to undertake but was unable to do so in London's built up area. And this was one of reasons why Darwin moved to Downe in 1842 and it was to find an area with access to a wide range of habitats to enable him to answer these questions. Many of his most productive lines of research in Downe on birds, insects, plants and other biodiversity was anticipated in the questions and experiments. And it was here that in this place that Darwin made his very special observations and theories. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Estonia you have the floor sir.

Estonia

Estonia welcomes the discussion the United Kingdom has initiated and finds it very important for the development of the implementing the World Heritage Convention. However, we are of the opinion that this Convention is first and foremost a Convention of physical

heritage. It means that the sites inscribed must have certain features that have the Outstanding Universal Value of their own and connections with great people and their ideas can only complement it. In the case of Darwin's Landscape Laboratory the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed site is connected with Darwin's ideas only as the landscape itself is typical to London's surroundings. Using a comparison of Isaac Newton one might ask whether his ideas which the falling apple stimulated would justify inscription of the apple tree in question on the World Heritage List. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you madam. Bahrain, you have the floor Sir.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Mr Chair. Bahrain welcomes this nomination and already reads the proposal with interest during the previous submission in 2007 which was not discussed by the World Heritage Committee after withdrawal by the State Party. We would like to commend the State Party for bringing this item to our discussion, despite the unfavourable recommendation by the Advisory Body. Bahrain recognized that this nomination is a milestone submission in the context of the World Heritage Convention and as such presents the challenges that established bodies face being presented with new concepts. We have here the criticism that this nomination is focused too much on the person, Darwin. After examining the nomination carefully Bahrain does not agree with this critic. The nomination is focused on a natural laboratory that was essential in guiding a scientist towards developing a new theory of human evolution. The fact that this scientist was Darwin makes him inseparable from this theory as Einstein would be inseparable from the theory of relativity of linears from biological classification. Perhaps the State Party proposing the property was not wise in its name proposal which Bahrain would have preferred to be called the Landscape Laboratory of Evolutionary Studies at Downe. Nevertheless we think that this site proposed reflects a significant achievement in human history whether one agrees with Darwin's theory or not we must acknowledge that it has shaped human society and our conception of human life. No other place could represent this change of our self conception better than the landscape laboratory used by Darwin. We therefore we think we would like to see this site on the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson

Thank you Bahrain. Australia you have the floor.

Australia

Thank you Sir. Clearly this is a nomination that is brave and does evoke passion around the room, which is very exciting to see. I would like to congratulate ICOMOS for the quality of its evaluation. I think also for the nature of response to the questions that was imposed already, in particular I think noting that there are already places on the list that relate to development of science and scientific theory. We certainly agree with Bahrain in relation to the point on the name of the property, but Mr Chairman to help us in reaching a decision on this point I wonder whether if through you we could pose a question to IUCN to discover whether they have a perspective on this sort of site as well. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. IUCN you have the floor sir.

IUCN

To be brief we have a perspective, in fact it is set out in our evaluation report, and I can answer questions in relation to the document provided.

The Chairperson

Thank you. You have answered the question. Thank you very much. Next speaker – France you have the floor.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais dire tout d'abord qu'avec un dossier de ce type nous sommes finalement au cœur du débat sur l'avenir de la Convention, enfin d'une certaine façon, parce qu'il s'agit d'envisager des catégories de bien que l'on a effectivement jusqu'à présent pas envisagé et c'est un problème assez compliqué. Mais la question qui est finalement posée c'est celle des valeurs associatives et des lieux de mémoire, parce que finalement c'est le fait que Darwin ai vécu et travaillé dans un certain endroit qui fait que l'on associe son œuvre à cet endroit.

Je dois dire que sur la liste du patrimoine mondial il existe déjà un certain nombre de biens qui répondent à cette définition. Je m'excuse, un seul exemple qui me traverse l'esprit quand on a inscrit la prison de Robben Island en Afrique du Sud, nous n'avons pas inscrit un exemple de prison du XX siècle, on a inscrit le lieu de détention de Nelson Mandela. Et c'était la valeur associative qui était évidemment prépondérante. Alors cette réflexion elle se pose particulièrement en ce qui concerne la pensée scientifique parce que si nous regardons la liste du patrimoine mondial, cette pensée scientifique est finalement peu représentée, en tout cas sous-représentée par rapport à beaucoup d'autres événements historiques guerriers, brutaux ou religieux etc. qui sont le tissu même du patrimoine mondial. Il y a donc là avec ce dossier une ouverture, que personnellement j'accueille favorablement.

Maintenant peut-être que le saut que cela représente pour les décisions du comité du patrimoine mondial est un petit peu haut. Peut-être qu'il y a une réflexion plus large à mener, au-delà de ce cas peut être il y a un groupe de travail, une réunion, j'en sais rien, c'est une proposition que je fais, mais je pense que nous sommes là au seuil d'une nouvelle manière d'envisager des biens sur la liste du patrimoine mondial et il me semble que c'est un sujet tout à fait important qui doit être considéré dans toutes ses implications.

The Chairperson

Thank you France. Brazil you have the floor.

Brazil

Well just for the comments made by colleague from France, and I share entirely the views expressed. We also carefully listened to the comments made by the State Party and by the Delegation of Barbados. I would like to address three precise questions to the State Party. First, is Darwin's Landscape Laboratory really unique or one of many similar properties. Second question - Would it be possible to nominate a smaller area such as Darwin's house, garden and other land he owned, next to the garden. And finally, could the State Party provide clarification on the integrity of the site. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Thank you Brazil. State Party you have the floor.

United Kingdom

Thank you Mr Chairman. I think in answer to the first question from the State Party of Brazil whether Darwin's Landscape Laboratory is really unique - we believe it is really unique. Whilst this is unlikely to be the only nomination of a landscape, the subject of the study dealing to scientific theory, we believe that this is a very important one and one of the

few properties worldwide which can still demonstrate the evidence for major discoveries in a tangible way in the area of biodiversity. Secondly, on the subject of whether it would be possible to nominate a smaller area, such as for example, Darwin's house, or garden etc., this is not being suggested by the Advisory Bodies. We consider that such a nomination would not be viable since the landscape is the basis of the scientific discovery, while his house and garden are clearly important, they do not tell the full story of the theory of evolution. This depended very much on Darwin's observations on the landscape as a whole, and one of the great strengths of the nomination is that the landscape which is studied survives. It survives substantially in tact so it is possible to see the same evidence which Darwin studied. It is possible to walk in his shoes. On the subject of integrity Mr Chairman, very quickly, we believe that the property has integrity. The landscape is still a patchwork of pasture, arable and woodland as it was in Darwin's time, including all the attributes necessary to the understanding of the development of the theory of evolution through natural selection. Yes, despite minor intrusions, such as power pillars, of which there are a few and some modern traffic, the pattern of landform and land use remains much as it was in the 19th century. It is important that the character and the pattern of the landscape is maintained in the face of changing agricultural practices. We believe this site truly has the integrity that is required. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. The next speaker, Switzerland, you have the floor.

Switzerland

Thank you Sir. Over the past few weeks we have had a great deal of impassioned discussion on this particular nomination and a number of us are open to a new approach in terms of World heritage based on immaterial factors and we understand that such factors can contribute to OUV. However, in this case, and this is a very fundamental issue we are in fact dealing with, we share the point of view of Estonia, the Downe Landscape does not have any exceptional material aspects, its landscape you can find in many places elsewhere and the only thing that is special about it that Darwin lived and worked here. He studied that landscape, that is very important for the history of science, but in our view it is not adequate for inscription on the World Heritage List. We would like once again to draw the attention of the Committee to the major implications as such an inscription can imply. Let me give you an example. La Provence landscape that we all know well in France, obviously it inspired a whole range of modern artists, Van Gogh, for example, that had an undeniable impact on modern art and sunflowers still grow there. Could we inscribe Provence. I know I am taking liberties with the comparison and I excuse ahead of time for making such a suggestion, particularly given the great amount of work that was put into this particular nomination. But it would seem to me that we need to be very careful and concerned with implications of inscribing such a property finally sir. It would seem to us that it might be much more opportune to have Europe, which is over-represented on the World Heritage Site, it seems a bit inappropriate to have us benefitting from a new exception to the rule. Unfortunately this might be a difficult decision, but we believe that it should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Switzerland, Iraq you have the floor.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chairman. For the factor of time I would endorse the two distinguished representatives of Bahrain and Australia and secondly I would argue with my distinguished neighbour, the French gentlemen, why not Darwin first and Mandela second.

The Chairperson

Thank you Iraq. South Africa you have the floor Sir.

South Africa

Thank you Mr Chairman. There are many instances of the use of criteria (vi) in cultural landscapes and other sites where there is little or no material evidence of the ITS that exists in the landscape. But in which the landscape by its very existence continues to bear testimony. One thinks of sites on the list that have similar qualities such as sacred forests. Incidentally all of these are inscribed on at least criteria (iii) and (vi) and to a greater or lesser extent than this nomination have physical association with the ITS that gives them value. It is now not clear to us at this point in time from the ICOMOS report why it sees this site differently from the others that seem to fit into the same category. And we believe that the Committee needs greater clarification in this regard before it can begin to really formulate an opinion on a nomination that potentially takes the Convention in a new and valuable area. Thanks chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you madam. I think that ICOMOS replied to the questions asked by Barbados. Do you want me to give the floor to ICOMOS to repeat the same or are you satisfied with what ICOMOS has given before.

South Africa

Thanks Chair. I think we need more clarity from ICOMOS.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS you have two minutes.

ICOMOS

Thank you chair. Thank you for the question. ICOMOS wishes to draw the attention on the fact that the property in itself cannot be considered to satisfy the criteria because first, criterion (iii) is being used usually for properties that bear tangible testimony to a cultural tradition through their materiality as I explained before and in this case most of the property has been observed by Darwin that is not modified by him. The fraction that has been modified, let us say recreated, for the data purposes as said before. For criterion (vi), in this case ICOMOS opinion would be used not to bear witness and association to a scientific tradition, but to Darwin's way of conducting scientific work, that is very much a biographical association, connected to a person, is not the entire way of conducting scientific research and some of the features that have been put forth by the State Party, like for example, the sand walk connects in fact reflects the way in which Darwin developed his ideas more than a scientific way of conducting research. That is why ICOMOS believes that the property does not satisfy the criteria. Particularly criterion (vi) that is for the associations, because recalling the previous committee decision that were taken not to consider only criterion (vi) but should be considered in association with another criteria and also because the Convention itself is not for celebrating or commemorating people that is why ICOMOS does not believe that the property meets the criteria. I hope I have answered the question.

The Chairperson

Thank you Madam. I have no further requests for interventions so I would like to suggest we give the floor to our Rapporteur for the examination of the Draft Decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 26 of the English version and on page 27 of the French version of document 8B and I have received one draft amendment by the Delegation of Barbados which concerns paragraph 2 and the introduction of a new paragraph 3. The existing paragraph 1 would remain as is. Paragraph 2 would read: Inscribes Darwin's Landscape Laboratory, United Kingdom on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii) and (vi) and the newly introduced paragraph 3 would adopt a statement of Outstanding Universal Value as would be distributed to you in the room. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

The Chairperson and the Rapporteur have the feeling that there is no consensus about the inscription of the site and I would like to ask the Legal Adviser for his point of view how to formulate the amendment of Barbados.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman, but I think Switzerland asked for the floor before.

The Chairperson

Switzerland you have the floor Sir.

Switzerland

I would like to ask the vote for this question. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson.

Thank you Switzerland. Nigeria?

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman, I think there was a question raised by Bahrain to the State Party to consider the possibility of changing the name of the property, probably that might allay the fears raised by ICOMOS.

The Chairperson

We closed the debate and now we may examine the Draft Decision.

Nigeria

It is part of the Draft Decision Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

No it is not part of the Draft Decision and not in the amendment given by Barbados. Thank you. Estonia you have the floor sir.

Estonia

Thank you. Estonia asks for a secret ballot in this matter.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. Mexico please.

Mexico

Yes sir, we support the request from Estonia.

The Chairperson

Thank you Mexico. So we will have 10 minutes up until the Secretariat prepares the envelopes for voting. Any suggestions for tellers. Egypt.

Egypt

I want to know what we are voting for and what is the majority needed.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to the Legal Adviser, while the Secretariat prepares the envelopes for voting, to give you more information about the voting process and the majority needed.

Legal Adviser

In the interest of time since the ballot papers are not ready we have been asked whether you could continue discussing further sites while the Secretariat prepares the material for voting. We have stated that if you have no objections we have no objection either, as long as it is understood that when the ballot papers are ready you can proceed to vote.

The Chairperson

Thank you again Legal Adviser, would you give more information about the voting process. I know that all the members of the Committee are aware of the process but as it was asked by Egypt again I will give you the floor. Point of order - Brazil please.

Brazil

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Just for clarification. We didn't start the process of voting yet. The ballot papers are not ready. I would like to suggest a compromise solution before going to the vote. It will be may I start the voting process I imagine. I would like a clarification on that. To the Legal Adviser.

The Chairperson

Point of order from Australia.

Australia

Mr Chairman, we would like to hear from the Legal Adviser as a qualification but certainly not any continuation of discussion and to the rules of procedures once the vote has been called by both we must proceed.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. I completely agree with you. Legal Adviser?

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman, I would concur that the voting process had already started. The only issue was that the ballots were not ready so we were going to suggest that you continue with the discussion of other subject matters and reverting to the vote once the papers were ready. But the voting has already started.

The Chairperson

Thank you Legal Adviser. I give the floor to the Rapporteur for the reading of the text to be voted.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. It seems the papers are ready so that we can start with the announcement of the text. You would be voting on the Draft Decision 34 COM/8B.31 and the question on your ballot paper is: Do you agree to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List? Thank you very much Mr Chairman. The ballot papers will be distributed now I understand. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I would like to suggest that to choose as the tellers are China and United Arab Emirates. Any objections. Barbados you are asking for a point of order.

Barbados

I'm asking for information chair.

The Chairperson

I don't think I have the right to give you. Legal Adviser only the?

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman. If it is information on the vote that she wants Yes.

The Chairperson

Is it information on the voting?

Barbados

Yes chair. I want to know whether it is possible to entertain Nigeria's approach which was to ask the Committee whether it would be prepared to consider another option which is referral.

The Chairperson

Thank you Barbados. Once the voting process has started as I understood from the Legal Adviser could we suspend that.

Legal Adviser

That would be a different amendment. So then you would have two amendments. It would be the amendment that you proposed and then it would be the amendment from South Africa. So you would have to vote on three amendments. We will have to start. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

The rapporteur just confirmed to me that we received two further amendments and I will now give the floor to our rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I believe I have received in the meantime two amendments, or at least one has arrived.

The Chairperson

Switzerland a point of order.

Switzerland

Yes, I'm sorry chair. Thank you very much Chair. For me the voting procedure had started. We have two objects upon which we must vote. Firstly, the proposal that we have in front of us that is to not inscribe and the proposal we have in front of us to inscribe. There was no third or fourth alternative sir, these came forward after the commencement of the voting procedure and I think the Legal Adviser would back me up on this. Thank you very much Sir.

The Chairperson

I have the same impression as you says The Chairperson. I have the same impression as you and I would like to have confirmation from the Legal Adviser if possible. Thank you.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman. The Committee has to vote whether to inscribe the site or not which is the resolution on the table. If that doesn't go through then it proceeds on the vote on the amendment proposed by Barbados. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So I give the floor to our Rapporteur for reading the text for voting.

Rapporteur

The ballot papers are being distributed to you and the text is written on the ballot paper. The question you have to answer is "Do you agree to inscribe the site on the World Heritage Site?" and the three choices you have is to say Yes, No or to Abstain. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you to our Rapporteur. I now ask the two tellers to come to the podium. We are going to start the process of distribution of the envelopes. China and United Arab Emirates.

The majority needed in fact is confirmed as two thirds. Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, did you vote? Thank you. Brazil, Cambodia, China, Thank you China, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates. The voting is finished. Would you join your seats please. The results of the voting: The number of valid votes: 20; the majority of two thirds means 14. The results of voting: Yes for inscription: 4; against: 16; abstention: 1.

Thank you. The Rapporteur confirmed to me that she received two further amendments from Bahrain and France and I would like to give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland:

Excuse me Chair. But here I am quite surprised. These amendments have arrived afterwards and that is quite a different case as if we have had four or five amendments and we have voted on them one after the other. The voting procedure had already commenced and the Committee has just decided in its majority not to inscribe the site. So we are not going to start all over again looking at alternatives. Whilst the Committee's decision has zero value. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you Sir. France do you maintain your amendment still?

France

So it looks like we handed our amendment at the right time I think.

The Chairperson

Your amendment was received after the start of the voting process France. I see that the Rapporteur shares my opinion.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The French amendment was indeed I believe received just before the voting started. But in any case I think the draft amendment is still open and the usual practice is that we can still receive amendments while considering the draft amendments. Thank you.

Switzerland

I'm sorry chair.

The Chairperson

France do you maintain your amendment?

France

Yes.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président, mais je ne pense pas qu'on puisse renverser une décision qui a été prise par le comité. Le Comité s'est prononcé sur le fait de la non inscription et je ne vois pas comment on peut renverser cette décision. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Merci à la Suisse. Je donne la parole au conseiller juridique.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Chair. I shall try to clarify the situation which is becoming even more thornier. The Draft Decision contained the decision not to inscribe. Before the vote commenced France had requested for an amendment. I can't remember whether it was for deferral or referral to the State. We proceeded to the vote and the Committee by a majority decided that it did not want to inscribe, did not agree to the inscription, of the property but the other amendment to the decision is still on the table. It was further removed and it has to be voted upon now to see whether there is a decision on that amendment. Thank you. Do you want to add anything John.

Perhaps a further clarification would be useful. Switzerland would be absolutely right if the other amendments concerned inscription or not or variations on inscription. The amendment that was furthest removed, if the amendment had passed and if the Committee had decided on inscription, the other two amendments would not be voted on, because it would be no sense in voting on them. Since the first amendment did not pass there is the option still for the Committee to decide some other action than inscription. That is what France is now proposing and the Committee may vote on that because it does not involve inscription or not. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Legal Adviser. If I understood well so I am going to give the floor to our Rapporteur to read the amendment of France and I will ask the Member States to act on either by voting or by any other method.

Rapporteur

I apologize Mr Chairperson I fear I need some more clarification by the Legal Adviser because I still have the amendment by Barbados and Bahrain which was submitted while the vote was going on and I would need to know if I have to consider those as these would be the next furthest removed.

The Chairperson

If I understood well from the Legal Adviser we are going to move further with the amendment of France and then the amendment of Barbados. Or we have to choose between them. And this is the question.

Legal Adviser

We are of the view that you should consider only the amendments that were introduced before the vote. The amendment of Barbados came after the vote.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So we have just one amendment from France and now I am asking our Rapporteur to read the amendment from France.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The amendment I received by France concerns paragraph 2 of the current Draft Decision and introduces a new paragraph 3 into the current Draft Decision. The first paragraph would remain unchanged. Paragraph 2 would be deleted and be replaced by the following text. "Differs the examination of the nomination of the Darwin's Laboratory Landscape, United Kingdom to the World Heritage List".

Paragraph 3 would introduce new text that I will read in the original language: Requests the World Heritage Centre to organize a meeting for consultations on the site presenting an Outstanding Universal Value and not only on an associative basis. So the new paragraph 3 “Requests the World Heritage Centre to organize a meeting for deliberating on sites presenting a Outstanding Universal Value and not only on an associative basis”. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you Britta. Now I am asking the members of the Committee who are in favour of the French amendment to raise their sign please.

[Point of order by Switzerland.]

The Chairperson

Switzerland you have the floor.

Switzerland

First of all I would like to ask the Legal Adviser what it means “valeur associative” according to the Convention. The second point I would like to ask if we vote that we vote on secret ballot. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you Switzerland. Legal Adviser please.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman. In response to the question by the Delegation of Switzerland, “valeur associative” the answer to this would be “criteria for Outstanding Universal Value the Secretariat has given me the text be directly material associated with events or living human values which have an exceptional universal value and the Committee consider that these criteria should be used as a priority in conjunction with other criteria. This is the text given to me by the Secretariat.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Legal Adviser. This is in the founding texts, I just want to remind members that we are voting on the deferral decision. We agree on this. It is a decision to defer the exam. And for the moment I have only Switzerland who has mentioned the desire for a secret ballot vote. I just want to save time to ask the Committee Members who is in favour of a secret ballot. Barbados you want the floor.

Barbados

Yes chair. Since it seems to give some people a level of comfort why not a secret ballot. I will second it.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I am going to ask China and the United Arab Emirates to come again to the podium. Thank you. I am giving the floor to our Rapporteur for the reading of the text to be voted.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. We are still on voting on Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.31. The question of the voting paper which is being distributed in a few seconds is "Do you agree to defer the examination of the nomination of the site on the World Heritage List?".

The Chairperson

Thank you. Legal Adviser would you please cite the majority required.

Legal Adviser.

I am sorry. Thank you Mr Chairman. The voting on this amendment is a procedural matter for which you require a simple majority of members present and voting. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Would you repeat it again Legal Adviser.

Legal Adviser

Mr Chairman, I said that the matter on which you are now voting requires a simple majority of the votes of Members present and voting. Thank you.

The Chairperson

So everybody is ready. We are going further with the voting. Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Egypt, Estonia, Serbia, France, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates. Thank you. End of voting.

The number of valid votes: 21, Majority required: 11. The number of Yes:11; the Number of No: 10. Agreed. The **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.31** is adopted. And the debate is closed.

We are moving to the next item which is concerning the **Upper Harz Water Management System, extension of Mines of Rammelsberg and Historic Town of Goslar in Germany**. I give the floor to ICOMOS. Would you join your seats please. We are going to continue with our work. Thank you. ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Il s'agit d'une proposition d'extension des mines de Rammelsberg et de la ville historique de Goslar qui ont été inscrites en 1992 sur la base des critères (i) et (iv). Le système hydraulique du Harz accompagne l'exploitation de minerai pour la production de métaux non ferreux depuis près de 800 ans. Complexe par ses nombreux éléments, mais il est cohérent. C'est un lieu majeur de l'innovation minière dans le monde occidental en termes de catégorie de biens culturels, l'extension proposée forme un ensemble. Par ailleurs le bien et son extension forment une série de cinq ensembles principaux. Le bien hydraulique est situé dans un massif montagneux le Harz, au sud-est des mines de Rammelsberg et de la ville de Goslar. Il comprend également des vestiges miniers et au sud l'ancien monastère de Walkenried. Depuis le Moyen Age, des retenues d'eau ont été aménagées à des fins minières dans ce massif montagneux du Harz, au centre de l'espace germanique. Il est en particulier riche en métaux non ferreux. Ces mines ont nécessité l'organisation et la gestion continue d'un vaste ensemble de barrages, de digues et de fossés. Ceux-ci sont faits de terre et de pierre, ils disposent de nombreux éléments techniques de gestion de l'eau. Dans ce massif rocheux, relief complexe, la première

fonction du système hydraulique est le drainage. Afin de pouvoir exploiter le minerai en profondeur, des dizaines de kilomètres de galerie ont été creusés au fil des siècles. L'organisation rationnelle du système hydraulique minier a été entreprise au XII et XIII siècles par les moines de l'abbaye cistercienne de Walkenried, dont subsistent le cloître et les vestiges de l'abbatiale. Plusieurs sites miniers aujourd'hui arrêtés complètent le patrimoine légué par l'exploitation continue de nombreux métaux non ferreux, l'argent, le plomb, le cuivre etc. les galeries sont s'enfonçaient jusqu'à près de 700 mètres sous terre au début du XIX siècle. Traditionnellement et cela depuis le Moyen-Age, l'utilisation de l'énergie hydraulique par la roue à eau a toujours été d'un niveau exemplaire. Des puits d'accès et des chambres sous-terraines pour les anciens dispositifs de pompage des eaux forment un patrimoine ancien qui inspira l'ouvrage de référence d'Agricola, *De Re Metallica*, à la Renaissance. Le Harz fut de tout temps un modèle de développement minier, c'est l'un des rares lieux industriels majeurs en Europe qui s'est passé de la vapeur au XIX siècle au profit des moteurs hydrauliques. L'ICOMOS considère que malgré certaines lacunes ponctuelles, les conditions d'intégrité et de d'authenticité sont remplies. L'extension proposée et le bien déjà inscrit forment une série qui a été justifiée par l'Etat partie. Le bien proposé pour extension renforce les critères (i) et (iv) déjà reconnus pour le bien inscrit et l'ICOMOS considère que le nouveau critère (ii) proposé par l'Etat partie a été démontré pour l'ensemble par rapport à de nouvelles recherches historiques et archéologiques. L'ensemble du bien déjà inscrit et l'extension proposée, témoignent d'échanges d'influence considérables dans le domaine de techniques minières et hydrauliques du Moyen Age aux époques modernes et contemporaines dans la sphère européenne. En revanche le critère (iii) qui était également demandé n'a pas été démontré.

L'ICOMOS considère qu'il n'y a pas de menaces notables pesant sur le bien à court et à moyen terme. Par contre il n'y a pas d'autorité de gestion, ni de système de plan de gestion commun avec celui des mines de Rammelsberg et de la ville historique de Goslar.

En conséquence l'ICOMOS recommande que l'extension soit renvoyée à l'Etat partie afin de lui permettre de mettre en place un système de gestion pour l'ensemble du bien, y compris son extension, instituer une autorité transversale de gestion et de coordination comme demandé au paragraphe 114 des orientations. Diverses recommandations complémentaires ont également été formulées par l'ICOMOS sur des points particuliers. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. For the Member States to commence. I see Bahrain. You have the floor sir.

Bahrain

Thank you Mr Chair. I would like to address a question to the State Party if you allow me Mr Chair regarding the management plan if they have any recent information regarding the implementation or the preparation of the management.

The Chairperson

Thank you Bahrain. State Party you have two minutes to answer.

Germany

Merci Monsieur le Président et merci pour la question, je la donne à mon expert qui est le chef de l'agence pour la protection du bien et le patrimoine mondial dans la région. Monsieur Lingart.

(Expert continues in English) Thank you very much for the question. So the overarching institution has been signed, the foundation is founded, the office will take up his work immediately after a positive decision of the World Heritage Committee. Without prior constitution and the name heritage office will be constituted in proper libeling. So all things which are challenged are fulfilled.

The Chairperson

Switzerland you have the floor sir.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Dans ce cas-là, comme dans les autres cas qui étaient analogues, la Suisse soutient l'inscription de ce site.

The Chairperson

Merci à la Suisse. La France.

France

Etant donné l'heure, Monsieur le Président, je serai extrêmement bref et je soutiendrai la position exprimée à l'instant par la Suisse. La Délégation française, puisque l'Etat partie nous a fourni toutes les informations complémentaires nécessaires, soutient l'extension dès cette année.

The Chairperson

Mercin à La France, la Fédération de Russie.

Russian Federation

Referring to the last information given by the State Party I suppose that we have to approve the extension.

The Chairperson

Thank you Madam. Sweden you asked for the floor.

Sweden

Permission to inscribe this site.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Jordan please.

Jordan

Thank you Mr Chairman. Jordan endorses the suggestion by Switzerland and go for inscription.

The Chairperson

Thank you Jordan. I would like to give the floor to our Rapporteur for adoption of the Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.33.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 27 of the English and page 28 of the French versions of your document 8B and I have received one draft amendment by the State Party of France. It addresses paragraph 2 of the current Draft Decision as well as paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision. The proposal is as follows: Paragraph 1 of the current Draft Decision would be retained. Then in paragraph 2 the existing paragraph would be deleted including subparagraphs small (a) and small (b) and replaced by the following text: "Approves the extension under the culture criteria of the Mines of Rammelsberg and historic town of Goslar to include the Upper Harz Water Management System, Germany on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv)". France would then accordingly introduce a new paragraph 3 which adopts the following statement of Outstanding Universal Value which again would be distributed to you and further France retains the current paragraph 3, including subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c), which would then become new paragraph 4. Thank you Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Are there any objections regarding the adoption of the amendment of France. ICOMOS would you like to comment. You have the floor.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. L'ICOMOS estime que le critère (iii) n'a pas été pleinement justifié. C'est la première remarque. La deuxième remarque, il faudrait proposer un nom pour l'ensemble et nous proposons le suivant, le réseau minier de Rammelsberg, de la ville historique de Goslar et le système hydraulique du Haut Harz.

The Chairperson

So I am turning to France. Would you turn what you mentioned in your amendment.

France

Monsieur le Président nous acceptons les modifications qui viennent d'être apportées à notre amendement.

The Chairperson

Regarding the amendment proposed by France for the inscription of extension. I see none. The **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.34** is adopted. Thank you very much. Congratulations to the State Party. I give the floor to the Rapporteur. She has something to ask.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I was just informed by the Secretariat that in this name we would need an indication as to what the new overall name of the property would be after the inclusion of the extension.

The Chairperson

State Party you have two minutes for the statement and if you would like to reply to the question asked by the Rapporteur. You have the floor madam.

Germany

Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. On préfère vraiment le propos qui a été fait par la France. Ici je peux remercier tout le Comité, je le fait cordialement pour cette décision qui nous encourage de continuer à travailler pour le patrimoine mondial et travailler pour le patrimoine certainement que nous avons sur notre territoire. Nous remercions cordialement aussi ICOMOS pour sa bonne analyse et ses bons conseils qui nous a beaucoup aidés pour faire tout comme il faut. Et maintenant permettez-moi de donner la parole à mon voisin, le représentant du Land Basse-Saxe, l'ancien ministre Herzch, qui est en même temps le Président de notre commission nationale, il est accompagné par Monsieur Lingart avec qui vous avez déjà parlé.

Mr Chair, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Government of Lower Saxony and by the Harz region people to express our deep thanks to the Committee, the Secretariat and especially to ICOMOS in charging on the Outstanding Universal Value of the extended site and we think that with a new management authority, which was established following the suggestion of ICOMOS, it is realized that in future that all demands of caring and bewaring of the site are realized. We appreciate the spirit of cooperation of all concerned during the process and we assure continuing our constructive dialogue with ICOMOS as well as with the authorities of local people and Goslar in the Harz region to the best of the confirmed and extended World Cultural Heritage property. We will undertake all possible efforts to beware and care for the site in contribution to the ideas and goals of the World Heritage Programme of UNESCO, for its own sustainable future, mankind needs all the conscious possible of its common cultural and natural treasures. Again thanks to all of you. Thank you very much warmly.

The Chairperson

Thank you sir and congratulations to the State Party. Now I would like to move to the next site regarding **The Røros Mining Town and the Circumference, extension of "Røros Mining Town" in Norway** and I give the floor to ICOMOS,

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Røros Mining Town is a proposal for the extension of the existing world heritage site of Røros Mining Town and includes both an extension to the town and the establishment of a buffer zone – the Circumference. The proposed extension is a serial nomination of three sites all reflecting different aspects of the economy that sustained the area. It is buffered by the Circumference, the area of privileges conceded by King Christian the IVth to the mining company since 1646 when the company was established after the discovery of copper ore in the area. The company has been operational until 1970.

In terms of category, it is a serial site (Chairman interrupts – Would you keep quiet please) and also a cultural landscape. Røros and its cultural landscape is located in the Sør-Trøndelag County not far from the Norwegian-Swedish border and you can see where it is located in the country. The proposed extension comprises mountainous and forested area and dramatically increases the size of the property passing from Circa 52 hectares to 60,500 hectares and is buffered by an area of circa 500,000 hectares. The landscape of the Circumference has substantially altered in a short period of time and left with a denuded

imprint due to severe exploitation of forestry reserves in the copper ore processing. Here we have few views of the existing World Heritage site Røros Mining Town.

The largest site of the serial proposed extension is named the “Town and Cultural Landscapes” that is the rural and industrial landscapes compressed rules. The surrounding landscape with the summer grazing farms and the area where the main mining fields are located. Farming activity was encouraged by the company so that miners could integrate their living and mining working timetable was organized accordingly. Here we have Storvartz, the oldest mining area, and is also the centre of the Circumference. Here we have some other areas and remains within the Stores field. Smelters needed a large amount of wood and charcoal to function and the forests in the region were rapidly depleted. As soon as the wood became scarce the smelters moved away.

Femundsytta exemplifies the industrial cultural landscape associated with the smelting activity of the copper work. Mining operations and the associated community needed to transport enormous amounts of material - timber, ore and other goods over a considerable distances. The winter transport route exemplifies the form of transport by sledge and horses that was used before the advent of the railway. And here we have images during the winter time of this route. Here we have some images of the buffer zones that the steel bears traces to the mining and other cultural activities that can be found in the area.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this extension of Røros Mining Town World Heritage site for approval. The condition of integrity and authenticity have been met by the property and the proposed extension and distinction reinforces criteria (iii) and (v) and contributes to the expression of criterion (iv). The boundaries of the proposed extension and the buffer zones are considered adequate. Protection is ensured through an intricate legal network provision and planning instruments.

With regard to conservation, further information on the type of pollution resulted from mining activity and on the action plan for improving the situation are needed. ICOMOS considers the overall management framework is adequate and relies on an inter-related planning system. The extension proposed links logically and persuasively to the area already inscribed on the World Heritage List by creating an integrated expression of the original World Heritage Site within its wider historic and social economic context. This provides a significantly announced record of the evolution of the mining-farming culture and therefore ICOMOS recommends that the extension to the Røros Mining Town be approved on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v).

ICOMOS has also made several recommendations and for details please see page 322 of the ICOMOS evaluation volume. I have add that a letter mentioning factual errors has been received and ICOMOS has acknowledged these factual errors. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. So I would suggest that we go further with the examination of the Draft Decision and I give the floor to our Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.34 is on page 27 of the English version and page 28 of the French version of the document and I have not received any amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of the Draft Decision **34 COM.8B.34**? I see none. Adopted. Congratulations to the State Party. Representative of Norway you have two minutes sir.

Norway

Thank you honourable Committee. On behalf of the State Party I have the pleasure to express our sincere gratitude to you for inscribing Røros Mining Town and the Circumference on the World Heritage List. At last this World Heritage property in truth tells the whole story of the ingenuity of the people, the strong will and success under severe climatic conditions. With this extension this heritage is now far more visible and its unique values far more visible than it was in the original property. Norway believes that it is a significant addition to the World Heritage List. We would like to pay a special tribute to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their assistance and support throughout the process. Always smooth, prompt and clear. Upon our invitation a pre-nomination mission and evaluation was executed by an expert with ICOMOS and ICCROM experience and this made us able to focus and present our nomination with a successful outcome, which was needed after grappling with this idea of an extension for almost 20 years. We have listened, noted and appreciated your useful and instructive recommendations and we look forward to further develop and secure this unique property and we will do our utmost to achieve best practice management. We have tried to work closely with the local authorities and people and I am pleased to inform you that two of the local mayors of the Circumference is present here with us tonight. Mayor Winterwol of Røros and Mayor Wolden of Harz and they would like to add a few words.

Mayor of Røros

Mr Chairman, honourable Committee, thank you very very much. We are proud to represent Røros Mining Town and the Circumference, and as you may see from the nomination files the Mayor of the region has signed a letter of intent to do our very best to safeguard values of the property. We want to hand these values and spoils over to our children and the children of the rest of the world. I can ensure you that the 31st of July 2010 will be a day to remember and for every day for celebration in our municipalities. We would like to greet, especially State Parties from our sister town for mining heritage, first of all Brazil, Ouro Preto and Diamantina. However, you are all heartily welcome to visit the new extended World Heritage Property of the higher note. This October when we host the conference for the organization of World Heritage Cities or any other time of your choice.

Mayor of Harz

Thank you, again on behalf of our municipalities thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Congratulations!

With your permission we should stop at midnight sharp and I would like to leave my place to Ms Mitrofanova for the examination of nominations of the **“Triple-arch Gate at Dan”**, **Israel**, because she is leaving tomorrow. Are there any objections? I see none. Thank you.

The Secretariat

Chair I refer to the document 34 COM.8B.Add. It is the addendum on page 4. I would like to recall that the decision 33 COM.8B.33 was taken which recognized the Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criterion (ii). The decision last year also requested the World Heritage Centre to facilitate the provision of the information which would enable the formal inscription of the property by the Committee at its 34th session. The Secretariat would like to explain that following the letter exchanged the UN Department of Political Affairs in 2008/2009 another letter was sent on 3 March 2010 to the Department of Political Affairs with the latest information on the nomination. A joint World Heritage Centre, UNESCO New York Office mission took place on 7 June 2010 to meet with the UN Department of Political Affairs to review all material available. A letter from Lyn Pascoe, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs of the United Nations was also received by the Secretariat in early July 2010. Following this letter further clarifications will be sought. On 4 July the State Party submitted a letter to the World Heritage Centre providing additional information that will be evaluated by ICOMOS. Thank you very much Madam Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Following the consultation which had been done by parties involved. I will give the floor only to two Delegations – the Delegations of Iraq and Australia. Iraq you have the floor please.

Iraq

Thank you Madam Chair. On behalf of the Arabic States Members of the World Heritage Committee I would like to present the position of the group. Tel Al Qawi site is located in a disputed area, in occupied territory. That area has never been demarcated and no borders exist between Lebanon, Syria and Israel. The ceasefire lines for all this in 1949 cannot be considered as a base line or boundary for the purposes of the Committee's determination bearing in mind that the ceasefire lines have moved many times due to armed conflicts between the concerned parties. In 1956, 1967 and 1973. In fact the UN Under-Secretary for Political Affairs recently wrote to the Director of the World Heritage Centre that and, I quote, the UN Secretariat is not in a position to confirm the location of the Triple-arch Gate. As a matter of principle inscribing a property in occupied or disputed territory could open a political Pandora's box and invites the Committee to play an adverse political role which is beyond its competence and mandate. Such inscriptions by the Committee could also have negative political consequences for reaching potential peace agreements between the concerned parties. And maybe used by the parties in a manner that could prejudice outstanding claims between them. Further, to illustrate political sensitivity of this point the UN Legal Counsel wisely advised that for the purposes of the World Heritage Committee Meeting the UN should not be required to make any determination. For the boundary of the location of the site, within or outside Israel, whether formally or informally. For all the above reasons we request that the Committee adjourn debate on the inscription of the site according to Option 1 of the draft resolution 34 COM/8B.3A distributed by the Secretariat. Thank you Madam Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you Jordan. Australia the floor is yours.

Australia

Thank you Madam Chair. Based on the documents previously provided to the Committee Australia is very satisfied that the site in question has Outstanding Universal Value and we would therefore support a decision that explicitly recognizes this fact. However, Australia notes that the World Heritage Centre has not been able to provide

definitive information to the Committee that satisfies the decision we took last year. Accordingly, Australia believes that the Committee should, as suggested by the previous speaker, adopt Option 1 which is to recognize that the site has Outstanding Universal Value but to postpone further consideration of this nomination until additional information is received. Our position on this issue is based on the general principle that the Committee needs to be very careful to avoid taking any decisions, however well intentioned, that may in any way contribute to increased tension on complex and sensitive issues that are more appropriately discussed and resolved either bilaterally or in other fora. Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 4 of the English version and page 4 of the French version of document 8B/Add. and I understood that the Committee is asked to consider Option 1 of the Draft Decisions in this document. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Any objections: I see none. Approved. So now I would like to give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Israel

Thank you Madam. Israel respects the decision by the Members of the World Heritage Committee of Experts. While I said in Quebec two years ago that the Triple-arch in Dan has been around for some 3,800 years one more year would not make that much of a difference. This Israeli Nature and Parks Authority has been for the past 62 years of the State of Israel, maintaining the site, conducting archaeological research and recently during the nomination process developed innovative programmes for laser monitoring based on the ICOMOS evaluation and recommendations. While we are saddened that the nomination has been once again postponed, perhaps with a little bit of politicization, I would like to recollect the old traditions of the name, both in Hebrew and Arabic. It is Dan Qadi, it means judge and the story of the old tradition of the parable, is that there were three springs, the Hudspani, Banyas and Dan, one in Lebanon, one in Syria and one in Israel, each declaring its importance. They finally came before the judge at Dan, the name of Qadi who deemed that none was more important and instructed the springs to flow together and meeting in the Jordan. Four neighbouring States Parties might learn from this parable and use the Convention for cooperation and dialogue for peace. With the courage for professionally to lead rather than to politically follow. I will not rebut the discussion and be involved in the question of the actual borders and boundaries and the potential use of Article 11 to use cultural heritage as a bridge towards peace. Israel stretches out a hand of peace to her neighbours and invites them next year to celebrate the inscription of the Triple-arch Gate at Dan and as we say (.....quotes in Hebrew) Closely, speedily in our time. Thank you.

The Chairperson

It seems to me that we can say that our evening meeting can be closed. Thank you very much.

The Secretariat

Just to remind the Committee Members that we will convene tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. There will be no Bureau Meeting tomorrow. Those who are registered for the

excursion, the non-Committee Members are welcome to go on their excursions, but the Committee itself will meet at 10. Thank you very much and have a good night.

Sunday, 1 August 2010

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Morning session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson

Good morning everybody. Could I ask the Committee Members to take your seats please. I give the floor now to the representative of Sweden who has an announcement to make. Sweden.

Sweden

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Your Excellency, dear colleagues before we start the examination of nominations to the list Sweden would like to share some of our reflections from yesterday. When examining nominations we should always keep in mind the purpose of the convention and be aware of the implications of the decisions we take. Decisions should be taken in an open, objective and professional manner and be based on expertise. Before inscribing properties on the list there should be no doubt about their Outstanding Universal Value. This requires complete nominations from the States Parties and clear evidence of the Outstanding Universal Value. Yesterday many of the proposed decisions were changed from referral to inscription and even from deferral to inscription. Of course, there should always be room for discussion and changes to the Draft Decisions, but such changes now seem to have become routine and evidence of an emerging gap between the Advisory Bodies advice and the Committee's decision. We have to bear in mind that the decisions of the Committee have implications for the credibility of the convention, the World Heritage List and the Committee maintaining credibility and ensuring good opportunities for preservation is of utmost importance. Let us keep this in mind when continuing our work today. We would also like these concerns to be considered by the Expert Meeting on the decision-making procedures of statutory organs of the Convention which is to be held in Bahrain later this year. Thank you Mr Chairman. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Now we are going to slightly modify the order of the files that we are going to look at. We will begin with **The Mercury and Silver Binomial. Almadén and Idrija with San Luis Potosí**. This is a nomination from Spain, Mexico and Slovenia and I give the floor to ICOMOS to present this draft nomination.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Un premier dossier d'inscription a été examiné par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à Séville en 2009. L'ICOMOS recommandait alors de différer l'examen de la proposition d'inscription. Le comité a décidé de le renvoyer, notamment pour reconsidérer la définition du bien à San Luis Potosí et dans sa région minière, plus largement dans les autres sites d'exploitation de l'argent, par le procédé de l'amalgame au mercure. Un inventaire du patrimoine technique et industriel, lié aux mines d'argent, serait en particulier nécessaire. Il était également recommandé aux Etats parties de mener une réflexion sur l'extension du bien en direction des mines d'argent de Bolivie, plus largement d'Amérique du

Sud et de la mine de mercure de Huancavelica au Pérou. La route du mercure relia l'Amérique hispanique et l'Europe pendant près de trois siècles. Elle apparut dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle lorsque le procédé de l'amalgamation permit d'exploiter en grand les mines d'argent sud-américaines, tout particulièrement celles du Mexique actuel. Le mercure était fourni par les mines européennes d'Almadén en Espagne et d'Idrija en Slovénie. L'exploitation des mines d'argent entraîna la construction de villes coloniales dont San Luis Potosí est un exemple caractéristique.

En termes de biens culturels il s'agit d'une proposition d'inscription en série de 3 ensembles. Voici la localisation géographique des trois biens proposés pour inscription d'Almadén en Espagne et d'Idrija en Slovénie pour la production du mercure, ainsi que de San Luis Potosí au Mexique pour l'extraction de l'argent. Au sein de l'empire espagnol le mercure dans un sens et l'argent dans l'autre ont emprunté la partie atlantique du Camino Real. A Almadén, le bien en rouge sur la carte est formé par la partie ouest de la ville et les champs miniers adjacents. Il comprend en outre divers monuments et sites individuels, l'ancienne prison des forçats, l'ancien hôpital reconverti en musée, les arènes. La ligne jaune indique la zone tampon. L'espace minier historique et contemporain jouxte directement la ville d'Almadén. Plusieurs vestiges techniques de l'exploitation minière ancienne sont bien repérables. En particulier la restauration du four Bustamante montre le procédé d'extraction du mercure au XVIII^e et au début du XIX^e siècles. Le bien comprend également des installations techniques et des bâtiments industriels plus récents associés à l'exploitation du mercure à la fin du XIX^e siècle et au XX^e. L'activité a cessé dans les années 1980. Le centre d'Almadén présente des caractéristiques urbaines qui rappellent son passé industriel, quartier des mineurs, vestiges de la maison du directeur, portes d'enceintes où passaient les convois des mercures en partance pour Cadix etc. De nombreux bâtiments publics sont en lien direct avec l'histoire de mine et de la vie des mineurs, l'hôpital, l'académie des mines, les arènes etc. A Idrija le bien est composé de sept parties distinctes.

Dans la zone de la ville d'Idrija ici à gauche les trois composantes sont entourées d'une zone tampon élargie. Nous trouvons notamment la vieille ville et les anciens entrepôts de mercure, les puits Francis et Joseph, un four et l'atelier d'extraction du mercure, ainsi que des vestiges du départ de la route du mercure. Différents monuments et institutions en rapport avec l'extraction du mercure sont également dans la ville. Dans les environs d'Idrija, 4 éléments hydrauliques miniers associés complètent le bien. Idrija est environné de massifs montagneux riches en eau et en forêt, ce qui représente une situation particulièrement favorable pour une exploitation minière d'envergure. Un ensemble de retenue d'eau et de petits canaux permettait d'approvisionner le site minier d'Idrija en eau et en bois. La ville présente de nombreux éléments urbains en relation avec les mines. Les vestiges de la route du mercure à son départ sont bien identifiables. Un vaste réseau de galeries a été conservé après l'arrêt de la mine dans les années 1970. On peut encore y observer des filons de cinabre, le minerai mercuriel. D'importants dispositifs techniques de l'exploitation au XX^e siècle sont demeurés en place. Les quartiers formés d'anciennes maisons de mineurs sont conservés, ils montrent une politique sociale active, également attestée par le rôle de l'hôpital et une conscience plus précoce qu'ailleurs des dangers liés aux pollutions mercurielles. A San Luis Potosí le bien est défini par la ville historique, notamment pour la valeur architecturale de ses principaux monuments, présentés comme témoignage de la richesse minière. Il n'y a pas eu de modification dans la définition du bien, les vestiges des anciennes mines d'argent et des ateliers de transformation du minerai n'y figurent pas. Toutefois une analyse approfondie des teneurs en mercure des sols dans différents endroits de la ville confirment la cartographie historique de l'exploitation et de la gestion du mercure dans la ville.

La Real Caja construite dans la deuxième moitié du XVIII^e siècle apporte un témoignage architectural baroque des plus marquants de la splendeur de la ville. Elle fut le dépôt et le centre de distribution du mercure aux exploitants miniers sous le contrôle directe de la couronne espagnole. C'est le seul édifice du bien ayant un rapport direct avec l'exploitation minière.

L'Eglise et le couvent San Francisco date des XVII et XVIII siècles et la cathédrale remonte au début du XVIII siècle. Ce sont deux exemples typiques des monuments et du style baroque développé dans cette ville tant pour les façades, les clochers, que pour les décorations intérieures. Plus largement San Luis Potosí dispose d'un important patrimoine baroque religieux ou civil, caractéristique de la période de la colonisation espagnole et dont la construction a été possible grâce à l'enrichissement régional lié à l'exploitation de l'argent. Sur la place d'armes à proximité de la cathédrale un ensemble de palais publics et privés représente une architecture néo-classique caractéristique de la seconde moitié du XIX siècle.

Les conditions d'intégrité sont remplies à Almadén et à Idrija, en regard du thème de la proposition d'inscription en série, mais pas pour San Luis Potosí, l'intégrité de la série dans son ensemble n'a donc pas été démontrée. L'analyse comparative montre la valeur des sites miniers d'Almadén et d'Idrija. Ce n'est toutefois pas encore le cas en ce qui concerne San Luis Potosí et l'utilisation technique et industrielle du procédé de l'amalgame. La définition de San Luis Potosí n'a pas été révisée comme demandé par la recommandation de la décision 33 COM 8b 26 du comité.

Les critères proposés (ii) (iv) et (v) ont été justifiés pour Almadén et pour Idrija, mais ils ne le sont pas encore pour véritablement pour San Luis Potosí. Plus largement pour les sites d'usage du procédé de l'amalgame au Mexique et en Amérique du Sud. L'ICOMOS considère que les principales menaces pesant sur les biens sont les conséquences de l'exploitation minière elle-même en termes géologiques et en termes de pollution mercurielle. La protection et la conservation des biens formant la série sont satisfaisantes. Le système global de gestion du bien en série, ainsi que les plans de gestion propres à chacun des sites sont satisfaisants et appropriés. Le bien en série dispose d'une autorité transversale de coordination effective.

L'ICOMOS recommande que la proposition d'inscription du binôme du mercure et de l'argent Almadén, Idrija et San Luis Potosí, Espagne, Slovénie et Mexique sur la liste du patrimoine mondial soit différée afin de permettre aux Etats parties de reconsidérer la définition du bien San Luis Potosí, mais aussi dans sa région minière et plus largement en comparaison avec les autres sites d'exploitation de l'argent par le procédé de l'amalgame au Mexique. Un inventaire du patrimoine technique et industriel lié aux mines d'argent est nécessaire à une telle redéfinition. L'ICOMOS formule également des recommandations complémentaires ayant un caractère plus local ou plus technique. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Does anyone wish to make any comments on this presentation? I give the floor to the representative of Iraq.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chairman. We would like to ask the State Party about the level of accomplishment of the recommendations received from the Committee regarding the candidacy in Seville. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Sweden I give you the floor.

Sweden

Thank you sir. We would like to have a clarification from ICOMOS concerning San Luis Potosí. In your presentation you gave the evidence in town you have evidence of the amalgamation procedure, but there are no industrial buildings left in that town. Would you

consider the remains in the earth as evidence enough or do you want more sides to be evaluated for this process.

The Chairperson I give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

En effet on considérait deux éléments géographiques différents par rapport à la candidature telle quelle. La ville elle-même de San Luis Potosí qui a été autrefois un lieu d'exploitation du procédé de l'amalgame, d'utilisation de ce procédé, et effectivement l'Etat partie a réalisé des analyses de sol et également des analyses de pollution. Sur ce point cela est conforme à la recommandation du comité de l'année dernière. Ce travail toutefois ne met pas en évidence des traces archéologiques des *hacienda de beneficios*, ces établissements industriels de constructions relativement provisoires et sommaires sur le lieu même proposé pour l'inscription. C'est la première partie géographique, le bien tel qu'il est défini et qui n' a pas changé depuis la première candidature.

Mais l'ICOMOS considère que c'est toute la région de San Luis Potosí qui est concernée. Il semble d'ailleurs que certains lieux miniers sont encore en exploitation aujourd'hui. Pour retrouver ses traces d'utilisation du procédé de l'amalgame, des conditions sociales également de l'exploitation de ces mines, des questions de transport etc. tous les éléments archéologiques qui pourraient justifier par des éléments matériels évidents, l'éventuelle VUE de ce bien.

Donc il nous semble nécessaire de redéfinir le bien à San Luis Potosí lui-même et plus largement au niveau du Mexique, car si San Luis Potosí est un exemple important d'utilisation du procédé de l'amalgame et de sa répartition par le pouvoir royal espagnol, beaucoup d'autres lieux ont utilisé ce procédé d'amalgamation, y compris des lieux déjà reconnus sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. Il faut donc une véritable approche de patrimoine industriel et pas seulement une approche urbaine figée telle que celle que nous avons aujourd'hui. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor now to Mexico for clarification.

Mexico

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I would just like to make reference to two important facts. San Luis Potosí is the only mining city in the Americas which has regular traces of history. The other mining cities were differently managed and so you don't have the same heritage there. In San Luis Potosí mining activities took place in the urban area and have been entirely covered over, buried by the force of time and changes over subsequent centuries. The mining remains in the very centre of the site that we are putting forward as the emblematic representative site for this process of amalgamation of mercury and silver is therefore to an extent covered over. We would refer to what we presented to the Advisory Bodies. We have more than scientifically proven demonstrations of the use of that amalgam procedure in the area that is entirely covered over by the urban area. We have applied a great deal of scientific rigour to establishing the use of this procedure in San Luis Potosí and to analysing the remains and the traces that remain there of the use of mercury in silver mining there. The most symbolic buildings there were entirely built using money generated by the mining activity. That is why we consider that this site is the most important demonstration of mining wealth in our country. Thank you very much Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mexico. I now give the floor to the representative of France.

France

Je vais essayer de préciser Monsieur le Président. La question que je souhaitais poser à l'Etat partie a trait à la ville de San Luis Potosí. Est-ce que l'Etat partie pourrait nous indiquer, pour illustrer justement si la ville de San Luis Potosí selon l'Etat partie a une VUE. Les éléments qui ont été indiqués dans l'inventaire vont justement indiquer qu'il y a une activité liée à l'argent. Merci.

The Chairperson

The Secretariat is pointing out to me that you cannot ask this kind of general open question of the State Party. Thank you. So I would suggest that the French delegate reformulate his question by making it more specific and perhaps more technical if possible.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. La délégation française souhaiterait, si vous l'autorisez, poser une question à l'Etat partie. Le rapport de l'ICOMOS établit de façon tout à fait claire la VUE d'Almadén et d'Idrija, néanmoins ce n'est pas aussi évident pour San Luis Potosí, selon le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Est-ce que l'Etat partie pourrait nous apporter son appréciation sur ce point ?

The Chairperson

Before I give the floor to Mexico to answer this question could I ask everybody when you ask questions to please make them technical questions that relate to aspects highlighted in the report. And can I ask Mexico to give a specific answer to France's question.

Mexico

Thank you Chairman. I have said very clearly that among the entire series of cities founded by the Spanish empire in the Americas and there are more than 960 of these, San Luis Potosí is the only city that has the regular octagonal floor plan of a typical mining town. But it seems to me that the distinguished delegate of France is actually making reference to the fact that not all of the serial properties in a serial nomination needs to have Outstanding Universal Value. It is just that the ensemble, the serial nomination as a whole, needs to have OUV. And with regard to that we would need to take into account the fact that this series of properties is an ensemble, it is a serial nomination, not three separate sites, that is the rating we think we can give for the concern expressed by the delegate of France.

The Chairperson

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

Australia

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Australia would like to address a question to ICOMOS if we may and it relates to the construction of the series. We know that in the comparative analysis of the nomination there is clearly reference to sites in other countries. Our interest is not so much in fact that there are other sites in other countries, but that there may be other components to this story which are important to tell, so the question to

ICOMOS is that are they satisfied with the or could they explain more to us, I'm sorry, about the Peruvian so the element to this or whether it is not important to include some more of it there. This relates to one of the comments ICOMOS has made in the evaluation as well.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS has the floor.

ICOMOS

Il y a effectivement une mine de mercure au Pérou qui a joué un rôle extrêmement important, la mine du Huancavelica et qui pourrait faire partie de cette série. Ce mercure a été utilisé notamment dans la région des Andes, à Potosí par exemple pour l'extraction de l'argent. Le problème était que les ressources énergétiques en bois n'étaient pas suffisantes pour les procédés traditionnels et que l'amalgamation par le mercure permettait une extraction à froid. Donc nous trouvons dans l'ensemble de l'Amérique du Sud un certain nombre d'ensembles, de valeurs diverses, liées soit aux mines d'argent, soit à cette mine de mercure de Huancavelica. Ceci dit il faut prendre conscience que autant les ressources en argent en tant que minerais sont extrêmement nombreuses, diffuses, assez bien réparties dans le monde, autant les mines de mercure sont extrêmement rares. Il y a à peu près 4 à 5 sites majeurs dans le monde sur la longue durée historique de mines de mercure. Donc effectivement la mine de mercure de Huancavelica pourrait faire partie de la série. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

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

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je ne voudrais pas d'abord faire de commentaires sur ce site extrêmement intéressant et transcontinental. Mais je voudrais poser une question technique et précise monsieur le Président. Ce dossier avait été renvoyé pour complément d'information par rapport à ses limites. Je voudrais savoir du côté de l'Etat partie parce que nous avons à faire à une série de biens. Est-ce qu'il y a des précisions à apporter à un seul bien ou à l'ensemble des biens, je vous remercie. Par rapport aux limites et à l'identification.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to ICOMOS to respond.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous discutons ici de San Luis Potosí, il n'y a pas de problèmes particuliers de délimitation, ces questions ont été réglées dans le passé avec les Etats parties pour les zones tampons etc. la question est, pour l'ICOMOS, dans la définition du bien à San Luis Potosí, qui en tant que limite du bien, un bien unique, le centre-ville n'a pas été révisé en fonction des recommandations qui ont été faites, à savoir la réalisation d'un inventaire de patrimoine technique et industriel dans l'ensemble de la région. Ceci demande du temps et c'est la région pour laquelle l'ICOMOS a d'une part proposé différer et d'autre part estime nécessaire une mission d'évaluation. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Egypt.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense que l'ICOMOS a apporté des informations très utiles en répondant aux questions de l'Australie et le Mali, peut-être la question en ce qui concerne l'intégrité de propriété et en comparaison, vous venez juste de mentionner les mines au Pérou. J'aimerais bien savoir les éléments sur lequel vous basez l'intégrité de nomination et l'impact que pourrais avoir du fait qu'il y a certains spots d'exploitation actuelle et par rapport à la VUE du site en cas d'inscription. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour évaluer la question de l'intégrité de ce dossier il faut, je crois, partir de sa définition, de son titre qui est très explicite, le binôme du mercure et de l'argent au sens d'un procédé technologique d'extraction de l'argent à basse température comme je le rappelais tout à l'heure, ce procédé ayant permis l'exploitation des mines notamment du Mexique pendant la période de la colonisation espagnole, mais aussi largement après tout au long du XIX siècle et encore aujourd'hui au XX siècle. C'est donc par rapport à ce thème de l'amalgamation, donc la ressource en mercure, le minerai d'argent, le transport, les dispositifs techniques, les dispositifs industriels qui ont été réalisés, que doit en priorité s'estimer l'intégrité du bien. C'est le travail qu'a fait l'ICOMOS en examinant les différents lieux. La réponse est tout à fait satisfaisante à Idrija et à Almadén où nous trouvons bien un ensemble de témoignages par rapport à ce procédé de l'amalgame et également les témoignages sociaux qui sont associés à la réalisation de ce procédé. Des témoignages sociaux voulant dire des témoignages urbains, des témoignages des constructions industrielles, des conditions de vie des hommes des femmes qui ont travaillé sur ces lieux. C'est par rapport à ce point de l'intégrité que la définition du bien proposé à San Luis Potosí n'est pour nous pas satisfaisante car elle ne retient qu'un aspect, qui est un aspect second que nous n'ignorons absolument pas, mais qui est celui de la réalisation urbaine et architecturale d'un centre-ville. Voilà, c'est là qu'il y a un problème.

Pour nous la définition du bien devrait être beaucoup plus large et examinée y compris bien sûr de manière archéologique, car nous savons qu'au Mexique ces constructions des *hacienda de beneficios* étaient extrêmement fragiles et provisoires, mais il faudrait avoir des indications archéologiques sur ce qui a existé. San Luis Potosí était essentiellement un centre de distribution du mercure et également, évidemment, de transformation, mais ce n'était pas un lieu minier, les mines sont dans les environs et les *hacienda de beneficios* étaient réparties sur un territoire bien plus vaste que le centre-ville. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Cambodia.

Cambodia

Le Cambodge voudrait avant tout remercier le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Monsieur le Président, nous devons d'abord reconnaître qu'il s'agit d'une proposition originale et qui enrichit la thématique du patrimoine mondial. Nous faisons remarquer que trois Etats ou peut être quatre avec le Pérou, non limitrophes, ce sont associés pour cette nomination. De même il est important que le site présenté constitue des références au dossier au Mexique, si célèbre historiquement, Almadén, dont le nom lié tant à la langue arabe qu'à la langue

espagnole indique la grande ancienneté. Il s'agit de grands symboles au niveau mondial. En même temps ces trois sites sont les plus connus pour la technique minière ayant connu le procédé de l'amalgame de l'argent et du mercure. C'est pourquoi le Cambodge propose l'inscription du bien sur la base des critères (ii) (iv) et (v).

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Sir the Delegation of Brazil would like to put a question to the State Party. We would like to know what measures have been put in place in order to meet the recommendations of the Committee.

The Chairperson

Mexico has the floor. Spain would like to answer.

Spain

Distinguished Chair and Members of the Committee, States Parties would like to confirm that all recommendations requested on decision 33 COM/8B.26 of 2009 have been fulfilled. According to the mentioned decision the property in San Luis Potosí has been reconsidered. It consists of technical industrial heritage in the town and in the surrounding region linked to the silver production. And some architectural items of *Real Caja* the municipal palace and the governmental palace, all of which bear witness to the extensive mercury and silver trade and exchange of knowledge through the centuries. The property in San Luis Potosí is of substantial meaning for the explanation of the extensive use of mercury in silver production through the process of amalgamation. The inventory of the technical and industrial heritage linked to the silver mines in the San Luis Potosí region is being completed. Also through the archaeological research and shall be systematically updated. The State Parties agreed upon the new name of the serial property which reflects the relations between the two mercury sites and one silver site. Following the Seville recommendations the State Parties have already conducted in Huancavelica in Peru, Potosí in Bolivia, Zacatecas and Guanajuato in Mexico. The issues concerning environmental pollution and risks for human beings caused by production and use of mercury have been addressed in the information presented to the World Heritage Centre in January 2010. In relation to this issue we are happy to inform that the International Mercury Information and Research Centre in Idrija for the study and raising of public awareness of environmental issues was established in June 2008 and operates inside the Idrija mercury mine. We are glad to let the distinguished delegates of the Committee know that the International Coordinating Committee for the nominated property has already held several sessions and coordinated joint activities on the three sites, such as the twinning of the three cities was formalized in November 2008. As a result of this twinning an agreement between the Universidad Polytechnica de Almadéna and Universidad de San Luis de Potosí was reached, as well as an alliance between commercial and technological businesses in Idrija and San Luis Potosí. We would also like to clarify that the heritage of San Luis de Potosí is not part of any other nomination submitted for consideration at this session. Finally, acknowledging the immense contribution of countless mine workers from the three cities, it is a way of honouring their toils and their memories. The past the three cities share is fraught with emotion for future generations and bolster the significance of this nomination. Thank you.

The Chairperson

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

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je souhaite remercier l'Etat partie, le Mexique en l'occurrence qui a répondu sur la question très importante, de notre point de vue, des biens en série. La VUE ne doit pas reposer selon nous et selon d'ailleurs les orientations sur chacun des éléments, mais bien sur l'ensemble de la série et pas sur chacune de ses composantes. Je crois Monsieur le Président que plusieurs questions ont été posées à l'Etat partie, l'ICOMOS a apporté des éléments, mais l'Etat partie n'a pas eu l'occasion de répondre, je pense notamment aux questions qui ont été posées par le Mali. Est-ce qu'il serait possible de donner la parole à l'Etat partie sur ce point ?

The Chairperson

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

The Secretariat

Mr Chairperson, I would just like to draw attention of the Committee to Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the World Heritage Committee and I would read it out: Representative of a State Party, whether or not a Member of the Committee shall not speak to advocate the inclusion in the World Heritage List of a property nominated or the approval of an assistance request submitted by that State, but only to deal with the point of information in answer to a question. This provision also applies to other observers. Thank you very much Mr Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I would like to ask the representative of France whether you are satisfied with the answer of the Secretariat.

France

Je remercie le secrétariat pour cette précision, mais je crois que je ne veux pas m'exprimer bien sûr au nom certains Etats membres du comité, mais il me semble que l'une des questions avait été posée de question très précise par le Mali, c'était sur la question du périmètre et là-dessus nous pouvons très bien avoir des éléments extrêmement techniques, précis. Est-ce que le Mali pourrait peut-être préciser les éléments qui n'ont pas reçu de réponse de l'Etat partie. Merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I now give the floor to Mali.

Mali

Suite aux explications données par l'Etat partie, de l'Espagne, je me réjouis beaucoup des informations précises qui ont été données et qui quelque part, si vous voulez répondre aussi aux questions posées par l'ICOMOS. Je ne me suis jamais rendu compte qu'il y avait autant d'informations sur les limites et surtout sur l'inventaire technique. Donc je suis suffisamment édifié, cela veut dire que nous avons à faire à un certain nombre de biens en série. Sur les trois biens au moins, le centre historique de San Luis Potosí répond, si vous voulez, aux exigences posées aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS, à savoir les limites. Nous avons un inventaire technique qui a été fait et qui donne suffisamment d'informations sur au moins un bien. Donc là-dessus de rejoins la proposition du Cambodge pour dire que je propose l'inscription du site sur la liste du patrimoine mondial, en commençant par au moins un bien dont nous disposons de suffisamment d'informations. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

The representative of Egypt has the floor.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. J'ai posé une question à ICOMOS à laquelle j'ai pas tout à fait eu une réponse en ce qui concerne les limites de San Luis. En fait le cas actuel, et il y a une certaine exploitation dans les mines, en cas d'inscription ça pourra avoir un impact sur ses valeurs universelles ou non? D'autre part en ce qui concerne l'intégrité du bien et les deux mines, et en fait l'exploitation minière, l'extraction de mercure, c'est duré sur une période assez vaste quand même et dans ce sens-là quand nous parlons de l'intégrité du bien, elle a eu des développements de techniques d'exploitation en qui concerne les mines de Idrija. Elle est exploitée jusqu'aux années '80 avec un développement des techniques d'exploitation et c'est la question du mercure. Et quand on parle de l'intégrité du bien, pour quelle période, et sur quelle méthode d'exploitation vous vous basez. C'est un premier point. D'autre part est-ce qu'il y a des traces matérielles suffisamment sur les trois sites pour traduire l'intégrité du bien ? merci.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS:

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. En effet les témoignages miniers, industriels, sont extrêmement riches et importants à Almadén et à Idrija et ils ont été soigneusement inventoriés par les Etats parties, soigneusement pris en compte dans la définition du bien pour former un ensemble qui représente effectivement des dimensions techniques, industrielles, territoriales, urbaines et sociales de la valeur de ce bien. Quant aux périodes d'exploitations minières, en effet l'exploitation des mines de mercures à Almadén et Idrija, remontent au moins à la renaissance et très certainement à des périodes beaucoup plus anciennes, probablement l'antiquité à Almadén, on a certainement utilisé les mines de mercure à cette période-là. Evidemment la richesse des témoignages apportés, n'est pas forcément caractéristique des périodes les plus anciennes. Il faut bien voir que dans la valeur d'un bien technologique il y a une dimension essentielle qui n'apparait pas dans les autres catégories de patrimoine, et qui en font un patrimoine particulier, un nouveau champ pour l'application de la convention, et en cela ces dossiers sont tout à fait intéressants et nouveaux. La technique se renouvelle, son but est d'améliorer son efficacité, d'innover, donc l'innovation signifie le changement, la restructuration l'extension. Ceci dit, notamment par le témoignage des galeries, tant à Idrija qu'à Almadén, nous avons des sections de galeries extrêmement anciennes qui remontent aux périodes de la Renaissance, voir à des périodes plus anciennes. Nous avons également des témoignages sociaux extrêmement forts sur le travail des mineurs, par exemple avec les forçats à Almadén, le couloir des forçats, le tunnel très ancien qui les amenait sur les lieux d'exploitation. Il y a donc un ensemble de témoignages très complémentaires tant du point de vue de l'intégrité thématique que des différentes périodes historiques. Je vous remercie donc de cette question qui permet de bien mettre en lumière la richesse et donc la contribution à la VUE de l'ensemble, apportée par les mines d'Almadén et d'Idrija, et c'est précisément ce que nous ne retrouvons absolument pas dans le dossier de San Luis Potosí et ce sont les raisons pour lesquelles nous souhaitons une redéfinition de ce bien qui tiennent compte de ces différents éléments thématiques d'une candidature pour un bien technique et industriel et également de ses multiples dimensions sociales, et pas seulement d'un épanouissement architectural et urbain. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. De ce que nous venons d'entendre de l'ICOMOS, et donc la question que nous devons nous poser ici et maintenant, c'est si les attributs de valeur du site mexicain, une forme urbaine particulière et le fait que la ville s'est construite grâce au commerce de l'argent, nous suffisent pour déclarer une contribution valable à la VUE de l'ensemble du bien ou pas. Je pense que c'est la question à laquelle nous devons répondre et j'aimerais un peu m'avancer sur un terrain aventureux, et parce que nous penchons un petit vers la direction de l'ICOMOS, que ce n'est pas le cas, que le site mexicain n'a encore pas la valeur, ne contribue pas dans un sens bien défini à la valeur de l'ensemble du bien. Si on ne pouvait pas inscrire ce site, parce que nous voulons bien de cette candidature, elle est effectivement très intéressante, mais que la partie en Slovénie et en Espagne pour le moment, en recommandant par contre très vivement de redéfinir ces questions au Mexique, pour arriver à une inscription de ce dernier site et voir d'autres ultérieurement, peut-être déjà l'année prochaine. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

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

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président, merci à la Suisse. L'Egypte rejoint tout à fait le point de vue de la Suisse, mais en même temps je n'ai toujours pas eu de réponse sur la deuxième partie de mes questions, par rapport à l'exploitation dans les mines de San Luis et son impact. L'ICOMOS dans son évaluation par rapport à l'intégrité, principalement pour les trois mines et là on parle d'une nomination en série s'est basé sur l'aspect technologique de l'exploitation minière et l'extraction de mercure. Et dans ce sens-là, quand on parle de galerie des mines et les méthodes d'exploitation minière, normalement il n'y a pas beaucoup de différentes méthodes d'exploitation, qu'on trouve dans la plupart des mines dans le monde entier, en fait il y a trois quatre méthodes d'exploitation minière qui existe pour tous les types d'exploitation au niveau international. Et dans ce sens-là, ma question, les méthodes d'extraction du mercure et l'exploitation, est-ce que cela a été au niveau de l'intégrité du bien, bien présenté ? Et je ne parle pas là de l'aspect social, mais déjà, ce qui remplit le critère (iv) au niveau technologique, est-ce que ça a été bien présenté dans les trois sites ou non ? Je vous remercie monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS for further clarification.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je n'ai pas parlé de mines pour San Luis Potosí puisqu'il n'y en a pas. Donc nous ne nous prononceront pas sur ce qui n'est pas dans le dossier. En ce qui concerne votre question sur les techniques d'exploitation minière, je crois qu'il faut prendre conscience que l'exploitation du mercure est un sujet très spécialisé qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec les sujets généraux de la mine et l'image générale qu'on a est plutôt celle de la mine de charbon, sur laquelle on a des questions quantitatives extrêmement importantes, ici ça n'est pas le cas, nous sommes dans des exploitations beaucoup plus diffuses qui nécessitent surtout le creusement et le percement de nombreux

tunnels, de nombreux réseaux, tout cela est bien présent. Je crois que ce qui fait l'originalité ce n'est pas tellement le procédé minier en somme. Je vous rejoins pour dire que la galerie de mines qu'elle soit de mercure ou d'autre chose n'a pas forcément une originalité particulière. Par contre, ce qui est extrêmement spécifique ce sont les fours d'extraction du mercure et nous avons notamment à Almadén un très beau témoignage qui a été restauré avec soin par l'Etat partie, qui nous montre l'état de ces techniques le four Bustamente, à l'horizon du XVII^e XIX siècles et c'est un témoignage unique, absolument exceptionnel en termes techniques et industriels. Il y a également des fours plus récents, mais tout à fait spécifiques et dédiés à des questions similaires à Idrija. J'espère que j'ai répondu à votre question. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Egypt please.

Egypt

Avec votre permission, je pense que l'ICOMOS est tout à fait répondu dans ce sens-là. Nous poussons dans le sens de donner un peu plus de temps à compléter le dossier et peut être revenir l'année prochaine pour la nomination éventuelle. Juste pour répondre au point qui a été levé par la Suisse. Nous sommes dans un cas de nomination en série, et dans ce sens-là est-ce qu'on pourra pour un dossier qui a été présenté pour une nomination en série, on pourra accorder une nomination juste pour une partie ou il vaut mieux reporter le dossier, renvoyer le dossier pour compléter. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS for further information.

ICOMOS

Merci Monsieur le Président. Il y a en effet dans les orientations une disposition qui permet d'examiner une série par étapes chronologiques différentes. Dans le respect de cette recommandation des orientations, il n'y a pas d'objections techniques à ne pas examiner une partie seulement du bien cette année pour l'inscription et à différer pour le reste, pour donner du temps aux Etats parties, notamment au Mexique et au Pérou pour compléter cette série. C'est-à-dire que cette série est bien annoncée, on a une idée de sa structure générale, mais conformément aux orientations nous reconnaissons une première étape pour laquelle la VUE a été démontrée.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia and after that Mali who has requested the floor. My apologies, China first, then Australia and then Mali and then the Rapporteur.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. When we consider the site we have to bear in mind that this serial nomination is under-represented on the World Heritage List. The second, we should consider is because this is relatively new type of nomination and there are still many thematic debates on this subject of how to inscribe the whole or part of it on the World Heritage List. I think the debate from last year and this year on this particular site is very valuable and also we have noticed that this year in February there is a conference on

serial nominations in Switzerland and I would like to ask perhaps ICOMOS can give us some ideas how this conference configured to the consideration of this site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. May I answer this question. I think the meeting was very valuable in considering some of the issues connected to serial nominations but was looking at ways that procedures and processes associated with serial nominations might be improved in the future. The recommendations of the meeting have not yet formally worked their way through into any approved process or into modifications to the guidelines. But certainly the thrust of the meeting was the need to ensure that component parts that were nominated as parts of series contributed very clearly to the overall OUV and that the full extent of the series in terms of its scope was identified at the time that the first sites were inscribed on the World Heritage List. But there are broader implications of the meetings but I hope that those two are relevant to the discussions that we are just now having.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia.

Australia

Thank you very much. I thank ICOMOS for that clarification which bears on what I was going to comment on and that is that as we begin to explore these series and which are the component parts that add up to the story it does beg the question of if we are considering change to the series and I think there are one or two proposals to include sites from Spain and Slovenia but not Mexico. Whether that is a significant change that at the moment we are not in a position to make that here in this Committee but it would need to be brought back as a revised nomination. And I wonder if I can say that ICOMOS clarification on that in relation to the operational Guidelines and their understanding of the articulation of the case. Clearly if there is a potential inscription that relates to Spain and Slovenia we are then focusing much more on the mining of mercury that then begins to open a different set of questions because there are other sites related to the mining of mercury as we have heard, in particular in Peru. And Mr Chairman I wonder in that respect as well as my question to ICOMOS whether we might ask the State Party of Spain, who I think is an observer in the room, to comment in particular on that question and the link to Peru. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS and then the representative of Spain.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairman. The observation I made previously concerns an inscription within the framework of the current serial nomination on the amalgamation procedure and we don't lose sight of the fact that these mercury mines have contributed mostly to the development of silver exploitation, so it is the first phase of the serial nomination which is the file we are now examining. Now the question of the mercury mines on its own is a different matter. And I just like to make an observation, I am repeating what I already said, these mines are extremely rare. There are four or five in the world that have really an industrial scale, so as regards mercury it seems that OUV is really there. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Spain for further clarification.

Spain)

Thank you very much Chairman. Huancavelica and the relations with Peru are clearly established and there was a mission in September 2007, agreement for cooperation were signed then. Within Huancavelica there have been cultural exchanges, you have the Santa Barbara mine and they would be delighted to join this serial nomination. In fact there is going to be a transnational proposal nomination in the future. I think in this regard as ICOMOS says this is a very unique and very original proposal and you need to consider mercury and silver together. The process of mining the amalgamation process for extraction, the processing. Huancavelica is very important. It rounds out this series we believe. As ICOMOS says we could expand and go into more detail on the information, but this is a very innovative proposal and it complements what we were talking about at the last Committee meeting in Seville. What we are calling for is perhaps further clarification and all of the experts are here, that would be great. But you do need to take into account the overall character of this nomination, the complexity of the nomination and this aspect of toing and froing the exchange that is not just with regard to the material mind but also the exchange between people. Something that really gives a greater dimension of richness to this cultural heritage which is something we have all been calling for.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Mali.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais d'abord avec votre autorisation recadrer le débat. Comme l'a dit le représentant de la Chine et tout de suite la représentante de l'Etat partie de l'Espagne, ce débat avait d'abord eu lieu en Espagne et tous les éléments relatifs au processus d'inscription ont été discutés. C'est par rapport à tout cela que l'organisation consultative de l'ICOMOS et le centre du patrimoine mondial avait demandé à ce que ce dossier soit renvoyé pour cette année. Je pense qu'il y a des éléments précis, des éléments complémentaires précis qui ont été demandé à l'Etat partie, à savoir les limites. Et quand nous avons entendu le représentant de l'Espagne, il nous a parlé d'un inventaire technique complet qui a été fait sur San Luis Potosí. Donc je reviens à ma proposition initiale qui a été aussi appuyée par l'ICOMOS, techniquement c'est faisable, on peut procéder à une inscription en série, en commençant par le site le mieux connu, le site qui est également le plus représentatif. Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Egypt now.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais revenir encore une fois sur le point d'intégrité et là avec l'aide de l'ICOMOS. Vous avez mentionné que l'intégrité se base en principe sur les techniques d'exploitation dans les trois mines, et à propos de ça, les trois mines sont de trois Etats différents, de trois régions différentes. Est-ce qu'il y a des liens sur les techniques d'harmonie, c'est lié aussi aux aspects technologiques, des liens historiques entre les trois mines ? Cela est une chose, et deuxième point l'ICOMOS a bien répondu et peut être j'ai mal compris, que pour l'instant il y a les mines de l'Espagne qui répond aux critères d'inscription, mais par contre les deux autres mines qui sont en Slovaquie et au

Mexique, ont besoin d'informations complémentaires. Et dans ce sens-là, si on adopte, est-ce que ce sera suffisant d'adopter l'inscription seulement de la mine de l'Espagne ou non ? Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will give the floor to ICOMOS to give us clarification.

ICOMOS

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. I will take advantage of this opportunity to speak. Last year ICOMOS recommended that this nomination be deferred. Which is not the same as the decision the Committee made. This year we have again recommended its deferral. Are the links between the three mines absolutely clear. Well, there are two things that are absolutely linked and complementary. The mining of mercury in Europe, its transportation and its use in the extraction of silver through the amalgamation process. Could I also stress the fact that the condition of integrity not only based on the technical aspect. Far from it. I think I have already answered that point. The social and human dimensions, the organization of work are also extremely important for the integrity. Concerning the complementary information connected to the issue of integrity of the mining sites, there are no particular problems with regard to Idrija. The ensemble is entirely satisfactory, it is a technical, territorial, industrial, social and urban whole. Thank you very much Mr Chairman.

Egypt

Avec votre permission Monsieur le Président, juste la réponse au dernier point, est-ce que les mines de l'Espagne répondront suffisamment au critère d'inscription ? Et en fait quand je parlais de l'harmonie entre les trois sites, je parlais d'harmonie historique aussi et dans l'histoire des contacts et des liens physiques et historiques entre les trois sites. Ce n'est pas l'harmonie seulement liée aux activités minières de l'exploitation.

ICOMOS

There were physical and historical links between the three sites. That link is the very subject of the nomination file itself.

The Chairperson

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

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je crois que nous avons eu un échange d'arguments déjà très nourri, que nous répétons dans sa globalité, le débat qui a eu lieu l'année dernière à Seville. Je pense que les arguments des uns et des autres ont été bien entendu beaucoup d'explications, de précisions apportée notamment sur le caractère complémentaire de ces séries. Certains Etats se sont prononcés en faveur de l'inscription. Je propose d'autres noms, je propose si vous en êtes d'accord que nous passions à l'examen du projet de décision et au moment où nous examinerons l'article qui propose la décision, nous poursuivront peut être ce débat ou nous passerons au vote si c'est nécessaire.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. As Chairman I am delighted to hear that proposal and I give the floor to our Rapporteur without further ado.

Rapporteur

The decision is on page 32 of the English version and page 33 of the French version of your document 8B, and I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Mali. The amendment proposed by the Delegation of Mali concerns paragraph 2, 3 and 4. Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 2 would be deleted completely and replaced by the following text: Inscribes the Mercury and Silver Binomal in Almadén and Idrija with San Luis Potosí (Spain/Slovenia/Mexico). Following this the proposal of Mali is to delete paragraph 3 and further retain paragraph 4, including subparagraphs (a) and (b) which would then follow new paragraph 3 which would include the adopted statement of outstanding universal value and remain as paragraph 4 in the decision. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Switzerland now.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voulais juste attirer votre attention sur le fait que nous venons de déposer aussi un amendement.

Rapporteur

It must have arrived when I was reading out the decision and indeed, I have a second amendment concerning inscription. After property, but with the exclusion of the site San Luis Potosi and I think concerning the fact that we have two different amendments, probably the amendment to inscribe all three sites would be further removed from the initial proposal of deferral and may have to be considered first. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I ask the States Parties to show a spirit of cooperation. The Rapporteur has presented the situation very clearly. Could you make your comments now on what the Rapporteur has said.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. D'après l'explication donnée par l'ICOMOS, l'Egypte soutient le projet de décision comme c'était rédigé dans le texte, on supporte le point de vue de l'ICOMOS. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président, et avec votre permission je pense que pour gagner du temps, est-ce qu'on maintient l'amendement proposé par le Mali pour l'inscription, ou la position de l'ICOMOS, et je pense pour aller plus loin, il faut persuader dans ce sens-là.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to France now.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour répondre très précisément à votre question, la Délégation française souhaite apporter son soutien à l'amendement proposé par le Mali et nous pensons qu'après le débat que nous avons eu et les informations qui ont été communiqués par les Etats parties, les trois biens sont absolument complémentaires et c'est à l'inscription des trois biens qu'il faut procéder.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I now give the floor to Australia.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chairman. We support the position just expressed by Egypt. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to Egypt, followed by Sweden.

Egypt

Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour gagner du temps, l'Egypte demande le vote sur l'amendement proposé par le Mali pour l'inscription et demande un vote secret.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I would give the floor to Sweden now.

Sweden

Thank you. At the moment we will withdraw our comments. Thank you. Until the voting procedure is decided.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je soutiens la proposition de l'Egypte. Passons au vote, et vote secret

The Chairperson

Thank you. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur. No in fact I will give the floor to the Legal Adviser.

Legal Adviser

I will be as clear as possible about the voting process now. There has been a request for a secret ballot and the secret ballot request has been supported by one member state so the procedure for secret ballot can go forward. The first vote would be on the proposal to inscribe or not the property which is a matter directly covered by the convention. Under the rules of procedure of your committee, Rule 38.2 decisions as to whether a particular matter is covered by the provisions of the convention shall be taken by a vote of two thirds of the Members of the Committee. After that, depending on the result of the vote, the Committee will proceed to vote on the amendments. Starting by the amendment that is furthest removed from the decision that you are voting on. It has been the practice of my office and former legal counsel of my office that a decision on whether to refer or to defer matters or procedural matters not directly covered by the Convention for which a simple majority of the vote is required. Thank you Mr Chairman. I think that this would clarify the procedure. Thanks.

The Chairperson

We have a point of order from Egypt.

Egypt

Excusez-moi Monsieur le Président. J'ai peut-être confus l'interprétation de la part du conseiller juridique, là nous sommes votants sur l'inscription et vous demandez la majorité simple. Je n'ai pas suivi alors.

Legal Officer

Mr Chair, I said at the beginning in that that was a matter covered by the Convention for which you require a two thirds majority of the vote of the members present and voting. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I give the floor to Barbados.

Barbados

Chair, I would just like to be assured that when this vote is concluded that sufficient time will be given for us to ask questions from the Legal Adviser for clarification before we proceed if necessary to the next vote. I just want to ensure there is the opportunity to do that and that it is not lost in the confusion between the two please. Thank you.

The Chairperson

After the first vote, is that what you mean, after the first round. In that case I will give you the floor. In fact I will only give the floor on clarification for the voting, so that everybody be fully informed as we go into the vote.

We are going to have two vote counters. I would suggest the representative of the Russian Federation and the representative of the Brazil to count the votes. Does everyone agree to that proposal. Can we appoint them as vote counters. Alright the Russian Federation and Brazil, their representatives will count the votes. Thank you.

Alright we are going to begin by distributing the voting slips now. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

While the ballot papers are being distributed in the room I would like to read out the text that we are voting also for information of the Observer States Parties who don't see the papers that you are receiving. We are voting on the Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.40 and the question you have to answer is: Do you agree to inscribe the three sites of the Mercury and Silver Binomal Almaden and Idrija with San Luis Potosi (Spain/Slovenia/Mexico) on the World Heritage List. And the choices you have is Yes/No or to Abstain. I apologize there was a last minute modification to the text so the formula the three sites is not in the voting paper, since the three sites constitute one property. The question would merely be: Do you agree to inscribe the Mercury and Silver Binomal Almaden and Idrija with San Luis Potosi (Spain/Slovenia/Mexico) on the World Heritage List? And I have also been asked to record –

Point of order Mr Chairman.

Mexico

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. For the sake of transparency the tellers have handed in a voting sheet to our Delegation and we would like to know whether as one of the States Parties presenting the nomination we can vote or not. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

The Legal Adviser please.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman. Yes of course you can vote because Mexico is a Member of the Committee. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Has everybody received a ballot paper? Then we can begin. 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.

We now have the results of the ballot. Thank you very much to all those who have assisted us. We have 13 votes in favour and 8 against. Since we need a two-thirds majority that would be 14, well we haven't reached that threshold of 14 so it is rejected. Invalid: 0; Abstentions: 0; Valid votes: 21; Yes: 13; No: 8. Two-thirds majority that would be 14 and therefore the proposal is rejected.

The Rapporteur now will take us through the next stage.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I have received another amendment by the Delegation of Switzerland which concerns paragraph 2 and 3 of the Draft Decision. I give the floor to Switzerland.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La délégation suisse a décidé de retirer son amendement la décision que le comité vient de prendre donne le temps aux Etats parties concernés de reformuler ce bien en série tout à fait valable en principe en y adjoignant éventuellement d'autres biens, comme cela est ressorti de la discussion. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. In this case I have no further amendment to the Draft Decision. The original Draft Decision is on page 32 of the English version and page 33 of the French version of the document of your document. Thank you.

The Chairperson

I am going to consult the Committee. Can you accept the text of the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.40** as found on page 32? Adopted.

The next nomination is the **City of Graz – Historic Centre and Schloss Eggenberg, extension of “City of Graz – Historic Centre” in Austria**. ICOMOS has the floor.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairman. This is an extension of the City of Graz Historic Centre inscribed according to criterion (ii) and (iv). This applies to the Palace of Eggenberg and the park. The examination of this nomination was deferred by the Committee during its 30th session in Vilnius in 2006. It has been re-examined during the 33rd session in Seville in 2009 and was referred to the State Party in order to enable it to first of all to extend the buffer zone to the road that links the Castle to the town. Secondly, to strengthen the management authority and broaden the powers of the authority in charge of the management plan. The Eggenberg Palace and its park was built in the immediate surroundings of the City of Graz, in the period between the Renaissance and the Baroque. It has many interior decorations and as a cultural property it is a monument. At the east of the City of Graz you will see the property shaded in red. The blue is the buffer zone. Three kilometres away you have the extension for the proposal of the extension for the palace, the park and the beginning of the alley that linked it up to the city. The buffer zone proposed is shaded in blue and at the centre of the road that links the palace to the city crosses the western suburbs of the greater City of Graz. It is suggested as an extension of the buffer zone with its own management plan. The Palace of Eggenberg was built shortly after 1623 and it was the residence of the von Eggenburg Duke, one of the political figures of the 17th century in the region of Graz. The palace was linked up to the city centre through a straight alley and that is the same trace as the road. Here you see the palace as you come from the city. You see the western façade with the chapel and you can see the coat of arms of the Eggenberg family. Amongst the different elements 365 windows which symbolize of course the days of the year. One for each day of the year. The architectural style shows the transition between the Renaissance and the beginning of the Baroque in Central Europe, as well as influences mainly from the Mediterranean area as well as Western Europe. The lower floor is now a museum and the upper levels have kept their stucco and paintings that reflect the Baroque and Rococo styles of the time, in particular the alegress (?) of the cosmos and many mythological references.

The second floor of the palace has 24 state rooms. They were built in two phases from the beginning of the 17th century to the end of the 17th century and you see the elements, in particular the planets that decorate the rooms. Regarding the fittings and furniture, this reflects the intellectual values of the counter reformation period and reflects the state of life of the aristocracy, close to the imperial circles as well as its aesthetic values. The park is a geometrical park that was first planted in 17th century, very much a renaissance park, then it was reformed and re-styled into a French style garden. It reflects the astronomical decorations of the palace and then in the 19th century it was converted into an English garden and then since the 1990s it was further renovated. ICOMOS considers that the property for extension corresponds to criteria (ii) and (iv) and it strengthens the OUV of the City of Graz, the historical centre of the city. For the palace, the main threat for the palace is urban development. The management plan has been in place since 2007 and with the urban plan of 2009 it outlines all the conservation measures for the buffer zone and the roads that links the historical centre of Graz to the palace. The Bureau for the Wider Property has been established since 2009 and has a strengthened authority.

ICOMOS recommends that the extension of the Historic Centre of Graz in order to include the Palace of Eggenberg be adopted according to criteria (ii) and (iv). ICOMOS presents a recommendation on the landscape integrity. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The Rapporteur has the floor.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 30 of the English version and page 32 of the French version of the document and I have not received any written amendments.

The Chairperson

Anybody has any objection to the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.37?** Adopted. (Applause). I give the floor to the State Party, Austria.

Austria

Thank you Mr Chairperson. Since this is the first time that Austria takes the floor we would like to take the opportunity to thank the Government of Brazil for its warm hospitality and excellent organization in hosting this meeting here in Brasilia. Mr Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee, the Republic of Austria would like to express its sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Committee for the decision to extend the World Heritage Site, City of Graz, Historic Centre to include Schloss Eggenberg. Austria warmly welcomes this decision which significantly strengthens the integrity of the property. I would now like to give the floor to the representative of the City of Graz to say a few words. Thank you.

Mr Chairperson, distinguished members of the Committee. As responsible World Heritage Manager of this city Graz and on behalf of the Mayor I am very grateful with your decision. I would like to thank you for accepting Schloss Eggenberg as an extension of the Historic Centre of Graz. Graz is for about 10 years in the World Heritage Site and the cultural and historical missing link the acceptance of Schloss Eggenberg has been included. And I want to point out that the citizens of Graz are very proud about this inscription. Your decision of the extension is an enormous motivation concerning further work on the City's world heritage so that we can preserve it for further generations. Two institutions supported us all the time. These are the World Heritage Centre as well as ICOMOS Advisory Body. Thank you so much. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you very much to the State Party. Thank you for thanking Brazil.

The next proposal is **Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral with Related Monastic Buildings, St. Cyril's and St. Andrew's Churches, Kiev Pechersk Lavra**, extension of "Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev Pechersk Lavra" in Ukraine. I hand over to ICOMOS for the presentation.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairman. This is a proposal for the extension of Kiev – of Saint Sophia Cathedral, the related Monastic Buildings and the Kiev Pechersk Lavra inscribed in 1991 according to criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The cultural property was the object of a joint reactive monitoring mission from 2-7 March 2009. And the decision taken in Seville asked the State Party to ensure an integrated planning system of the urban zone through a detailed urban plan for the cultural properties as well as for the buffer zones. It also expressed concerns regarding ongoing changes in the buffer zone.

Alongside the Saint Sophia Cathedral and the Kiev Pechersk Lavra the Churches of Saint Cyril and Saint Andrew reflect the spiritual and historic importance of the City of Kiev and the development of Eastern Christendom from the Middle Ages to the modern times. In terms of cultural category, these are two monuments. The Church of Saint Andrew is situated at the northern zone of the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral. Saint Cyril is a separate monument of the cultural property inscribed, situated at four and half kilometres northwest of Saint Sophia. The Saint Cyril church was built in the 12th century. It was a fortified church and it was placed on a promontory, so as to provide a defence system for the city of Kiev. The Monastery associated to the Saint Cyril church was converted into a hospital. Many ancient buildings close to the church were demolished or modified. All these were built close to the cultural property. In the Byzantine style the plan of the church is similar to a square, has three knaves, the façade and roof was rebuilt in the 16th and 17th centuries. The old structure of the church can be clearly seen. On the lower plan it has a large ensemble of 2400 square kilometres with wall paintings and 800 square metres date from the initial 12th century decoration. The style reflects the spiritual values of Russian and Ukrainian Christendom and there is a stylistic evolution in relation to the Byzantine and Balkan styles of the same areas.

The paintings present the lives of the saints, Saint Cyril and hierarchies Saint Athanasium of Alexandria and various religious scenes. The subsequent restoration sought thematic continuity and stylistic continuity of the original works whilst bringing in new colour. The St Andrew church is built on a promontory over the Dnieper Valley. It is organized around four promontories that support the main area. It was built at the beginning of the 18th century by Empress Elizabeth, as part of the Imperial Residence of the Kiev City. Its silhouette dominates the whole environment and is a very important part of the silhouette of the city, in particular when you see it from the River Valley. The Church of Saint Andrew offers a painted decoration which is typical of a mixed Baroque style with western influence, as well as Russian and Ukrainian Orthodox styles. The white paint and blue turquoise paint with gold and red are typical of this church. It was built on an unstable terrain because its water logged and this is why the foundations are unstable and a lot of work had to be carried out in order to shore up the foundations, in particular with the cement pillars, also deforestation of the hill. ICOMOS has reservations as to the subsequent work. The immediate surroundings of the church have not been included in any management plan and there is no plan either to welcome visitors. This cultural property could actually help show the OUV of the cultural property. Criterion (i) could be strengthened in particular because it could help the general panorama of Kiev as an urban centre. However, further protection of the values must be implemented.

The main threats are the serious issues of unregulated urban development in the immediate surroundings of the Church of Saint Andrew as those that were already recognized by the monitoring mission, as well as the decision of the Committee at its previous session. The same goes for the hospital that is immediately adjacent to the Saint Cyril church. Conservation measures are satisfactory regarding architecture and paintings, but they should lead to well thought out measures regarding the stabilization of the foundation of both buildings. ICOMOS believes that we should completely review the next management plan and we should have a unified plan for the cultural property, the buffer zone and also the landscape values of the whole. We need to involve all stakeholders and they need to work hand-in-hand with the management authority. For the reasons that we have just explained ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the extension of Kiev: Saint Sophia Cathedral and Monastic Buildings and Kiev Pechersk Lavra in order to include the Churches of Saint Cyril's and Saint Andrews be deferred. ICOMOS has also outlined additional recommendations in the document. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to members of the Committee. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 29 of the English version and page 31 of the French version of the document and I have not received any written amendments.

The Chairperson

I would like to consult the members of the Committee. Do you agree with the adoption of this **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.36?** . It is adopted. (Applause)

The next property is the **Church of the Resurrection of Sucevița Monastery, extension of the "Churches of Moldavia" in Romania**, and I give the floor to ICOMOS now.

ICOMOS

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. This is a proposal to extend this church on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv). This is a proposal that was examined by the Committee in 2009 and was referred back to the State Party to promote the nomination as an ensemble and to include the Sucevița Monastery. To define a tourist management plan that would also comply with the buffer zone and to conduct Sucevița restoration and repair work and also to formulate a regional management and development plan to ensure the protection of the site and the buffer zone. And also to ensure coordination between the various partners. The Sucevița Church is one of the painted churches of Northern Moldavia with its internal and external walls entirely covered with paintings of the 16th and 17th centuries, directly inspired by Byzantine art. These churches are unique in Europe.

In terms of cultural property this is a monument and the extension being requested is for a serial nomination. The property is in the same region as the churches that are already listed. It includes the church and the fortified surroundings of the Monastery. This is an image of the Monastery with its fortifications. The buffer zone for the time being is a rural zone with individual dwellings and it is also extended by forest zones. The Church of the Resurrection was constructed and painted at the end of the 16th century continuing and completing the regional tradition of the similar churches that are already listed on the World Heritage List and that were built between the years 1530 and 1550. There is an overhanging roof of wooden slates that protect the external paintings. The internal walls and the external walls

are covered with mural paintings that were carried out using a fresco technique with highlights. The hierarchy of the triumphal church is represented in seven horizontal strata on the wall painting. The seven façades represent the Jesse Tree and the philosophers of antiquity.

In terms of detail, you can see a detailed view showing the fine artistic work of the homogeneity and the good general state of conservation of the exterior wall paintings, particularly in the southern part of the church. The Saint John Climacus represented on the walls is one of the rare images of this saint and it appears on the northern façade. Inside the church you have iconography art that follows the main canons of Byzantine painting and illustrates the regional orthodox religious traditions at the same time. The historic themes and allegoric themes represented here are very numerous and there is considerable amount of detail dealt with in refined artistic style. Many regional and local artists participated in this decorative programme which was finished over a relatively short period of time. The space is used to its best advantage and the organization of the images is very systematic. All of the wall's surfaces, the vaults, the niches are incorporated into this vast iconographic artistic programme. The major themes of orthodox Christian tradition, such as communion are represented in a very clear narrative style, similar to the representation of the liturgic calendar which sets out the lives of the saints in a very highly imaged way.

ICOMOS considers that the integrity and the authenticity of the Church of the Resurrection is satisfactory. The property proposed for extension corresponds to criteria (i) and (iv) and its contribution to the outstanding universal value of the already listed site has been demonstrated. ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are the development of tourist activities and unregulated economic development also. The legal protection of the site that is already in place is appropriate. However, the promulgation of a new general urban plan for Sucevița needs to be confirmed. The establishment of a management plan for Sucevița is well under way, following the adoption of the management plan of 2009.

ICOMOS feels that the inclusion of this site would complement and finish the series of painted churches of Moldavia, the already listed site. ICOMOS has formulated various recommendations on page 113 of the evaluation document, in particular the provision of a report to the next Committee meeting concerning the functioning of the coordination committee for the serial property and its local post in Sucevița ensuring regulation of visitors to the inside of the church and the hosting of tourist visits outside the monastery and informing the committee on construction projects in the buffer zone.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 31 of the English version and page 32 of the French version of the document 8B and I have not received any amendments.

The Chairperson

I would like to ask the Committee do you agree with the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.39** just presented. It is adopted. (Applause). I give the floor to the State Party Romania to make its comments. Romania you have the floor. Romania is not represented in the room at the moment.

Alright let us continue. The next site is **Palaeolithic Rock Art Ensemble in Siega Verde in Spain, extension of “Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley”, Portugal**. I will give the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chairperson. This is a proposed extension to the existing World Heritage Site named Pre-historic Rock-Art Sites in the Côa Valley in Portugal inscribed on the World Heritage List, in 1980 on the basis of criteria (i) and (iii). The nominated property covers both banks of the river Águeda tributary to the Douro in Spain and includes hundreds of engraved rock surfaces. Mostly figurative depicting animals. In terms of category the nominated property is a site. The Palaeolithic rock-art of Siega Verde lies to the extreme west of Salamanca, close the Spanish-Portuguese border. On rocky outcrops on the banks of the River Águeda, parallel to the River Coa, which is a Portuguese tributary to the River Douro in Portugal. The location of the engravings to the rock on the two sides along the tributaries of the same river, River Douro, makes evident the connection between the World Heritage Site and the nominated extension. The nominated property is here highlighted in yellow and here in the area 645 engraved rock surfaces have been identified. The buffer zone is in green and includes agricultural land immediately surrounding the river banks. Here we have few images representing the landscape and the banks of the river and here we have the buffer zone and the agricultural landscape surrounding the rock banks. Various techniques have been used for the engravings, percussion first but also incision and abrasions were found. The subject of the engravings cover a wide range of animal groups. Horses, bovids, cervids while human forms are only seldom depicted. Based on its more stylistic features the find has been dated as 16,000 years before Christ and belong to the same chronological and cultural phases as those in Foz Côa. This has been proven by the use of similar cutting techniques as well as by the strong similarities in the engraved drawings. Siega Verde chronologically completes the forms represented in the Côa sites and especially in the middle and later phases which are poorly represented in the Portuguese World Heritage Site. The two sites form a unit in terms of chronology graphics, geology and the environment. Here we have just an image to show the equipment that has been provided at the site for the visit.

The condition of integrity and authenticity have been met. Integrity is however affected by the presence of three station measuring at the river water flow. The State Party has committed to find out solutions to mitigate the impact upon the proposed extension. It should be taken into account, however, that the importance of these measuring stations for security reasons, because of the necessity of measuring the level of the water in case of floods.

The comparative analysis has demonstrated that Siega Verde may be considered a satellite site to Foz Côa and after Foz Côa the nominated property is unique in Europe as an example of Palaeolithic rock-art in an outdoor environment. Usually in fact these engravings are found in caves. Criteria have therefore been justified for the proposed extension. All known engravings are included in the nominated property. They are in a rather good condition. The setting has maintained the geomorphological features that made the Palaeolithic group select it for depicting these engravings. Protection is adequate. The current state of conservation of the nominated property is good and the management framework is adequate. Permanent coordination bodies for the site and this extension has been created.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed extension appears logically, considerably reinforces the expression of the criteria selected for Foz Côa and contributes to shed additional light on the cultural practices of the Palaeolithic groups that lived in the region. ICOMOS therefore recommends that extension on the basis of criteria (i) and (iii) be approved and that the name of property become Prehistoric Rock Art sites in the Foz Côa

and Siega Verde. Additional recommendations have been made to the State Party and these are listed in page 333 of the evaluation volume. Thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 28 of the English version and page 30 of the French version of document 8B and I have not received any written amendments.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I will turn to the Committee Members are you in favour of adopting the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.35?** It is adopted. (Applause) I give the floor now to the representative of Spain for comments.

Spain

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Spain would like to thank the Members of the World Heritage Committee and the Secretariat, the Member States participating here and the members of the Advisory Bodies that participate in the evaluation mission and the report that is served as the basis for this decision. This is a great satisfaction and a high responsibility to incorporate this list on the World Heritage List. This is an extension to a site that already recognized the Valley de Côa in Portugal. This is now a transnational site of natural heritage and it is destined to a common future. There is a high concentration of Paleolithic rock-art in the open air. This was discovered in 1988, so very, very recently in fact and it is exceptionally beautiful. An ongoing surprise that how well these rock engravings exposed to the open air have survived. This is art that is available to everybody. It is somewhat isolated, but it is within reach of everybody. It will now become more accessible to the citizens of the world as a result of this listing. Ladies and gentlemen, Spain has always expressed its deep commitment to the protection of heritage at this forum and over these long and hard days of debate. This is a wonderful occasion for us to re-express that commitment. We would like to see ongoing progress and the discovery of the heritage of the world and also the protection and enhancement of the existing sites. We all know that the future of the convention, the future of the heritage, the future in fact of its all depends on our desire to innovate, to continue and you can count on Spain's ongoing support in this regard. Thank you very much and congratulations. The Autonomous Community of Castilla and León will be delighted with this decision and will be watching this event over the Internet. We would very much like to share our pleasure with you at this time. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Spain and please accept the congratulations of the Chairperson.

We will now move on to the sites of Latin America and the Caribbean, beginning with the **Camino Real de Tierra Adentro of Mexico**. And I give the floor to ICOMOS who will now present this proposal.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chair. This is a serial nomination. This map shows the sites in Central Mexico. The Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (the Royal Inland Road) extends north from Mexico City to Texas and Neuvo Mexico in the United States of America. The Camino Real de Tierra Adentro was actively used as a trade route for 300 years from the mid 16th to the 19 centuries. The Camino Real de Tierra Adentro forms one section of the Spanish

Intercontinental Camino Real that is the Spanish Intercontinental Royal Road, a land and sea route that was used for the exploitation and commercialization of natural resources linking Spain with its colonies in America, South-East Asia at the beginnings of the Modern era. The Spanish explorer Cortés discovered Mexico in 1518 conquering the Aztec empire by 1521. Cortés' invasion route from the Port City of Veracruz to Mexico City became the first section or the first leg of the El Camino Real with ships sailing between Spain and Veracruz. Silver was discovered in the Zacatecas Mountains to the north of Mexico City. So much silver in fact that smelters and mints were built in Mexico City and silver ingots shipped to Spain. The heavily travelled road from Mexico City to the silver mines in Zacatecas became the second leg of the El Camino Real. The third leg was opened up after Count Orñate received permission from the King of Spain to conduct the first colonized expedition far into the interior what is today New Mexico, 1500 kilometres away. Orñate's trail to Zacatecas to Santa Fe which he reached in 1603 became the third leg of the Royal Inland Route or the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro. And over the next 300 years silver fostered train and development along the whole of this route.

Now the serial nomination which consists of 55 sites and 5 existing World Heritage Sites covers or extends along approximately 1400 kilometres of the overall 2600 kilometres of the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro. So the serial nomination is part of the second leg of this route. The nominated sites have been chosen to reflect the development and multi-ethnic societies over three centuries through the selection of representative typological components. In terms of category this is a serial nomination. It is also under the Operational Guidelines, a heritage route. The Mexican States involved in this nomination are 11 and the component numbers for each State is set out here. As you can see just over half the nominations is in two States of Durango and Zacatecas. And as you can see the nomination includes five World Heritage Sites.

The component parts consists of 20 towns and historic centres, 7 former haciendas, 13 chapels and 17 other types of sites. The majority of the components are religious buildings. Now, although this is a cultural route, the nomination only includes very short stretches of the actual road. What is nominated is a collection of sites on or near the main part of the road. In our evaluation dossier these extensive sites were described on a State by State basis from Mexico City northwards. I will now look at them in a slightly different way, in a thematic way.

First of all the nomination includes five World Heritage Sites and one site on the nominated list, that is San Luis Potosí, which we have already been hearing about earlier on. Not all the World Heritage Sites that are included were inscribed initially for their association with the Camino Real. And two were inscribed for criteria other than what is proposed for the serial nomination. The historic city of Mexico City was inscribed for the Spanish buildings that reflect the power and wealth of the silver trade. But it also includes Xochimilco which was included for its pre-Spanish remains. The historic monuments of Queretaro were inscribed for the layout and buildings as Colonial city. The protective town of San Miguel certainly was inscribed for the way it protected the royal route. The historic town of Guanajuato and the adjacent mines was also closely related to the silver mining and the wealth that it created and are directly linked to the route. Zacatecas, the evaluation of the property does not stress its strategic importance in terms of it being a link between the mining areas of Zacatecas, Guanajuato and San Luis Potosí. It was inscribed as a colonial town with a unique layout. You have heard about San Luis Potosí already today.

The second types of properties are towns and historic centres and most of these are small collections of buildings within the centres of the settlement. For instance the town of Aculco was a town of muleteers, the historic centre of San Juan del Rio was a centre for cattle breeding. The historic centre of Lagos de Moreno was built as a defensive settlement but much remodeled in the 19th century. The historic ensemble of the town of Ojuelos in Jalisco, the historic ensemble of Aguascalientes, here the churches that are nominated are linked by a section of the road. In many of these historic centres the chief buildings are

churches. One of the difficulties shown here is how these fragmented areas; in the way they are nominated; can be understood and perceived on the ground. In this architectural ensemble there are four buildings and two churches and two civil buildings. In the town of Pinos, seven buildings have been nominated. The historic city of Durango is a much larger area than most; with some distinguished buildings. The two of San Pedro de Gallo is mainly a church and small one-storey buildings. The architectonic ensemble of the town of Mapimi This town was founded to exploit the nearby mines but these are not included in the nominated area. And the architectonic ensemble of Nazas in Durango are modest buildings of the 19th century. In the two of Indé there are 12 buildings. Also this town was formed to work the nearby towns, but these are not included. The town of Valley de Allende, this is a larger area with 66 buildings around a church.

The next category is seven former haciendas. Haciendas were enormously important part of the structure of the road trade. They were the centre of the way that the landscape was managed, and they were acquired by wealthy miners and the church, as well as by farmers. Of those nominated only two have most of their component parts; that is the houses, the chapel and the agricultural buildings and this one is one of those examples. Some have only the church nominated and sometimes the surrounding buildings are in ruins. This again is a largely in tact hacienda. This one the church has been nominated only and this one the church and also the remains of only a dam and dykes for irrigation in the surrounding area. This is a former hacienda Hidalgo a part of this survives and a part is in ruins. In this one the chapel has been nominated but the adjoining house and workers housing is not included in the boundaries. This section includes a hacienda, well the church from a hacienda, and a nearby bridge. And here we have a former hacienda in Durango and indeed there are a series of six chapels from haciendas in Durango State. This is the first, this one the second, this one the third, this one the fourth, this one the fifth and this one the sixth. There is a separate section on chapels, churches, convents and colleges. These are chapels not related to haciendas or particularly related to historic centres. This one in the State of New Mexico, this second one was part of a former convent, this one this the first of a series of five churches from Zacatacas State. A small ensemble of churches, this is the second one. Now I will show you them very briefly. This one is the third and this one illustrates one of the difficulties in a sense it is only the church in this small town that is nominated, but its context is very much the surrounding settlement. This is the sanctuary of Plateras in Zacatecas. Then we also have four in Durango State. This is the second one and this is just a partially complete church. What this, I hope, illustrates is that in some instances the exact rationale for the inclusion of all these components has not been clearly set out in terms of how each of them is needed to fulfil one aspect of Outstanding Universal Value. This is the fourth one from Durango and then we have a hospital and a cemetery. This hospital was commissioned in the 18th century and still functions as a hospital and there is a cemetery for the nearby town, which flourished as a result of the mining. And then finally, we have bridges and stretches of roads. This is the bridges working North from the State of Mexico, a section of road, a bridge near to a former hacienda, another bridge in Guanajuato State and a second bridge in that State and a third bridge in that state and a bridge in Jalasco and a stretch of the Camino Real in Zacatacas and then also in Zacatacas, this is a natural feature which was seen as a boundary between two kingdoms along the route, and then a stretch of the Camino Real in Durango, and finally one mine. This is a small mine as opposed to the very large silver mines that underpin the prosperity of trade that was along the route. And two caves with paintings that show horsemen and quadrupeds.

ICOMOS considers that the Camino Real de Tierra was an extraordinary phenomena as a trade route for silver that was processed and transported to Spain. For the wealth that it generated and the impetus to open up the northern territory for development through settlements, forts, haciendas and churches. And for the extraordinary communication channel that it became, funneling exchanges, ideas and customs. This route led to enormous social changes. So in ICOMOS' view the route as a concept undoubtedly has the capacity to manifest OUV through certain physical properties. However, the crucial questions are what is the overall extent of the road. We understand there is interest for the

United States to consider nominations to the north. What are the attributes that are needed to convey Outstanding Universal Value. We are not nominating the route. What is being nominated is the structures to reflect its power and influence. How do we attribute each of the nominated parts relate to the overall Outstanding Universal Value. We consider that it is not possible to fully justify the criteria until we can have a better understanding of the precise region for each of the component parts nominated in terms of their contribution. The State Party has indicated that it would have liked to include a further 36 sites and these are listed in the dossier, although they are not officially nominated at this moment. The questions we had to ask were do we need all the haciendas for instance, even though some of them are partial or should the crucial part played by the hacienda system be demonstrated by the finest and most complete examples that remain. Or, are the ones that are nominated distinctive in some way, but this was not really described. How do we choose sufficient components without including what might one call a whole catalogue. We also need to understand the full dimensions of the road in terms of its length and its branches. The States Party indicates that it wishes to nominate in future ancillary routes for salt and cattle. How do these relate to the overall silver route. ICOMOS considers that silver mining underpin the prosperity of the Camino Real de tierra Adentro and it was the extraordinary wealth generated by the silver trade that promoted development and the planned colonization of the northern territories. Therefore, we consider we ought to be choosing sites that reflect the key aspects of this process along the routes and to consider the exemplar sites that consider these processes and aspects. We are not inscribing the idea but the specific sites that convey its scope and influence. Therefore in terms of conditions of integrity and authenticity, we feel that they can be justified, but only with a further justification of a selection of the nominated sites and the boundaries that are needed.

The boundaries of the individual component parts are in many ways adequate. But what we are not saying is adequate is the boundaries of the overall series in terms of how many component parts are needed to justify Outstanding Universal Value. The legal protection in place and the protective measures are generally adequate. The conservation measures and conditions are generally satisfactory. The management of the individual components is adequate. But, at the current moment there is no overall coordinated management of the serial components.

In conclusion, Chair, and I apologize that this has taken rather long to present, ICOMOS recommends that the nomination of Camino Real de Tierra Adentro be referred back to the State Party in order it to allow it to strengthen the comparative analysis in order to establish the importance of the nominated sections of the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro in the framework of a larger route and further justify the selection of sites that make up the nomination to clearly define how each of the component parts conveys and contributes Outstanding Universal Value through defining a methodology that can be seen as a exemplar of the manifestations of the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. The Chairperson would like to thank you for that report. We consider that this report took a long time and this is justified given the size of this property. China you have the floor.

China

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. This is an interesting site of a cultural heritage route. Again this type of property is under-represented on the World Heritage Site. This we should take into consideration when discussing this site. As discussed previously there are many issues that remain unsolved, such as defining criteria for selecting the site to reflect the outstanding universal value. The implication of the relatively few physical remains of the original route to the outstanding universal value of the site and the conservation and the management of site of such a large scale. We have learned from the State Party that the

State Party has already made considerable progress in responding to the ICOMOS recommendations, particularly in improving the comparative analysis, clarification of the relationship between the nominated property and the mercury and silver binomial. We would like the State Party with the permission of The Chairperson to clarify what progress has been made. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to the State Party.

Mexico

Thank you Mr Chairman. The question put to us from the distinguished delegate from China enables us to make a clarification that we think is essential. First of all we have been working with the United States for 15 years now and over that time we have been extremely careful in selecting the sites that we felt was most representative. The 54 monuments and sites are proposed in the nomination file, plus the five cities already listed on the World Historical List strictly fulfil all of the necessary requirements to reinforce the outstanding universal value of a cultural itinerary, not a series of cultural properties. We are basing ourselves on the ICOMOS charter approved in 2008 at the General Assembly of Quebec where it was perfectly clearly established what cultural itinerary HI consists of. In similar cases of cultural routes and itineraries in other regions that have already been listed on the World Heritage List. There are also monumental ensembles and sites that were already listed prior to that. That is the case for the St James Way, the Camino de Santiago and these are chosen to give clearer expression to the value of the property and its integrated character. In the specific case of the Spanish St James Way, the French St James Way, this was also established in the past in the similar way to what we are doing. Thank you Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. I give the floor to Brazil now.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. First of all I would like to thank ICOMOS for its report and for all of the information that has been provided to us. There is no doubt that we are dealing with an exceptional nomination here, because there are very few cultural itineraries that are currently on the World Heritage List and that is why the Brazilian Delegation would like to congratulate the State Party for having made this proposal for a nomination in this category. The category of cultural itinerary which is very under-represented on the world Heritage List. The property that is being nominated the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro it seems to us has a highly relevant territorial presence, both historically, culturally and scientifically it represents an era in our history that was a very important one. Through you chair we would like to ask the State Party for additional clarification with regard to the various sites that compose this nomination for a serial nomination. The question that Brazil is asking the State Party is this: Why among the buildings and the sites put forward for this nomination are certain sites already listed on the World Heritage. Why did you include them in this nomination.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. And could I also add that following the clarification of the State Party we are going to suspend our work and we are going to adjourn for lunch and we will resume at 2 p.m. I do have a speakers list of those Delegations that have requested the floor. We do have that list already drawn up. But my suggestion so as not to disrupt our timetable is that after hearing the State Party now we are going to break for lunch.

Mexico

Thank you very much. The selection criteria for the sites listed in this nomination were to take into account all of the elements that confirm and have an impact on the functioning of the route. And as we said that complies with the requirements for this cultural category of nomination. Some of these sites as you have seen, when we are talking about hospitals for instance, we are talking about hospitals for those travelers that were set up from the 16th century. When we are talking about bridges these are those elements of infrastructure that are absolutely essential for understanding the route that was taken by the travelers. Mr Chairman, I am talking about a distance of almost 3000 kilometres, a route that was built up over three centuries. The sites chosen enable us to understand what it was that enabled the culture and the transmission of elements from the North to the South and from the South to the North along this route. We are talking about heritage which only really makes sense if you read it in this dynamic way, in this north-south, south-north passage, so the elements that we selected to form part of this nomination were discussed in great detail with regard to their meaning in complementing the concept of the cultural route that we are putting forward. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Alright we will adjourn at this point. We will resume at 3 p.m. and work from 3 until 6 p.m. I give the floor to the Secretariat.

The Secretariat

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. So could I indeed confirm that we are working this afternoon, thank you to our interpreters who were to have had the day off today. We thank them for being with us today. (Applause). (The interpreters thank the Secretary for her kind comments.) We will be working this afternoon from 3 p.m. until 7 p.m. says the Secretary with the hope of finishing our nominations and The Chairperson would also like to remind you that from 2 until 3 p.m. the working group on the future of the Convention will be meeting in the Bureau room, unfortunately without interpretation. We are not able to cover all services today, but they will be meeting. Thank you very much and please be back at 3 p.m.

Sunday, 1 August 2010
SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Afternoon session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson

Welcome. Shall we start? Next speaker is Switzerland. You have the floor sir.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. On est restés avec la candidature mexicaine du **Camino Real**. La Suisse considère que cette proposition est fascinante, parce qu'elle comprend une grande diversité d'éléments constitutifs afin de démontrer un phénomène socio-économique complexe, mais dans sa totalité. C'est un grand défi de créer une telle série, parce que les liens entre les nombreux éléments constitutifs ne sont pas faciles à démontrer, tout comme la justification de la composition de la série et la sélection de ces éléments. Pour avoir un peu plus de clarté, nous aimerions demander encore une fois demander à l'Etat partie quelle était la méthodologie qui a été appliquée pour cette sélection de ces éléments de la série. Merci monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. France you have the floor sir.

Mexico

Yes indeed, the question asked by the distinguished delegate of Switzerland comes at an opportune time because indeed we would like to say that this is a cultural nomination. Nomination of a cultural itinerary, it is not a serial nomination. Now there are three things that are very important for us to understand what is going on here. You have the human activity, you have the period of over which these elements were put in place and the entire document really was prepared and we showed the clarity of the cultural map and ICOMOS approved this in 2008 and in that document we showed very clearly all the different points. All the different sites that were selected. We showed the dynamic perspective. We looked at space and time and so that is really why we picked each one of these different components. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you. The next speaker is France. You have the floor.

France

Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président, comme nous avons eu la pause du déjeuner je voudrais revenir un instant sur une précision qui me paraît très importante que nous a apporté l'Etat partie en fin de matinée, c'est qu'il s'agit d'une inscription qui est proposée au titre des itinéraires culturels et pas des biens en série. Et ces itinéraires culturels demandent, nous le savons une vision d'ensemble, une vision holistique comme nous aimons souvent le répéter ici. La France a une expérience du concept de route historique qui est inscrite dans

la liste du patrimoine mondial, par exemple les chemins de Saint Jacques de Compostelle. Nous concevons ce type de biens comme des traces d'un itinéraire majeur dans l'histoire, qu'il s'agisse de la voie elle-même ou de son tracé, ou des édifices ou ensembles qui la jalonnent et qui participent à sa valeur. Ses itinéraires au plan mondial sont sans doute peu nombreux et nous aimerions poser une question à l'Etat partie. L'Etat partie pourrait-il préciser l'étendue de l'analyse comparative à laquelle il s'est livré ?

The Chairperson

Thank you. State Party would you please respond.

Mexico

Thank you chair. With respect to the comparative analysis the State Party conducted a very exhaustive analysis of the properties to be inscribed on the World Heritage List and I would like to mention these so that we can understand what we are talking about. The first was inscribed in 1994. It is the Santiago route on Spanish soil. The second relates to the four roads that meet on French soil. The French route and they were inscribed subsequently. Then we also conducted comparative analysis with the Humahuaca Quebrada which was also inscribed as a serial property that was also a cultural itinerary and this was in the northern part of Argentina. We also conducted comparative analysis with the pilgrimage sites, the Mountain Roads in Japan and later we conducted a comparative analysis study with the Incense Routes in the Negev described in Israel. And here again, we conducted a comparative study with those of the indicative list, El Campanea (?) and the main Andean Route. We conducted a comparative study with the frankincense route in the Negev. We conducted a comparative analysis with Grand dyke in Canada, with the major route of Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Labertaya route in Jordan, Yemen and Saudi Arabia as well as Iraq, Syria and Palestine. So these I think are the most telling, are the most significant examples of such routes that can be used for comparative studies. Some of these are cultural routes that have already been recognized in the list. And then there are others that are on the indicative list and furthermore I would like to say that the other routes that we have on the indicative list we find very ambitious and they go beyond the scope of comparative analysis. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS would you like to give more information to comment.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Just to clarify a couple of points. The honourable delegate for Mexico mentioned something about ICOMOS approving something in 2008. I just want to clarify that I presume that this was the ICOMOS charter on cultural routes which was mentioned before lunch. This ICOMOS charter is a general charter on cultural routes which is very helpful in identifying the attributes of cultural routes but is not specific to World Heritage Sites. Whereas there is an annex 3B in the Operational Guidelines which sets out specifically the points relating to cultural routes and what World Heritage Sites which we have certainly taken into account in our evaluation which talks about the identification of a heritage route being based on a collection of tangible elements testimony to the significance of the route itself. And I think in terms of comparative analysis there are two levels in a complex nomination such as this. One is the comparative analysis between the whole route and other routes in different parts of the world and then there is a comparative analysis within the route as to which elements might be appropriate to put forward to reflect the significance of the route. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. Barbados, you have the floor madam.

Barbados

Thank you Chair. I have listened very attentively to the responses offered by the State Party and ICOMOS and indeed I am satisfied that the State Party has demonstrated the maturity of vision, the capacity to interrogate the subject and to manage the information and to assemble the necessary data with respect to articulating this extraordinary route. I would like therefore to ask through you Chair, if ICOMOS could clarify, for my satisfaction, firstly the request for the State Party to reconsider the inclusion of the five already inscribed World Heritage properties. I understood from the presentation that I think two of them did not, were not inscribed with respect to some of the criteria, but I am not quite understanding, apart from this fact, why it should not be included in this inscription. So I would like clarification from ICOMOS on that and then Chair, if you would, I would like to have the State Party clarify the other question relating to this. The relationship between the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro and the Mercury and Silver Binomial route since that was a question to put to them I would like to hear more on those two points. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. On the question of the existing World Heritage Sites, there are several scenarios that can be followed if existing World Heritage Sites are related to newly inscribed properties. In the case of the Loire Valley, one existing World Heritage Site was absorbed within the wider Loire Valley and then lost its individual identity. In other areas the sites may exist side by side, such as the route of Santiago de Compostelo in Spain where the cathedral is separate from the rest of the route. So, in this instance, it is not quite clear whether the State Party wishes to absorb these World Heritage Sites within the new route or leave as they were associated with the new route, in which case we need to consider the route without these World Heritage Sites to identify the remaining elements have Outstanding Universal Value. One of the difficulties in absorbing these sites would be the although they are already World Heritage Sites, they are inscribed on the list, some of them for similar criteria, but for different justification, and in some instances only part of the World heritage site would be relevant for this particular route. So I think there are a number of ways to go. What we consider is that it would be preferable to leave these existing World Heritage Sites as individual entities on their own and consider them as being associated with the route. But with the rest of the route having an identity separately and justifying the criteria separately.

The Chairperson

Thank you. State Party you have the floor.

Mexico

Thank you sir. The question from Barbados affords me an opportunity to clarify a subject in my opinion is key to our discussion right now. Indeed, there is a whole series of properties that were inscribed before. But they are really recognized because of other values. However, they are connected with the main route. For instance, the Bourgos Cathedral and the Santiago de Compostelo route, the Bourgos was a city that was built actually before the 10th century but then became connected with the Santiago route. However, they found their

way to the Heritage List independently, even though they are connected with each other. And the same thing applies to some of the Mexican cases, which were listed for other reasons, but the background for which is the Camino Real. However, as regards the Mercury and Silver Binomial obviously the Spanish Crown had what they called the Intercontinental Camino Real which is a transoceanic route and for us this was interesting methodologically to see what routes the ships took and applying the Atlantic Ocean and to also what the route was on land. And that enabled us to know exactly what the flow of trade was from one side to the other of the Atlantic Ocean. And that is the reason why this is mentioned in the study. At in the studies we have these big reference points available as background. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Russian Federation you have the floor.

Russian Federation

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous pouvons dire que le grand travail de plus de 15 ans a donné des résultats exceptionnels et la formation des nominations en série qui prend la place, peut être une des meilleures nominations chez nous. En même temps nous pouvons dire que nous pensons, nous proposons la description de cette nomination sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. Mais maintenant si vous le permettez, Monsieur le Président, on peut donner la question pour les pays membres, nous pensons que c'est la question centrale de cette nomination, quels sont les instruments de gestion pour la totalité de la zone et des éléments inclus.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Russian Federation. Mexico please you have the floor.

Mexico

Chairperson, allow me please to answer the question put to us by the representative of the Russian Federation. All of the properties included in this nomination are covered by way of protection by all kinds of legal instruments. There is a general act on the protection of cultural routes, accepted by the Congress of Mexico, promulgated by the Congress in order to restore and maintain the whole system of cultural routes. Also starting with January this year the Camino Real Committee was set up under the national conference of governors of the country. The idea is to have a management plan and another one for sustainable development, plus obviously all kinds of decorations and monuments that had been made before by the Federal Government within the framework of the federal legislation covering all of these monuments. As you can see there is a tremendous amount of legislation covering and protecting all of the components and all of the governors of the State where these components are met in January this year to agree that such protection be afforded legally. Thank you sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I have no further requests for interventions. Mali you have asked for the floor. You have the floor sir.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Président je pense que nous avons à faire à un bien dont une partie des éléments sont déjà inscrits au patrimoine mondial, donc sur ces biens là il n'y a pas de doutes sur l'intégrité, l'authenticité, la VUE, tous les éléments sont réunis. A côté de ces biens il y aussi d'autres éléments qui pour l'ICOMOS il y a des efforts à faire en termes de gestion, de protection et de conservation de site. Monsieur le Président,

j'allais poser la question par rapport aux efforts consentis par l'Etat pour un peu lever le niveau de protection et de gestion pour cette catégorie secondaire de biens. Parce que c'est là l'inquiétude de l'ICOMOS, et suite à l'intervention de l'Etat partie je me rends compte qu'il y a des efforts qui sont développés, il y a un cadre institutionnel et réglementaire, il y a un plan d'aménagement ou alors de gestion, mais aussi un accord-cadre entre les gouvernements intéressés. Aux vues de tous ces éléments, Monsieur le Président, je propose l'inscription du site au patrimoine mondial.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. ICOMOS you have the floor please.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Perhaps I could clarify that ICOMOS, as we said in our introduction, supports the idea of Outstanding Universal Value, this route having the capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value but we just have to be clear precisely how we can articulate that in terms of the individual components. It is a hugely ambitious project, one of the most ambitious we have seen before this Committee and we support the principle of it and its capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value but we do remain concerned about the methodology used for choosing the components and the transparency of that methodology, because in evaluating the site we found it quite difficult to understand how each of the components related to the whole, so we do feel that in a project which is seen to be as exemplary as this one is in cutting new ground and putting on to the World Heritage List an extraordinarily large and complex itinerary, it is an opportunity to define very clearly what this methodology should be, how the site should be chosen, so that we can then inform other properties that might come along thereafter. So although we feel this nomination has many strengths, we do feel that it has not quite ticked all the boxes if you like in terms of comparative analysis between the individual components and in putting in place an overall coordinated management for an extraordinarily large and complex number of sites. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia you have the floor sir.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chairman. I would like to congratulate the State Party on this, ICOMOS has just said so actually, put forward a very powerful and important nomination. I wonder Mr Chairman if we can through you put forward two questions to the State Party. We note that five of the properties, or five of the component parts of this nomination are already inscribed on the World Heritage List and we just wonder if we can seek through you some clarification how they might relate to the development of the property as a whole and secondly, we understand that under the Operational Guidelines it is possible that serial properties may be expanded in the future. Can we seek clarification from the State Party if or not whether they have any intentions to do so or whether this is the complete list.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. State Party please.

Mexico

Thank you. The question from the distinguished representative of Australia gives me an opportunity to say this. The site that are already on the World Heritage List, only serve as a reference and we are only making a reference to them and they are included in the dossier

without any specific proposal for them because they are already been listed. Now secondly, indeed, in the future there is a plan, we don't know when it can be implemented, there is a plan for future nomination, but always jointly with the United States of America, because we have been working with the US for 15 years and the nomination originally was going to be a joint transnational nomination US and Mexico. However, we had to hold back and keep within just the Mexican territory, the idea being obviously that in the future it would be prolonged into the US, but we have no date for that. That is when the United States themselves decide to go ahead with that and do it in a manner that is consistent with ours. But also let me say that the word for the past 15 years has always been joint work and it has been exhaustive work, in every sense of the word, showing clearly the consistency of this project, which I believe does bear witness, not just to urban and architectural landscapes, but also demographic movements, military activity, constant toing and froing of ideas, cultural properties and goods. In my opinion it is extremely important to emphasize the dynamic nature of this nomination as a whole. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Jordan you have the floor.

Jordan

Mr Chairperson, I want to ask a direct question from ICOMOS about their comparative analysis. So I want to ask whether the site should be compared with a World Heritage Site, I mean with sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson

Thank you Jordan. ICOMOS and if you have any further comments about the question asked by us as well.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. What the comparative analysis of any nomination should seek to do is first of all to compare the nominated property with sites of the World Heritage List to see if there is anything there similar or if there is room for the nomination. And ICOMOS considers that what has been demonstrated is more or less adequate to show that this Camino Real that part of the Camino Real that is being nominated doesn't have comparative analysis on the World Heritage List. So in that sense that comparison is value and has been carried out. But as I tried to say before there is a second level of comparative analysis with serial nominations which is comparisons within the site and that is where we feel that the comparisons have not been so robust. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I have no further requests for interventions, so I am giving the floor to our Rapporteur for examination of that Draft Decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 8B.41 is on page 32 of the English version and page 34 of the French version of document 8B. I have received one written amendment from the Delegation of Brazil. The amendment addresses paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, paragraph 1 would be retained, paragraph 2 replaced by inscribes the Camino Real, I'm sorry I am no longer sure if this is submitted. I believe I have just .. thank you I have just received it again. It is not submitted by Brazil but by Australia. I apologize for the confusion. The amendment however was explained correctly. It would replace the current paragraph 2 with the following text:

“Inscribes the nomination of Camino Real de Tierra Adentro on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).” A newly introduced paragraph 3 would then adopt a statement of Outstanding Universal Value and which we would distribute to you in writing. The Australian Delegation would also propose a new paragraph 4 which would read: “Notes that the five properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List remain separate inscriptions from the serial inscription of the cultural route although they are clearly linked to its development.” Following a new paragraph 5 would retain three of the recommendations, slightly reformulated, and would read as follows:

“Requests that the State Party report by 1 February 2011 for consideration by the world Heritage Committee at its 35th session that: (a) provides a succinct statement on how the component sites were selected; (b) expand the buffer zone to include the landscape settings in those locations along the stretches of the road that are important for the context of the route; and (c) reports on progress on the implementation of the new law for the protection of cultural routes and the overarching formal coordinated management framework which includes all of the components within the boundary of the property.” The former paragraphs 2(a) to 2(h) would accordingly be deleted and yet another paragraph would be introduced – paragraph 6 – which would read: “Agrees that this serial property will not be expanded through the inclusion of additional component parts.” Thank you very much Mr Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objections. Australia you have the floor.

Australia

Sorry Chairman, just a couple of final words in the final paragraph read out. The proposal was that this property not have any additional component parts added within Mexico. I think we heard from the distinguished delegate from Mexico that there may be the possibility of further component parts from the United State. We would wish to leave that possibility open.

Rapporteur

Thank you. For clarification, I would then note that the proposal for paragraph 6 would be amended to read as follows: “Agrees that that this serial property will not be expanded through the inclusion of additional component parts within Mexico.” Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So are there any objections regarding the adoption of **the Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.41** as amended by Australia? I see none. Adopted. Thank you. Congratulations to the State Party. (Applause) Mexico you have the floor for two minutes sir.

Mexico

Mr Chairperson, Members of the Committee, distinguished States Parties to the Convention, we are particularly grateful to you for this decision and I should like to take the liberty to give the floor to Mexico’s World Heritage Director.

Your Excellency, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, distinguished Committee Members, Advisory Body representatives, it is an honour for us to be in this spectacular city of Brasilia, which is commemorating its 50th anniversary. It was born out of a utopian and visionary idea of three great Brazilian creative artists who were a perfect embodiment of the spirit of the 20th century, Burle Marx, Lucio Costa and Oscar Niemeyer, and as The Chairperson of the Committee said, clearly Brasilia is an embodiment of Brazil. It is like a synthesis of Brazil, a mixed country where all the various voices of Latin America come together, in an extraordinary manner, and how to forget people like Chico Buarque, Hector

Vilalobos (?), Celadino (?), Jorge Amado, all part of the Brazilian soul. I am saying this because the substance of this nomination that has just been submitted to your consideration and has been now adopted by the distinguished members of the Committee. It is focusing on the tremendous role played by the Camino for more than three centuries in the northern part of the American continent, all along bridges, convents, chapels, penitentiaries, trading posts, all of this together is representative of a huge undertaking and by inscribing this cultural itinerary, which is in fact a category not sufficiently represented on the World Heritage List, the magnitude of which is the symbol of how these huge undertakings were in the 17th and 18 century, you are thereby also acknowledging the work that for more than 15 years, countless experts from Mexico and the United States have been undertaking in order to put forward this nomination that bears witness to part of a national history and which will bear even more fruit in the future and shows the commitment of the Federal Government of Mexico to the safeguarding of often various components of this cultural itinerary, abiding by all of the necessary standards enshrined in the ICOMOS Charter. So thank you very much indeed to all of the Members of the Committee, thank you distinguished Chair, Members of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and do rest assured one and all that Mexico takes it upon itself this year which is the Commemoration of the Bicentennial of Latin American independence and of our own revolution we take upon ourselves the full responsibility incumbent upon this decision. Thank you. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Congratulations to Mexico.

And we are moving to the next site in **Mexico** regarding the **Prehistoric caves of Yagul and Mitla in the Central Valley of Oaxaca**. ICOMOS you have the floor Madam.

ICOMOS

Thank you Mr Chair. Can we now turn to the next site the Prehistoric Caves of Yagul and Mitla in the Central Valley of Oaxaca in Mexico. This is a location map of the general area and this is a map of the property, the smaller line and the outer line which is its buffer zone. Surrounded by the Mixe Mountain Range, the property lies on the northern slopes of Tlacolula valley in subtropical central Oaxaca. Two pre-Hispanic archaeological complexes and a series of pre-historical caves are surrounded by land that is farmed to varying degrees. In the central part of the property are 147 caves and rock shelters, a few of which are said to have provided compelling archaeological and rock art evidence for the progress of nomadic hunter-gatherers to incipient farmers. In terms of categories of cultural properties this is a site. In terms of the Operational Guidelines this is also a cultural landscape.

There are four main elements to this property. The pre-historic caves, the archaeological complexes of Yagul and Cabalito Blanco, and then the surrounding landscape. First of all to consider the caves. This one, Guila Naquitz cave is located at 1900 metres above sea level and was the focus of excavations in the 1960s. The very dry conditions of the cave have allowed the survival of botanical evidence. The excavation produced corn cobs, the seeds of squash and beans, and rind fragments of bottle gourds, as well as evidence that the site was occupied several times intermittently between 8,000 and 6,500 BC by hunter-gatherers.

The wide range of plant food recovered from the cave, including the wild forms of bottle gourds, squash and beans, are said to be evidence of early cultivation, said to be one of the earliest evidence of cultivation of these plants in the continent. In the same caves three corn cobs were excavated, dated from around 4000 BC and was said in the dossier to be the earliest dated samples of corn cobs and to provide evidence for the domestication of corn earlier than that suggested by previous finds in the area.

Although not reported in the nomination dossier, since these excavations were undertaken in the 1960s, yet earlier evidence has been found for the domestication of corn from Rio Balsas dating from around 6700 BC and it is now clear that Naquitz cave does not present the earliest evidence of domestication of corn nor is the evidence for it being the locus for the spread of the corn on the continent.

The Ceuva Blanca was also excavated in the 1960s and provided evidence of Pleistocene animals and stone tools.

A third excavation site Geo Shih site is an open encampment located at low level, near the river, that has provided evidence of the seasonal use of the abundance of fruit and small mammals. The site includes two parallel lines of small boulders and some perforated stones that you can see here, although these aspects of the site are outside the nominated area, within the buffer zone. There are altogether some 147 caves within the property of which the three I have mentioned have been excavated. A few others include the rock paintings such as the Cueva de la Paloma, the Cueva de los Machines seen here and the Caves around Caballito Blanco. Then there are two archeological complexes. The first Yagul. This property includes the remains two small complexes that reflect one of a series of small city states that emerged following the decline of the urban state of Monte Alban and the remains of that were inscribed on the list in 1987. So this is Yagul, that was explored between 1954 and 1961 and it consists of the remains of a Palace, a Ball Court, Council Room and a Fortress. Caballito Blanco is the second archaeological complex area. It represents one of the smaller satellite societies of the smaller urban centres such as Yagul. And there are some remains of three prehistoric buildings creating a central space or plaza. Nearby are caves with engravings, possibly used for public rituals. Around Yagul the landscape is intensively cultivated but on the higher slopes there are some cattle grazing. In a few areas pockets of remnants of forests that reflect the type of vegetation known to early man. The recent abandonment of some of the higher-level grazing is seen as an opportunity to create a more leisure landscape or landscape for visitors. The dossier contains a great deal of documentation on the significance of corn in Mesoamerican culture. The claim is made that corn, whose origin is found in Yagul, provided the basis for the development of civilizations that began in Mesoamerica. As already stated the earlier evidence for corn and maize is now not thought to have come of Yagul and the type that is found in Oaxaca is anyway not related to the current domesticated maize.

The landscape does not provide any evidence to show continuity in settlements between the cave dwellers, the Yagul and the Caballito Blanca complex and present day communities. The conditions of integrity and authenticity might in ICOMOS' view be considered to be met for a much smaller area than the nominated one. In other words just panning the three caves that have provided the very early evidence of domestication and early settlement.

The comparative analysis does not provide justification for the consideration in our view of the whole property to be nominated for the World Heritage List. We do, however, we do not consider that criterion (ii) be justified. We do however that criterion (iii) could be justified for a smaller area than has been currently nominated. We do not think that the property can be seen to be an exceptional testimony to the cultivation for corn, but we do, however, consider that the evidence for Guilá Naquitz Cave in particular, related to the domestication of other plants, linked to the evidence from Cueva Blanca and Gheo Shih site can together be seen as an exceptional testimony to the very aspect of pre-history in Central America. But this criteria could be justified for a very much smaller area than that nominated. Though we have some concerns about boundaries, but that is the boundaries of the larger site as currently nominated because of its inter-relationship with urban development and there are some concerns about protection and conservation as well, both of which we consider need to be proved to meet the needs of the property and particularly to meet the needs of the cave.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends the nomination be referred back to the State Party to allow it to define a smaller area and we have some other recommendations as well which are set out in your document. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much ICOMOS and I would appreciate if you speak the time allocated next time. Now I would like to open the floor for Member States to comment. Mali you have the floor.

Mali

Merci Monsieur le Président. Avant de commencer mon intervention, j'ai dû entendre dans la traduction en français, une demande de référer du dossier à l'Etat partie. Je n'ai pas compris le mot du traducteur. De référer ou de différer ?

(le Président) De renvoyer.

Merci Monsieur le Président, après cette clarification, je voudrais revenir à ce site extrêmement intéressant qui est d'ailleurs, pour moi en tout cas, un paysage culturel, parce que nous avons différents niveaux naturels, mais aussi culturels, et il y a une interaction forte entre les différents niveaux. Je voudrais revenir à un aspect extrêmement intéressant, c'est la place et le rôle du maïs dans le développement de la civilisation dans cette partie du monde. Dans cette partie du monde, le maïs a joué un rôle extrêmement important pour perpétuer cette civilisation. Au passage je loue également les efforts consentis par l'Etat pour les fouilles organisées. On a parlé de 143 grottes qui ont été fouillées, donc à côté des grottes naturelles il y a aussi des grottes sacrées. C'est un ensemble d'éléments extrêmement importants et dynamique. Je voudrais aussi partager les inquiétudes de l'ICOMOS. L'ICOMOS a posé un certain nombre d'éléments d'inquiétudes par rapport à l'intégrité du site, par rapport à son authenticité d'analyse comparative. Mais aussi des améliorations à faire dans le domaine de la conservation et de la protection. Alors là, Monsieur le Président, je voudrais m'adresser à l'Etat partie pour voir ce qui a été fait dans ces différents domaines. Je précise bien l'intégrité, l'authenticité à les déterminer, l'analyse comparative, et s'il y a eu des mesures de renforcement de la protection et de la conservation

The Chairperson

Thank you Mali. That is not a technical question. You have the report of ICOMOS for that. Could you really put your technical question in more specific terms. I will give the floor to France and give you a few moments to think and come back to you.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Oui, justement dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS on comprend qu'il y a une demande de réduire assez nettement la surface du bien et cela a évidemment des implications en termes de gestion. Alors j'avais justement une question à poser à l'Etat Partie, déjà sur l'organe de gestion de la zone assez étendue, assez importante telle qu'elle était prévue et donc à la lumière du rapport d'ICOMOS, quelles sont les conséquences sur ces prévisions de gestion d'une réduction importante de la zone.

The Chairperson

Thank you France. That partly covers the question that Mali wanted to ask. I will give the floor to the State Party to respond.

Mexico

Mr Chairman, thank you very much for giving me the floor. I would like to give some clarification that I think is essential. Some of the comments made by ICOMOS and the expressed question put by both France and Mali I think merit response. Why does the State Party reject a reduction of the size of the description of the site. Well, first of all could I give you a basic premise. Mexico has other rock-art sites listed in the San Francisco Sierra in Baja California. But this new nomination incorporates a new and necessary concept. The living and subsistence territory as a demonstration of a pre-Hispanic life style that involves interaction with the environment and its conservation. We have rock-art sites in Africa which have as a collateral matter incorporated this kind of consideration in previous years but none in the Americas. The possible reduction of the site to the three properties mentioned by ICOMOS as considered to be a cultural landscape would limit that vision. The theoretical implications of the site and the environment in terms of archaeology, the patterns of settlement and subsistence of the society, which is a nomadic society, the studies on hunter-gatherers cannot be limited in this way because necessarily we are dealing with a nomadic phenomenon and so to reduce the site to the three sites mentioned by ICOMOS would eliminate that concept and would be counter-productive if also for the management of this area. As a cultural landscape it is also the subject of study and a tool to concrete social phenomena. To conclude, Mr Chairman, we would like to say as ICOMOS recognizes the major threat to the site is urban development. So a dramatic reduction in the area of the nomination would also significantly reduce our arguments and the relevant bodies' capacity to slow or halt urban development and the construction of structures that could be detrimental to the archaeological sites and to the cultural landscape as a whole. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and I give the floor to Brazil.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman we would like to put a question, but in a way that question has been addressed, so we don't need to repeat it. So we are going to make a few comments instead. Once again, we are dealing with a nomination of a site that has Outstanding Universal Value and we would like to congratulate the State Party for all of the efforts that it has made to rescue and protect sites that are institutionally represented on the World Heritage List. That is very much the case of pre-historic sites. Mr Chairman, we would like to thank the State Party for its explanations, but also ICOMOS for its reports and we would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its contribution. Also the World Heritage Centre has provided consistent help to the State Parties. The Yagul and Mitla Caves are evidence of exchange of pre-historic technologies relating to the use of plans and their cultivation. There is evidence Mr Chairman that these sites are exceptional in demonstrating cultural traditions of this civilization, which unfortunately has now disappeared. This is an exceptional example of our cultural landscape which illustrates a very significant period in human history. Our ancestors abandoned the nomadic life subsequently and began to found the first fixed human settlements in the region later. Mr Chairman I am trying to limit my comments here so as to not unnecessarily prolong the debate on this nomination. Could I just say that Brazil has submitted a proposed amendment but we did submit it a little late and the Rapporteur will tell you about it when the time comes.

The Chairperson

The Rapporteur has just indicated to me that she has just received your amendment. In any way I have no further requests for interventions so we are moving to the examination of the Draft Decision and I am giving the floor to our Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.42 is on page 33 of the English version and page 34 of the French version of your document. And I have indeed received an amendment from the Brazilian Delegation. The amendment addresses paragraph 2 of the current Draft Decision. The paragraph as it exists is deleted and replaced by the following paragraph: "Inscribes the Prehistoric Caves of Yagul and Mitla in the Central Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico, I apologize to the Mexican Delegation for the very bad mispronunciation, on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). Accordingly, a new paragraph 3 would be inserted which contains the statement of Outstanding Value, which again would be distributed to you in writing, and then the Brazilian Delegation proposes a new paragraph 3 which would retain some recommendations to the State Party and since those have been reformulated I would read them to you in the original language of submission, that is in French. (From interpretation) New paragraph 3 asks "the State Party to take into consideration: little (a) the establishment of an effective conservation programme to guarantee control of axis to the landscape and to prepare for risks; little (b) to ensure that the management plan addresses in full all conditions of integrity, protection and management to guarantee the long-term conservation and reinforcement of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property; little (c) to establish a monitoring and scientific research programme over the long-term for the better understanding of the agricultural landscape; and little (d) to establish a general system of management coordinated by the relevant authorities that covers all of the sites in accordance with the provisions of 114 of the Operational Guidelines to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention." Thank you very much Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you Britta. ICOMOS. I'm sorry Australia you have the floor.

Australia

Thank you Mr Chairman. I have just noted that we have also submitted an amendment which I think the Rapporteur has.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. Rapporteur you have the floor.

Rapporteur

Yes I confirm I have also received an amendment from Australia. The amendment equally concerns paragraph 2, however it does not concern the general recommendation in paragraph 2. It would retain referral and introduce changes to the subparagraphs in the recommendation so I think Mr Chairman we would need to consider the Brazilian amendment first as it seems further removed from the original Draft Decision. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson.

Thank you Rapporteur. Switzerland you have the floor Sir. No, Jordan you have something to say.

Jordan

Jordan supports the Brazilian amendment.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS have you something to say.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Just in connection with the proposed Brazilian amendment. The honourable delegate for Brazil may like to consider the criteria which ICOMOS considered in its evaluation. The property was nominated under three criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS considered that criterion (iii) was justified in our understanding for a slightly smaller area, but nevertheless we felt that that was justified but we could not find justification for the other two criteria. Thank you.

Brazil

Chair, I would ask the State Party to please comment on this.

The Chairperson

I'm sorry I didn't hear you.

Brazil

Mr Chairman I would kindly ask you to give the floor to the State Party in order to comment on this question asked by ICOMOS.

The Chairperson

I am sorry I can't. If you have no further questions and we start the adoption of the Draft Decision. Thank you very much for your understanding. Thank you ICOMOS. Legal Adviser please.

Legal Adviser

Thank you Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman would you like me to answer a question. What is the question. Thank you Mr Chairman. It is my understanding that there are two amendments on the table. There is an amendment by Australia and there is an amendment by Brazil. I presume that the Secretariat has made the determination that the amendment from Brazil is the furthest removed. If that is the case then the amendment from Brazil should be put to a vote first. But I understand that the Brazilian Delegation wants to take the floor. Is it regarding this matter sir. O.K Mr Chairman can Brazil have the floor.

The Chairperson

Australia asked for the floor first.

Australia

Just very briefly Mr Chairman, the Rapporteur has mentioned that we introduced an amendment, if I may briefly summarize. It does call for the nomination to be referred but to be referred with the original scope in which the nomination was put, as a larger landscape not to be referred on the narrow basis that has been banged out by ICOMOS as something shaped more around the caves. So our proposal is to retain as referred the larger nomination that was originally put by Mexico.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. Brazil.

Brazil

To the question put by ICOMOS. I shall agree on the question of the criteria.

ICOMOS

Thank you very much for this question. With regard to the criteria the difficulty with regard to what would be listed and so we would retain the idea of listing under criterion (iii). We are trying to reach agreement with you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS have you anything to add.

ICOMOS

No not at this moment.

The Chairperson

So we are going to give the floor to our Rapporteur. Legal Adviser you have something to say.

Legal Adviser

I hadn't finished. I was in the middle of the procedure to vote on the amendments. First on the amendment that was furthest removed which was the amendment presented by Brazil and then depending on the result of that vote you proceed to the amendment of Australia. You have to make a determination whether the vote is by a show of hands or by secret ballot. The amendment from Brazil requires a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting for adoption.

The Chairperson

Thank you Legal Adviser. Brazil you have the floor.

Brazil

Did anybody, any Member State ask for a vote. I didn't hear any requests for a vote. That is why I cannot understand why there's a vote.

The Chairperson

I was just going to ask whether there was any objection regarding the amendment of Brazil and I am going to give the floor to our Rapporteur just for reading the first umbrella of paragraph 2.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. In order to read paragraph 2 again correctly I would like to have a very brief clarification from the Brazilian Delegation because in their amendment they seem to have deleted part of the name of the property and I just would like to find you if it was accidental or on purpose because they are no longer prehistoric caves. Can I retain the prehistoric caves or would you indeed want this to be deleted.

Brazil

Brazil thinks that perhaps that was a mistake.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much. It was appreciated. Then paragraph 2 would read as follows: Inscribes the Prehistoric Caves of Yagul and Mitla in the Central Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico, on the World Heritage List on the basis of culture criterion (iii). Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia. So are there any objects regarding the amendment from Brazil. I would like to ask State Parties. Australia?

Australia

Sorry Mr Chairman, it is not a point of order. It is just an objection. We do not agree with the amendment proposed by Brazil. I suggest that we move to a vote on the amendment proposed by Brazil.

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. Can I ask the States Parties if they agree with the Brazilian amendment. If you agree please raise your signs. Thank you will you put it down. I'm going to ask again who are against the Brazilian amendment to raise your signs please. Thank you. For the third time I am going to ask the Members for abstention to raise your signs please. Thank you. The number of members who voted: 20; Acceptance of the Brazilian amendment: 15; against: 3; abstention: 2. So it is agreed, adoption of the **Draft Decision 35 COM 8B. 42.** (Applause). State Party you have two minutes for a statement.

Mexico

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. We sincerely thank the entire committee for giving us the opportunity to speak. The Prehistoric Caves of Yagul and Mitla in the Central Valley of Oaxaca a cultural landscape whose components are of exceptional relevance for the history of archaeology and the cultural heritage are an undoubtable example of the relationship between man and nature in the origins of domestication of plants in North America which then led to the development of the Mesoamerican civilizations. With this listing not only are we recognizing the major academic work that has been conducted by experts and institutions from the United States and Mexico, this is the most important point for us, recognizing the ancient populations of Oaxaca, whose ingenuity and knowledge of nature led to the development of agriculture, gave us the original corn crops and the populations of Mitla, Tlacolula and other communities, today are the heirs to this 1000-year old technology. We would like to thank the Members of the community and the host country also and we would like to restate Mexico's commitment to the premise of the 1972 Convention. Thank you. (applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you. Congratulations to the State Party.

And now we are going to move to the last site on the cultural properties regarding **São Francisco Square in the town of São Cristóvão in Brazil**, and I give the floor to ICOMOS. You have one minute to start. Would you start Madam.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. São Francisco Square in the town of São Cristóvão in Brazil is the next property. It is in central eastern Brazil in the State of Sergipe. The nominated area is for a zone shaded here, is the square within the São Cristóvão town. The square consists of the central open area and the surrounding buildings and the central cross. This is a referred back

nomination. At the 32nd session when the nomination dossier was examined by the World Heritage Committee, it was referred back in order to allow the State Party to reorientate the comparative analysis in order to more convincingly demonstrate similarities and differences with other properties in Brazil and in the wider region, and to reconsider the boundaries of the nominated property in order to include other sectors of the São Cristóvão historic centre that might contribute to the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property. And it was added that this could enable a more accurate identification of cultural values and define boundaries of areas that clearly express them. Furthermore, there were technical recommendations as well that is listed here. This decision in ICOMOS' view highlights the difficulties facing this nomination, as initially ICOMOS recommended that this property should be deferred, in order to allow the State Party to address the recommendations that I have just outlined. In the event it was referred, but as the State Party was asked to reformulate the nomination with new boundaries, demonstrate OUV with authenticity and integrity and put in place protection of management for a larger area. Without a revised nomination this was impossible to achieve within the referral process which has proved to be constraining. So the nomination property that we are now considering is the same as the first nomination and the dossier is almost identical.

São Francisco Square in the town of São Cristóvão, is a quadrilateral open space surrounded by substantial buildings such as São Francisco Church and convent, the church in Santa Casa da Misericórdia, the Provincial Palace and associated 18th and 19th century houses. The Franciscan complex is seen as an example of typical architecture of the religious orders developed in north-eastern Brazil. In terms of categories this is a group of buildings. This next photograph shows you an overview of the town. The square is in the top centre of the image and as you can see it is one of several small squares within the town. This is a closer view of the square and this is the building on the North side, the São Francisco Church and Convent. It was built in 1693 but almost totally rebuilt in 1902. Within it has cloisters with six arcades on each side, one of which you can see in this picture. And this is a couple more views of the Monastery and its monastic church and its interior view. The lower picture is the former Provincial Palace on the south side of the square which is now a museum. Which this was reconstructed in 1826. The top slide is a photo of the building on the east side, which is the Church of Santa Casa da Misericórdia, which dates from the 18th century. On the fourth side of the square are a group of five modest houses. Until 1855 the town of São Cristóvão was the capital of Sigepe, an administrative and commercial centre. The square remains the focus for social and civic life in the town and as you can see here is used for dances and processions.

ICOMOS considers that the attributes of the square only form part of a wider landscape that could be seen to be of value. Therefore, in terms of wholeness, integrity has not in our view been demonstrated. However, in terms of intactness the attributes nominated are not under threat. The urban and architectural fabric of the square and the associated buildings are authentic and it continues to function as a focal point for the city. However, what has not been set out in our view is how the ensemble, as a whole, conveys the suggested Outstanding Universal Value. The comparative analysis compares the São Francisco Square with religious ensembles constructed by the Franciscan Order in north eastern Brazil. This reveals considerable similarities between the buildings of São Francisco Square and other squares and it does not demonstrate uniqueness or exceptionality of this particular square, over and above the others.

While recognizing the importance of the property as a coherent and harmonious ensemble at the national level, ICOMOS does not consider that a case has been made either in terms of demonstrating a gap in the list or in terms of demonstrating that no other ensemble of squares and buildings exist with comparable assets that could allow consideration of this property on the World Heritage List. We consider that the boundaries don't encompass a sufficient area that could justify Outstanding Universal Value. We have some comments on the boundaries, but protection, conservation and management we consider are satisfactory.

Our conclusion therefore is that we recommend that this property be deferred in order to allow the State Party to address the boundaries in order to allow a larger area that might have the potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value and we make a series of other recommendations which you will find in your documents.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. Now I would like to invite the Members of the committee for their comments. I see Mexico, Nigeria, China, United Arab Emirates, France, Jordan, South Africa, Switzerland, Estonia, Barbados, Cambodia, Iraq, Bahrain, Ethiopia. Mexico you have the floor sir.

Mexico

Thank you Chair. We are certain, we are convinced of the OUV of this property being proposed by Brazil the São Francisco Square in São Cristóvão in our view is an extraordinary example of urbanization in the Americas and of a specific part of its history shared by Spain and Portugal. We would raise a matter which we think is essential to establish OUV. We would ask the State Party, how through the comparative analysis, one can recognize the uniqueness of this Square in order to justify its inscription on the World Heritage List. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

I don't think that this is a technical question Mexico.

Mexico

Well, it is on the comparative analysis conducted in the dossier and that is why we feel the comparative analysis reveals some issues that are fundamental to establish OUV. Thank you.

The Chairperson

ICOMOS do you have something to add?

ICOMOS

The comparative analysis that was in the dossier was interesting and compared in some detail, as in the first dossier, this square with other squares in Franciscan buildings in north-east Brazil. As I have mentioned in our view what that comparative analysis shows very clearly is that the square and the Franciscan buildings on one side of it are part of a group of buildings in the north east of Brazil which together have very distinctive characteristics. We do agree with that. What we don't believe that the comparative analysis does is show how this square is exceptional and can in a way show for all of those buildings.

The Chairperson

Thank you ICOMOS. Nigeria. Mexico you have the floor.

Mexico

Thank you, Chair. We would like to specify that the question raised by this Delegation is directed to the State Party. We would like to know what is the justification of the exceptionality of this place based on their comparative analysis. Thank you, Chair.

The Chairperson

State Party you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you Chair. I thank the State Party of Mexico for making it possible for us to give this answer. Portugal became an independent kingdom in 1730 and it arrived at its current level in 1270 with the conquest of the Algarve. We had the ordinance that in the 15th century established similar sites in Africa, in Asia and in South America, and this legal and administrative establishment still had medieval influences and was the foundation for the establishment of the first Brazilian cities. In the 16th century and the Manuel system took over in 1520 and affected the way that colonial settlements were put in place in Brazil. Then there was the unit of the Catholic kings in 1420 and this new State emerged very late and Spain was able to put in place its own legal and administrative structures in the areas it colonized with a lot of Renaissance influences and so Spanish colonization put in place specific organization systems, very geometrical and the system was used throughout the Spanish colonies. In the Philippines, in Peru, in Mexico, in Patagonia. Now, in the Portuguese-speaking world the process was radically different. There were less than one million inhabitants in Portugal and Portugal had to protect its colonies of four continents. There was a huge territory in Brazil and so it could not possibly do the same thing and so Portuguese colonization maintained middle-age urbanization systems. The occupation of, the land was organic, there was specific characteristics that were linked to the topography and to the local natural environment. And when you analyse Brazilian sites on the World Heritage List you will get a clear picture of what I am talking about. Olinda, Goyaz, Gemantina, Goyaiz..., Salvador, they were very asymmetrical. It shows the way that the land was occupied. The roads are narrow and they are tortuous. The squares are large and they are irregular in shape. The Portuguese and Brazilian colonial cities in the Americas do not have straight lines or geometrical organization of the urban spaces. When you look at the ensemble in the São Francisco Square you see that it is very similar to the Spanish geometrical style. It's a very different urban system as compared to what was done before. And so the São Francisco Square is very different. It is very individual. It is very different from what you have in other parts of the world. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much. Nigeria you have the floor sir.

Nigeria

Thank you very much Chair. We would like to thank the Advisory Body for the excellent work that they have carried. We notice that this property is a referred one. It was treated last year but we also recognize the two most important points that have been raised by the Advisory Body concerning this property, namely the comparative analysis and the issue of the boundary. However, we see when going through the dossier it is very clear São Francisco Square appears to be the only standing testimony that there was once a convergence between two other models which confer to the property's unique and hybrid features that do not exist anywhere in this world. Apparently the major concern here is that the OUV has not been fully demonstrated in terms of the limit of the property and the issue of the comparative analysis has just been dealt with by the State Party. We would like to address the State Party to address the second most important issue through The Chairperson. That is to establish direct relations between the OUV and the limit of the property. Thank you very much sir.

The Chairperson

I'm sorry Nigeria. Again this is not a question that could be addressed to the State Party. I would just like to clarify that we should address direct and technical questions regarding further information without getting inside the evaluation process.

Nigeria

Thank you Mr Chairman. But my question is, (Chairman interrupts) if you allow me to explain. The issues raised by ICOMOS is to comparative analysis and boundary. The comparative analysis has been adequately addressed by the State Party. The other issue is the boundary – to establish the link between the OUV and the limit of the boundary. So that this thing can come out clearly. I think the State Party would be in a good position to give this explanation.

The Chairperson

O.K. thank you. I have 12 further requests for intervention. Maybe would you mind if I take the next one and maybe if we have another question addressed to the State Party, so the State Party can address both at once. China you have the floor.

China

Thank you Mr Chairman. China appreciates the valuable work done by the Advisory Body. We also noted that the State Party has submitted a revised statement of integrity and authenticity. Taking into account the importance of integrity and authenticity, which should directly relate to clarify the boundary of a nominated property which was mentioned by the previous speaker. China appreciates the active response of the State Party in accordance with the decision of the Committee, so therefore may I address one question to my Brazilian colleague. On which basis does the State Party support the Outstanding Universal Value of the São Francisco Square since ICOMOS considers that there are other similar sites in the Americas already inscribed on the World Heritage List where Spanish urban regulations are present. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you China. State Party for replying those questions raised by Nigeria and China.

Brazil

Thank you Chair. Well, in the case of the São Francisco Square is really unique in the Americas. We are looking at an architectural ensemble, built in Portuguese colonial territory, based on typically Spanish urbanization systems. Between 1580 and a subsequent period, the two crowns were united and the imperial crowns had to have the same administrative system, the same legal and urbanization system, imposed by the Spanish crown, the Philippines Ordinances. So you have these urban and legal systems that was the same so those areas that were occupied by the Spaniards and the Portuguese still had their own specific identities, based on a very different vision of territorial occupation. The only existing testimony of the convergence of these two urban models is in São Francisco Square in São Cristóvão and ICOMOS' assessment is historically an incomplete vision of the occupation process of the Americas. We need to make it very clear that the models used by Portugal and Spain in the colonization systems were totally different. In terms of political organization, economic and social organization, as well as in terms of the use of the land and architectural systems. In 1494 the discovered lands were divided among the two crowns and Spain and Portugal had the opportunity to make their mark in this specific areas that they occupied in the new world. It is only in the case of the São Francisco Square that we see a perfect synthesis of these two different models. There is nowhere in Brazil or in any other

country in Latin America or in any other country of the world that you have a similar example of the convergence of these two visions of the world and the urbanization systems of Portugal and Spain. In the Spanish colonies no efforts were made to bring in Portuguese concepts and models. And so, that is why this site is exceptional. It is unique and it is very different from other urban ensembles on the American Continent and in the other Spanish and Portuguese colonies. And, so for all these reasons Brazil believes that the São Francisco Square should be inscribed, deserves to be inscribed, on the World Heritage List. As to the boundaries chair, Brazil.

The Chairperson

Excuse me. Just reply to the questions raised by Nigeria. Don't get into the evaluation itself.

Brazil

I am answering the question asked by Nigeria. First I answered the question raised by China. Now I am about to answer the question raised by Nigeria as to the boundaries Chair. Now Brazil noted the recommendations of the Committee, we looked at the boundaries for the delineation of the property and in this new analysis we made it very clear that the boundaries proposed in the dossier are accurate. Why? Because the components of the urban ensemble of the São Francisco Square are the ones that in an uncontested fashion show the exceptional Outstanding Universal Value of the site. And we were looking at keeping a direct link between the OUV and the boundaries of the property. Furthermore, we want to ensure the integrity of the property and we expanded the buffer zone and brought in areas that had not been included previously.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Avec toute la bonne volonté et la compréhension que nous avons pour écouter les explications de la délégation du Brésil, il me semble qu'on est déjà largement dans une sorte de plaidoyer. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you, Switzerland. France you have the floor and I would ask that we all keep to the time allotted to us and I would say to the State Party when answering questions please stick to the time available to you.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président, je crois que nous touchons sur le plan de la procédure la milite de regrouper des questions pour donner ensuite la parole à l'Etat partie. L'Etat partie ne peut pas répondre à deux questions différentes dans le temps qui en principe est imparti à une seule question. Cela dit je vais à mon tour prendre la parole et poursuivre si vous m'y autorisez. Monsieur le Président, nous savons que le Brésil est un pays de synthèse réussie et de symbiose entre des influences culturelles très variées, et c'est bien cette symbiose qu'illustre le bien, la candidature du bien que nous sommes en train d'examiner. La place de São Francisco est elle aussi le résultat unique de la fusion des pratiques urbaines, du Portugal et de l'Espagne qui ont guidé la création de centres urbains dans leurs empires coloniaux respectifs. L'Etat partie vient de nous apporter ces indications, c'est bien cette idée tension avec l'équilibre et la symétrie qui prédominaient dans l'empire hispanique et une rupture avec cette symétrie qui est la caractéristique unique de l'empire lusophone. La délégation française est convaincue de la valeur universelle de ce bien. Je vais à mon tour adresser une question très précise et technique à l'Etat partie pour faire suite à des préoccupations exprimées dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Le dossier de candidature de la place de São Francisco fait référence à un corps d'urbanisme. Cependant nous ne savons pas si ce code d'urbanisme est déjà mis en œuvre. La délégation de la France souhaiterait

avoir une clarification de l'Etat partie sur ce point, c'est-à-dire sur l'existence d'un code d'urbanisme et d'un code de gestion. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much France. State Party you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you very much Chair. Federal protection and Municipal protection measures available are appropriate to maintain OUV of the São Francisco Square. These measures have been in place since the 1940s and ICOMOS does acknowledge that the São Francisco Square is in a good state of conservation. The urban planning plan was developed by the city authorities and it included Federal guidelines for heritage protection. We also have a local administrative committee that was set up less than two years ago and we have an integrated management system that includes different levels of government and civil society. We also have regular assessment obviously for the state of conservation of the property. The best proof that this system works very well is the good state of conservation of the historic centre and so the OUV has been maintained consequently. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. The next speaker is United Arab Emirates.

United Arab Emirates

Thank you Mr Chairperson. We were going to ask a question on the border issue which has been already clarified.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Jordan you have the floor.

Jordan

Sir, Jordan welcomes and appreciates the efforts of the Advisory Body. In the meantime I would ask ICOMOS on how and what part of this historic site does not meet the requirements of the Convention and its Operational Guidelines in regard of authenticity.

The Chairperson

Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor Madam.

ICOMOS

Thank you Chair. Just going back to what the honourable delegate from Brazil was explaining about this fusion between the Spanish and Portuguese models which has been really well documented and was referred to in our literature. We consider it as extremely important and that the Square we are talking about was constructed just at the moment when Spain and Portugal ruled by the same crown and we accept this argument that has been put forward. That this Square was created at just that moment if you like, and therefore, to look for this fusion between Spanish regular planning and the more organic planning of Portugal. I think what we were looking at is the small scope of the nomination that was put forward. Comparing that to other squares in the comparative analysis section of our evaluation, we discussed this and reflected the actual comparisons the State Party had produced as I mentioned earlier and looking at squares and Franciscan monuments in other parts of Brazil. We consider that the Outstanding Universal Value that was being suggested in terms of an

understanding of this fusion, couldn't readily be manifested in just the square and the surrounding buildings, but as was the case when this was last considered by the Committee, we believe that the Outstanding Universal Value had the potential to be demonstrated with a larger area of the town. Still along the same lines of understanding this fusion of urban planning, but this square can, we considered and should be appreciated as part of a wider urban ensemble. And that was the basis of our comments on Outstanding Universal Value and authenticity and integrity. We need to see as the Committee had agreed the last time a larger area to manifest this area which is being suggested.

The Chairperson

Thank you. South Africa you have the floor sir.

South Africa

Thank you Chairperson. We had a question on the Outstanding Universal Value that was cleared. But also based on, we had a concern because we heard from ICOMOS saying that since the last dossier not much has been done that the current dossier is almost very similar to the previous one. But what I have listened to and what I hear now looks like considerable effort has been done by the State Party, and based on that and on the latest information provided by the State Party I would like us then that we move for the inscription of the site on criteria (ii) and (iv). Thank you Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you South Africa. I have further 7 requests for intervention and I am turning to the Members of the Committee – do you agree to go directly to the examining of Draft Decision or to go further with the comments.

Estonia

With comments please.

The Chairperson

Estonia, you are asking that we continue. Thank you. Switzerland you have the floor sir.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Pour écouter le débat et suivre vos préoccupations, j'aimerais simplement dire peut être ceci, que dans son plaidoyer le représentant de l'Etat partie a répondu en ce qui me concerne aux questions de la délégation suisse que je voulais poser, mais malgré le débat nourri qui s'est passé jusqu'ici, nous ne sommes pas convaincus que cela soit exceptionnel sur le plan universel. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Estonia considers that the São Francisco Square in São Cristóvão is a great place. At one of the preparatory meetings of Estonian team of experts in Berlin, while we were discussing this nomination, almost all of the experts immediately started to contemplate on paragraph 52 of the Operational Guidelines. I read: "The Convention is not intended to ensure the protection of all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a

select list of the most outstanding of these from an international view point. It is not to be assumed that a property of national and/or regional importance will automatically be inscribed on the World Heritage List.” In the situation where ICOMOS has considered that there is not justified OUV and criteria, Estonia can’t support the inscription. And there is one more thing. We just heard from Susan Daniel that the nomination file we looked through was almost the same what was proposed at the Quebec meeting but we were then not Committee Members then so we don’t know the history, we can’t approve the behaviour of the Member State who we nominate the same this year without elaborating it according to the recommendations of the advisory bodies. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. Barbados you have the floor, sir.

Barbados

Thank you Mr Chairperson. With respect to authenticity, the question posed by Jordan to ICOMOS, that has satisfied our answer to some extent, but we would also like for the State Party to respond to the same question. And also a second question. We would also like to the State Party to respond to the issue of the difference in the submissions in Quebec and this Committee today.

The Chairperson

Thank you. State Party you have the floor please.

Mexico

The dossier was redone by Brazil, the major portion of the issues raised were addressed, especially with respect to the integrity and authenticity of the property. As I had said the boundaries were not changed because from our point of view, from the point of view of the State Party we need to have a clear link between the OUV where we say that the property has and the boundaries of the property. Obviously the boundaries are within a historic site, which is already well protected. However, we don’t think that there will be any point in extending the boundaries of the property simply to respond to the recommendation of ICOMOS, in that we feel that there has to be that clear correlation between the OUV and the boundary and the new dossier is available and these are pictures of Quebec and we do not have the same pictures as the ones we had last year. Thank you very much Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Cambodia you have the floor.

Cambodia

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je vais être bref. Monsieur le Président, nous croyons fermement, à la lecture du dossier préparé de nouveau par le Brésil, que les facteurs géographiques et historiques, architecturaux et urbanistiques ont été pris en compte pour mettre en exergues la VUE de la place São Francisco dans la ville de São Cristóvão. Nous pensons aussi que le système de gestion est adéquat. En tenant compte des structures gouvernementales fédérales, régionales et administratives du Brésil. C’est pourquoi le Cambodge propose l’inscription de la place sur la base des critères (ii) et (iv).

The Chairperson

Thank you, Cambodia. Iraq please.

Iraq

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. I second the suggestion of the distinguished representative of South Africa and I think it is about time to start the process of inscription. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you, Iraq. I am turning once again to the Member States of the Committee, can we go directly to the examination of the Draft Decision. Are there any objections regarding going ahead. Bahrain you have the floor.

Bahrain

I did ask for the floor after Barbados. But I don't know why I didn't get the floor.

The Chairperson

You will have the floor after Iraq. But I am asking once again do you have any objections to go directly to the examination of the Draft Decision. I see none. So I will give the floor to our Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. The Draft Decision can be found on page 33 of the English version and on page 35 of the French version of the document. And I have received two written amendments to the Draft Decision. The first amendment concerns the current paragraphs 2 and 3. The amendment is submitted by Australia, Barbados, Cambodia, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Thailand, United Arab Emirates and France. The amendment sustains the current paragraph 1 and replaces paragraph 2 in its entirety by the following paragraph: "Inscribes the Sao Francisco Square in the town of São Cristóvão on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv)". Further the amendment suggests the deletion of paragraph 3 which would then be substituted by the paragraph that adopts a statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which again would be distributed to you in writing.

The second amendment which is submitted I understand in addition to the first amendment by the State Party of France suggests in addition to include a paragraph 4 with recommendations to the State Party. Mr Chairperson would you like me to read this at this point? I will read in the original language submitted. Include a new paragraph: "Recommends that the State Party: (a) ensure the implementation of a management plan and improve the management structure for the property; (b) ensure greater coordination among the various government levels as well as increased participation of the community and other entities concerned in the development and the putting into place of actions aimed at the conservation of the property; (c) establish and implement a monitoring system for the conservation of the property in the long term, whilst including key indicators and the designation of a monitoring body."

The Chairperson

Thank you to the Rapporteur. I think we are going to the examination and adoption of the **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.43** and I am turning to the Committee – are there any objections to the inscription and amendment given by Member States of the Committee? I

see none. (Applause) Congratulations to the State Party. State Party you have two minutes for a statement.

Brazil

Distinguished Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, States Parties, delegates, Director of the World Heritage Centre, and distinguished representatives of the Advisory Bodies, the Delegation of Brazil would like to take the floor to express our deep felt gratitude to the Members of the Committee for the decision that has just been taken to inscribe the São Francisco Square in São Cristóvão. Indeed, this is a site that has Outstanding Universal Value and that means the criteria required for its inscription. The São Francisco Square is a unique monument. It has a major artistic and cultural value which demonstrates a specific cultural period when the crowns of Portugal and Spain were united in what we call the Iberian union in the 16th century. This is a very special moment for my country, because this year, we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Brasília and we Brazilians are very proud of this. And the Delegation of Brazil would like to say that to have this inscription done in Brazil makes us even more proud. The Delegation of Brazil thus is very thankful and grateful to all the Members of the Committee, to the World Heritage Committee, to ICOMOS whose contribution helped with our inscription on the World Heritage List. Allow me to particularly thank the Minister of Culture, the Institute for Historical Heritage, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Environment Ministry, represented by the Institute of Biodiversity. Brazil is indeed very proud to have one more cultural site recognized on the Heritage List. This international recognition will indeed have to encourage the Government and the people of Brazil to further promote and preserve this absolutely unique property and it demonstrates a very unique period to the history of our country. I say congratulations to the Committee, to the Member States, to the States Parties, to the Federal Government, to Brazil, to the State, to the people of Brazil and to the people of Sergipe. Allow me to give the floor to the distinguished representative of Sergipe who is here with us. Thank you very much Chair. (Applause)

Distinguished Chair, distinguished representatives of State Parties, I am simply going to read out the statement of the governor of the State who asked me to communicate this on his behalf. On behalf of the government and the people of the State of Sergipe, and in particular the people of São Cristóvão we would like to express our very deep thanks on the decision of this Committee whereby the São Francisco Square has been inscribed on the World Heritage List. I would like to thank all those who contributed to the success of this nomination. We are thankful for the commitment of the government, the Federal Government of Brazil, through the Ministry of Culture, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, they provided all that was required at every stage of the process. We are indeed very thankful to each and every one of you. The governor of the State of Sergipe – Marcelo Déda Chagas.

The Chairperson

Congratulations to the State Party.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

So we will go further with our Committee Meeting work and we are going to examine the nomination of **Danxia in China**. IUCN you have the floor sir.

IUCN

Thank you, Chair. We have in fact just one slide by way of introduction, and in opening our evaluations of natural nominations IUCN would simply like to recall from the presentation to the orientations set to consider Outstanding Universal Value based on three elements defined in the Operational Guidelines. That the sites nominated meet one or more World Heritage criteria, that they meet the condition of integrity and they meet the requirements for protection and management, including the additional requirements needed for serial properties. We make our recommendations in line with the Operational Guidelines of this Convention and in line with the request to us to be objective, rigorous, scientific and consistent and with that one slide I will turn to our evaluation of China Danxia.

Our report is at page 3 of both the English and French versions of the IUCN report. China Danxia is a serial world heritage nomination comprising six areas found in the subtropical zones ... (The Chairperson interrupts – Excuse me, would you join your seats please. Thank you. Please continue). Thank you Chair. The nominated property has been put forward under all four natural criteria. In relation to criterion (vii), China Danxia includes prominent sculpted and varied red Danxia landforms, subtropical broadleaved forests. Whilst individually a number of the component parts are highly attractive landscapes and dramatic landforms. This is also true of a number of other sandstone landscapes globally. Comparative analysis has not provided compelling evidence to support a claim of OUV under criterion (vii).

At present there is not a fully agreed definition for the phenomenon of China Danxia, and thus no adequate and definitive comparative analysis is possible. There are many sandstone landscapes that are of equivalent importance to the components included in the nominated property, including areas that are more extensive and natural, although mostly in arid areas. Whilst some components are accepted as classic examples of the geomorphology of the Danxia region, others do not appear to fit into the model proposed in the nomination, and I can illustrate this. This is the six part conceptual model for the series that was only offered in February of this year, one year after the submission of the nomination, and if you observe the diagram you can see that at least one component, which is Jianglanshan that has been proposed by the State Party does not fit with this model according to the supplementary information received.

China Danxia includes nationally significant conservation samples of the subtropical broadleaved evergreen forests of South China. The main biogeographic province is represented, are already recognized on the World Heritage List, but inconsistent values do not seem to be a basis for the selection of the components of the series and the property does not meet criterion (ix). Once the high species numbers indicated in the wider region indicate important biodiversity values in this part of China, the nominated property does not stand out compared to existing inscribed properties and IUCN considers the nominated property does not meet criterion (x).

The protection status of the property is adequate with some scope to be strengthened. The boundaries of the six nominated sites and their associated buffer zones are appropriate to earth science and aesthetic values, but not appropriate to biodiversity criteria and the buffer zone boundaries do not fully protect the larger catchments which influence the components.

Planning for the serial property is advanced and extensive efforts have been made in this regard. An integrated management plan has been prepared for the property as a whole, as well as individual plans for the six areas in the series. There is a good provision of staffing and management, well-defined expectations for monitoring. There is a mature understanding of conservation issues and requirements, including threats from tourism pressure, deforestation and agriculture. Overall, the level of management commitment appears adequate to the main challenges, however, one component does not appear to

meet the expectations of integrity for natural property and that is the Lonhushan component. IUCN does not consider that a full justification of the serial approach has yet been established. The property is nominated for all four natural criteria, but biodiversity factors were not, as I said earlier, an overt part of the selection of the components of the series.

In summary, IUCN considers that the series nominated as a whole does not meet the natural criteria, does not fully conform to integrity requirements nor fully reflect protection and management requirements in all of its components. There may be potential for a reconsidered and refocused nomination combining some components of the property but not before the necessary science and comparisons that could underpin a sound definition of OUV and an appropriate and consistent selection of component parts has been defined. Therefore, IUCN recommends that the World Heritage Committee defer the nomination of China Danxia and our decision is set out on page 4 of the English and French versions of document 8B. Thank you, Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you IUCN. Now I open the floor to the Members of the Committee to assess the comments. Iraq you have the floor Sir.

Iraq

Thank you Mr Chairman. I would like to have the answers of two questions that I am going to ask the State Party please. The evaluation report stated, IUCN also notes that developing conceptual models for serial nominations after their nomination rather than prior to it is a problematic practice. Paragraph 3, part 3 evaluation report, we would like to invite the State Party to have a clarification on this issue. No.2 – how the six sites are selected – is there any criteria for the selection? Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you Iraq. Now the State Party has the floor.

China

Thank you Mr Chairperson. First of all I would like to thank IUCN for their hard work on this programme. Then I would like to answer the two questions raised by the Committee Member. First, it is stated in the report that IUCN notes that developing conceptual models for serial nomination after their nomination, rather than prior to it, is a problematic practice. We were surprised and even shocked at this statement. It is totally unacceptable. (Chair interrupts – Excuse me. Just reply to the question asked by Iraq please). O.K. As a matter of fact China Danxia was not prepared and based on any conceptual model, rather it is based on the real natural features. This conceptual model was actually prepared together with IUCN evaluator during the period of field inspection. Because the IUCN evaluator emphasized the conceptual model and asked to provide it. Later, in January this year the State Party received a letter from IUCN, received this letter from IUCN requiring supplementary information, including clarify the underlining conceptual model using the comparison. Then after the State Party opened the request submitted the requested supplementary information, as well as the conceptual model (Chairman interrupts again – Would you reply to the question raised by Iraq and do not get into any other details.) because this is severe, it claims that the State Party conducted a problematic practice, so after we provided what was requested, the conceptual model, then State Party was blamed to have conducted a problematic practice. We wonder how could the Advisory Body first ask the State Party to do something and then blame that the State Party did the wrong thing.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Brazil you have the floor Sir.

Brazil

Thank you very much indeed, Mister Chairperson this China Danxia sandstone as shown in the evaluation dossier is geomorphologically most important and we know obviously that this is essential to be considered as of Outstanding Universal Value. There is a very specific evaluation of the comparative analysis and this was a very huge responsibility for the Advisory Bodies – IUCN in this case – and also the State Party so is to give enough information, enough data for us to have sound technical advice. Where this should be compared with other academic studies that have recognized value in the area of geomorphology, we would then see that this type of geomorphological landscape hasn't a great deal of international recognition. The Danxia sample characterized as the Sandbike terrain has been now studied for a number of years according to the information we just received so we must so the State Party must have been congratulated according to the information we just received. The State Party carried out a huge conference and carried out consultation with more than 30 very well known specialists and also 15 IUCN evaluators – all in all 45 specialists on this matter actually took part in all this. And probably this involved the whole of specialists in-situ. We know that the Danxia has been compared to the many many other sites and not just those of the World Heritage List but a terrain of this nature that may not be on the World Heritage List but is important to be found in other parts of the World and therefore the comparative nature of this site is comprehensive. On this line Sir we have a question to the State Party and we would like to ask them the following: Is there a scientific consensus, is there an agreed scientific framework on this issue and we would like to know how this consensus is shown in connection to this particular site. Thank you Sir

The Chairperson

Thank you Brazil, State Party you have the floor Sir.

China

Thank you Mister Chair and I would like to answer the question if there is a consensus on the China Danxia model because I would like to reiterate that this programme was not prepared with any model. It is based on the fact. Indeed the conception model would lead to something artificial. During the preparation process many international experts were involved but they have no greater recognized conceptual model because this program was based on the fact what is the eroding degree as illustrated in the IUCN report. This series is from the least eroded to the most eroded and represents a sequence for land development. Any proposed conceptual model is just the explanation for the natural phenomena. It is just a reference. It should not be used as a base each site's feature and its value. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Serbia you have the floor Sir.

Serbia

The Serbian Delegation appreciates the IUCN evaluation of the nomination of the China Danxia. We know the OUV is the key test to the property. OUV is embedded on the property satisfaction for World heritage criteria. We noted that China Danxia is nominated under four natural criteria and IUCN concluded that the nominated property does not meet criteria (ix) and (x). We believe this conclusion is clear. Meanwhile we also noticed that the IUCN evaluation report stated overall there is considerable evidence for IUCN reviews that there are significant natural values within the Daxia area that have sufficient specificity to

have the potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value in relation to the Earth heritage value - in Paragraph 7 Part C -and is related to criteria (vii) and (viii). The report stated that there may be potential for a viable serial nomination of China Daxia including some of the component of the present series number. Series under the above mentioned criteria. Part 6, IUCN report. Also taking into consideration of the position and comments. Positive comments of the report that IUCN considered that the management of the property needs the requirements set out the Operational guidelines. So we believe that China Danxia meets criteria (vii) and (viii) and is of Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore it should be inscribed on the World Heritage List under this two criteria. And we have submitted an amendment as cosponsor together with other fifty members. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia you have the floor.

Estonia

Thank you Mister Chair. The Estonian delegation believes that there are potential for a viable nomination of China Danxia in the future. But the Outstanding Universal Value has not been fully demonstrated in the current nomination. Therefore we support IUCN's recommendation to defer the property. Actually we see that as a matter of principle. We have an established system of how we go about the evaluation of nominations. We believe that the Advisory Bodies who provide professional and independent advice are essential in this process. The Committee is also a body of experts and like the Swedish Delegation said this morning, it is only to be expected that sometimes the opinions of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies differ. But we feel very strongly that in a case where according to the Advisory Bodies evaluation the proposed site does not fully meet any proposed criteria, like this is the case before us, it should not be possible to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. Doing so, we are compromising the credibility of the Committee which is duty bound to base its decision on the criteria defined by the Operational guidelines. In our interventions, many of us paid tribute to the excellent work done by the Advisory Bodies. But when looking at our decisions taken so far, one might wonder if sometimes they have worked in vain. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you Estonia. Bahrain you have the floor Sir.

Bahrain

Thank you very much Mister Chair. At the beginning, I would like to congratulate the State Party for the interesting nomination file they have provided and the Advisory Bodies for the extreme evaluation and assessment they are doing and helping the Committee. Bahrain however has a few remarks on the nominated site. According from what we read from the dossier, it is a spectacular range from erosional landforms representing a remarkable geomorphical system that shows through a sequence of separate sites all of the variation of its information telling a story about natural phenomena. However the Advisory Bodies saw a potential criteria under number 7 and 8. When a problem raised by the Advisory Body regarding the international definition of this phenomena. In this regard, the State Party argue that for the last 80 years the conducted research in this field elaborated in China; However many of the researcher did not get access for such information – could be through the problem of the language. I would also like to mention the protection and management that was reported as adequate by the Advisory Body. Bahrain has two questions: One for IUCN and one for the State Party. The one for IUCN regarding the six nominated sites. Does the Advisory Body think that the six nominated sites can tell a complete story or can the OUV be strengthened by other specific sites? The question for the State Party. Why a number of sites was decreased? It was in the beginning 15 sites and in the nomination file it was only six

sites. Is that related to management or do the six sites capture the OUV. Thank you Mister Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you Bahrain; State Party, you have the floor.

China

Thank you Mister Chair and ... China Danxia is a serial property and it has undergone a severe selecting process. And as mentioned in the nomination dossier, in China there are about 800 Danxia sites, widespread in more than 20 provinces but the best are focused in southern China. So it is a challenge to the State Party to select qualified sites and initially 15 sites were considered and after domestic arguments nine sites were selected for this sequence and after further international consultation, the six sites were finally selected. They form a complete sequence of natural story because - as just was mentioned – this six sites reflect the least eroded at the beginning to the most eroded. It features different stages. So this is for the first time in terms of geoscience significance to fill the gap at the World Heritage List because compared to other mayor landform properties, sandform landform was less reflected on the World Heritage List. This is to reflect the OUV from the geoscience. Thank you Mister Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you IUCN you have the floor.

IUCN

Thank you Mister Chair. To respond to the question from Bahrain and perhaps to wrap a couple of other points that the selection of components within the series is precisely why a comparative framework has to be established. And for the reasons that the distinguished delegate from China outlined, there are 800 Danxia sites spread across China and a serial nomination has to have some clear rational and framework to be sure we do not create a situation where there is actually an open-ended series that is not been defined. And I think the question is why this six, why not 200 sites. Just to come to the point of the conception model, I would like to firstly correct a point that we did not focus on the perception model per se. We asked in our letter that was mentioned about the clearer justification for the methodology adopted in both the comparative analysis and we also asked a question about the selection of the sites. We do think it is difficult when firstly the nomination is received, then there is a mayor conference about the phenomenon and then, after the discussion with the evaluator – the evaluator didn't acutally develop the model – but after discussion with the evaluator during the field visit, there is an evolution of the basis for the selection of the site. We do think that is problematic. To turn to the specific question: do the six sites tell the story. I think our concern is there may be more than enough to tell the story. Firstly there is overlap and if we accept the model that is adopted in relation to the scale of evolution of landforms that is within the sites, they don't fall into a simple one to six format so they actually have landforms that overlap in age. Secondly as I noted in my presentation, at least one of the components does not correspond to the view that is put forward about what Danxia actually is. And thirdly there is one component which seems to have questions regarding its integrity. If I may just close with two points which were mentioned: There was a mention about 15 IUCN evaluators participating in the evaluation. That was not the case. Sorry the nomination. Nobody from IUCN participated... the role of IUCN in the preparation of the nomination, except we send one representative to the conference that took place after the nomination was submitted. And in fact some of the evaluators who had contact with the nomination provided review comment which has been brought forward in our report (Chair interrupts: Thank you) and lastly a simple answer is that we are quite confident based on the

reviews we received that there is not a scientific consensus at the international level regarding the the phenomena of China Danxia.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Now I give the floor to Switzerland. You have the floor Sir.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse soutient les recommandations de l'organe consultatif pour les raisons suivantes. Une étude comparative est un élément prépondérant à une candidature. Pour établir une telle étude il faut une base scientifique reconnue sur le sujet sur lequel soit appliquée une comparaison. Comme ici la définition géologique et géomorphologique n'est pas encore donnée, et que cette définition est tout à fait indispensable, une étude comparative ne peut satisfaire les exigences pour un bien inscrit sur la liste des biens du patrimoine mondial. Même suivant les résultats de ce symposium, qui s'est tenu après le dépôt de la candidature, cette exigence n'est pas du tout remplie. De ce symposium résulte qu'il est affirmé que le relief Danxia fait référence à des facteurs géologiques, biologiques et esthétiques, et qu'à ce jour il n'y a pas de définitions géologiques et géomorphologiques internationales bien établis du relief Danxia. L'Etat partie même considère que l'étude comparative révisée n'est pas définitive. La Suisse aimerait poser cette question à discuter et aimerait donner la parole à l'Etat partie de se prononcer sur ce fait. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to the State Party.

China

Thank you Mister Chair. The problem is that China Danxia has not yet international recognition. The problem is so far there is no well recognized definition of a Danxia but we repeated again and again and we provided our explanation about the concept and the definition of a Danxia. Simply from the geologic perspective, it is a kind of landform or landscape developed from the sandstone just like the cast developed from the limestone. We also provided many specific feature of Danxia and from IUCN's report we know what Danxia means so here .. China Danxia... about the definition of Danxia we believe it is an academic issue and is not used as a criteria to judge the reality of our landform. Thank you

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to France.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je serai très bref. Les questions que je souhaitais adresser à l'Etat partie ont déjà été posées par des Etats membres du comité et les réponses qui ont été fournies par l'Etat partie nous satisfont tout à fait.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to Cambodia.

Cambodia

Merci Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Président, compte tenu des remarques complémentaires faites par l'Etat partie sur la pertinence des critères (vii) et (viii), proposées avec les critères (ix) et (x), tout en respectant les recommandations de l'IUCN, le Cambodge propose d'inscrire le relief Danxia de Chine sur la liste.

The Chairperson

Thank you. I give the floor to the Russian Federation

Russian Federation

Thank you Chair. China Danxia is a nominated serial property comprising six sites. And we noted that IUCN report concluded that the same sites may satisfy criteria (vii) and (viii) and are qualified for a serial property. But the report failed to specify which sites are the qualified ones. Maybe I did not understand well and I would like that IUCN gives some explanation. In addition, because of China Danxia great scientific and geomorphologic significance in particular its unrevealed geomorphological richness and representation of a complex red landform, we are in favour of its inscription in the World Heritage List under criteria (vii) and (viii). Thank you very much;

The Chairperson

Thank you. IUCN, briefly please.

IUCN

Thank you. So the two points about the value system and which components are qualified. We just cannot accept the comment that to understand China Danxia is purely an academic issue. It seems clear that to have a coherent serial selection, you have to understand what the phenomenon is. I mentioned in our introduction that we have a partnership with the international association of geomorphologists and we need to go back to them and explain the decisions that have been taken. Really we do have very clear comments.... some of the comments were really tough about the nature of defining Danxia as landform developed red-beds sandstones. This is such a generalization that it cannot work at the global level. In terms of the components, we may leave aside the question whether there is a global proof of the value of China Danxia, then there are six components... we felt that within the parameters of the Chinese definition, two of those very clearly convey what Danxia is about and this is Danxiashan and Langshan. There was a degree of clarity about Taining as a component which conveys values. There was some debate about Chishui because there was a question about the type of sedimentology that Danxia represents and Jianglangshan doesn't fit the model proposed by China ... along Jianglangshan has integrity problems. So within the six components we found two good representations of a classic Danxia which have something significant to offer and to be seen as a coherent part of this serial nomination at this stage. But I do make these comments with the proviser that we do not see that the global level approve has been reached. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia you have the floor.

Australia

Thank you Mister Chair. My comments are actually a follow up of the last comments made by IUCN and to the issue of Outstanding Universal Value and how this is established. I

should start by making it clear that we do consider in this case that OUV has been established. It is really to reflect that normally in the case of natural nomination – and this is the dialogue we have been hearing – we normally have the benefit of working with a very clear set of internationally established criteria and the task before us is often then moving from those criteria to ensure that we find the best or most outstanding examples that can best demonstrate that. This is certainly the case for natural nomination. It does in that respect differ from cultural.. can differ from cultural nominations. In this case, I must say our delegation has struggled because the clear international taxonomy understanding is not present on how to describe sandstone geomorphology and therefore there is a gap in the global knowledge. And in this respect, I guess the issue of China Danxia differs from other areas of geology and morphology. This nomination has actually helped to advance international understanding of this aspect of geomorphology and helped to define it –that is still a work in process. Just because it is a working progress we do not consider that that necessarily cast out on the fundamental question on whether there is OUV which in our case... I have stated, Australia is clear that that have been established. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Mexico you have the floor Sir.

Mexico

Thank you very much Chairman. First of all, we would like to express our acknowledgement of the professional work done by IUCN. We also consider that with the additional information the State Party has provided, the Outstanding universal value is clear and so in that regard we feel the Committee should act accordingly. Just very briefly we would like to put a question to the State Party: could the State Party give us a little bit more detail concerning the efforts to translate the studies that have been carried out on this site over the past few years in Chinese literature? Thank you very much Chair.

China

Thank you. China has undertaken big efforts. Over the last eighty years there are hundred publications but unfortunately most have not been translated into other languages. In China, Danxia landform is an established geomorphology discipline. Almost everybody in China knows what Danxia means. Thank you. Sorry Mister Chairman I am going to answer the question put forward by Mister Tim Badman (Chair interrupts : You have already answered the question put forward by the Member of the committee) I hope you will give me an opportunity later.

The Chairperson

Iraq, you have the floor Sir.

Iraq

Thank you Mister Chairman. I endorse fully the statement by the Lady of the Russian Federation. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Jordan.

Jordan

Mister Chairperson, Jordan wonders with the situation of the Committee. The Committee stands on the site of encouraging the inscription of more natural sites. On the

other hand, when we come to the practical site we disappoint State Parties with approving defers or refers or non-inscription. Moreover, when I look at photos which show the beauty and uniqueness of the site in this volume and compare on what we see on the screen, I find that most of the photos or shots represented on the screen are not representative for the site. So I may ask the Advisory Body to show us more indicative and representative photos that would show the uniqueness and beauty of this site. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Last speaker. Barbados you have the floor.

Barbados

Thank you Mister Chairperson and without expanding the issue I can say that our delegation has struggle with what has been said about the nomination. We thank and welcome the State Party submission. We know that it is beyond what we've considered so far. We also compliment IUCN for a very detailed analysis but like Australia and a lot of other delegations, we think that Outstanding Universal Value has been established and therefore Barbados supports this nomination. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So I give the floor to the Rapporteur for the exam of the Decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 4 of the English version and (Chair interrupts: IUCN, there was a question that I did not follow)

IUCN

There was a question from Jordan. We can prepare further pictures if they are required by the Committee. Those pictures that we did not include in the presentation were mostly, not all but mostly from the nomination document. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page four of the English version and page four of the French version of Document 8b. I have received one written amendement to the Draft Decision submitted by the Delegations of Ethiopia, Brazil, Cambodia, Thailand, Iraq, Mali, Barbados, Australia, France, Egypt, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Jordan and Mexico. The draft amendement proposed by these delegations amends the Decision in Paragraph 2 and 3. The Paragraphs will be modified. Paragraph 2 would be replaced by the following formulation "Inscribes China Danxia on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (vii) and (viii)". In paragraph 3 the emitting State Parties propose to adopt a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that will be distributed to you. Current Paragraph 4 would be deleted and replaced by the following wording: "Commends the State Party for its efforts towards protection and management of the property across different provinces of China". Current Paragraph 5 would be equally deleted and replaced by the following text "Requests the State Party to ensure the effective long-term management and protection in the future, with a view to make all the property components meet integrity requirements for natural World Heritage properties and supported

by both adequate and effective buffer zones and the protection of wider catchment areas". Further the submitting State Parties propose to delete Paragraph 6 and to replace it by the following wording: "Invites the State Party to support the organization of international meetings, to go with scientific research regarding the Danxia Landform". Then two new paragraphs would be proposed at the end of the Draft Decision which would then be new Paragraph 7 and new Paragraph 8 which those read: "Also requests the State Party to continue its focus on the protection and effective management of the important biodiversity values" and new 8 "Further requests the State Party to translate and make available in translation key scientific studies on the topic of the China Danxia phenomena and to actively assist the further development of international scientific knowledge of the China Danxia phenomena and red-beds sandstone geomorphology more generally.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objection regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.1** as been amended by a number of Committee members? See none. Adopted. (Applause) State Party you have two minutes please.

China

Thank you Mister Chairman and I would like to thank the State Party of the Committee. I would like to ask my colleague to say a few words to express our gratitude to all my colleagues here. But before doing that, Mister Chair if you allow me, I want to make a clarification (Chair interrupts: I prefer that you do the clarification in bilateral conversations) This is truly an honor to China and to the people of China Danxia service. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to the Committee Members for their support for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. My thanks also goes to IUCN, the Advisory Body who has managed to undertake hard work in evaluating this large scale property. The Chinese government always attaches great importance to the protection and conservation of World Heritage sites. Nature heritage nominations can be found at each session of the World Heritage Committee. The inscription of China Danxia on the World Heritage List appears to be more encouraging and meaningful. It is our obligation to give more attention and consideration to the conservation of the natural sites. I can assure you that China will cherish the title of World Heritage and will continued the efforts for the conservation through sustainable planning and management. Thank you. (Applause)

The Chairperson

Thank you China. Congratulations again. And we are quite late so I would like to give the floor to IUCN for the presentation of the site **Phoenix Islands Protected Area in Kiribati**. You have the floor Sir.

IUCN

Thank you Mister Chair. Phoenix Islands Protected Area, State Party of Kiribati It is page 17 in the English and page 19 in the French of the IUCN Technical Evaluation Report, Document INF/8B2.... One minute ok.... I start with the location map slide. Phoenix Island Protected Area or PIPA is an enormous protected area of over 400,000 km² encompasses the Phoenix Island Group, one of three island groups in Kiribati. PIPA is one of the world's most extensive remaining intact open seascapes of this planet. The property has been nominated under criterion (vii), (ix) and (x). IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (vii) due to the characteristics of the seamounts landscapes situated in an area of ocean of up to 4,000-6,000m depth. As regards criterion (ix), the criterion referring to ecological and biological processes, the scale remoteness and naturalness have conserved vast seascapes with predator-dominated ecosystems: healthy fish, corral and sea turtle populations. The vertical and horizontal connectivity between the mosaic of intact and very diverse marine habitats at this scale is exceptional. IUCN therefore considers that the

property meets criterion (ix). While PIPA is clearly of high biodiversity conservation significance, the level of species richness and endemism and the number of threatened species are not superior to other comparable marine areas. The small terrestrial components do not constitute a significant contribution to the Polynesia-Micronesia-biodiversity hotspot. Likewise the global importance as a breeding site for seabirds is not at the level of other island World Heritage properties. IUCN considers that the nominated property does not meet criterion (x). IUCN considers the current protection status meets the requirements as set out in the Operational Guidelines within the areas identified as no-take areas. However this account at less than 4% of the nominated property which is still a very large area indicated here in this map. This is phase 1 zonation. A second phase of protection is planned which would further increase the protected area by 25%. Currently the remaining 96% of this property is stated to function more as a buffer zone. The property as nominated clearly does not meet the integrity requirements in the Operational Guidelines. Impressive efforts have been made to develop the management system for the property. Significant challenges remain. In terms of management, IUCN notes a still limited state of development of a management system. The management body for the property is functioning but requires additional resources to be able to become fully effective. The enforcement capacity of the property is not adequate for the vast area. Only one boat is available for patrols and monitoring of the entire zone. Progress on finding solutions for funding is under way and IUCN considers that a deferral could assist the mobilization of the necessary conservation funding for the property. It is judged to meet criterion (vii) and (ix). At present the protection and management of the property does not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. While it is acknowledged that the remoteness of PIPA reduces the scope of threats, there are threats to the property, mostly through illegal fishing by licensed and unlicensed vessels. Alien and invasive species will require further monitoring despite reported progress. In summary, the property nominated meet criterion (vii) and (ix) but does not meet integrity, protection and management requirements. IUCN therefore recommends that the Committee defers the nomination of PIPA at this point in time and the Draft Decision is at page 4 in both the English and the French version of the document 8B. thank you Mister Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you so I open the floor to the comments of the Members of the Committee. I see Switzerland, Barbados, Bahrain, Australia. Switzerland you have the floor Sir.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous avons attentivement analysé le rapport approfondi et les recommandations très claires de l'organe consultatif. Etant donné que le critère (vii) et (ix) sont acceptés, la question principale reste celle de la taille très grande du territoire proposé, et les possibilités de garantir la conservation et la gestion pour une surface couvrant l'équivalent d'un facteur dix du territoire de la Suisse. L'importance du site proposé est prépondérante pour la conservation d'écosystèmes marins vierges au niveau mondial. La Suisse félicite les Etats partie qui appuient la gestion et la surveillance de cet écosystème. La décision de différer ou d'inscrire dépend beaucoup de cette question de la gestion et de la conservation. Pour ce faire nous aimerions donner la parole à l'Etat partie qui a déjà entrepris des efforts très grands pour cette candidature et pour nous fournir des informations supplémentaires sur les efforts qui ont été entrepris entre temps et qui sont peut-être en vue d'être mis en œuvre. Merci beaucoup.

The Chairperson

Are there representatives of the State Party in the room? State Party you have the floor.

Kiribati

Thank you Mister Chairman. Kiribati thanks for the opportunity to speak to the Committee and we thank you all for considering PIPA for listing. In brief PIPA has been established in 2008 and we have completed the management plan which was adopted by the Cabinet in 2009. While we undertook this planning process and had clearly agreed inter-management measures in operating in 2005. The PIPA Management Committee - also established in the Kiribitean's law - is the established management authority responsible for this site. For this, we have allocated at least 200 000 Australian Dollars annually for PIPA management. To supplement our efforts, we have a partnership strategy for PIPA. We noted with thanks that Conservation International and New England Aquarium have invested nearly 2.5 Million Australian Dollars and the expertise of scientists, lawyers and managers. Another one million Australian Dollars together with technical expertise has been provided from bilateral partners and we sincerely thank Australia, New-Zealand, the USA and France, noting with pride that PIPA is the largest site in France coral reef initiative in the Pacific. Partnerships with our neighboring Pacific States and regional agencies are equally important. Together with seven other Pacific countries, we have affected complementary measures for conservation management. Today if a distant water fishing nation applies for license to fish in PIPA, they must agree not to fish the high-seas pockets. We recognize that long-term sustainable financing is essential and I am pleased to report that since the nomination we have established a law, the PIPA Trust Fund and the Board. We envisage that ..(Chair interrupts: Thank you. I think that is enough to the questions by Switzerland).

The Chairperson

Barbados you have the floor.

Barbados

Thank you Chairperson. This nomination represents a very challenging nomination indeed by a Small Island Developing State. It brings together the conflicts and contradictions in small Island development. The nomination is asking for a size of area that is beyond the size of Switzerland as mentioned before, beyond the size of many countries. We are talking about management skills and the capacity. Yet, in terms of the States skills and capacity. If they will not protect the site, it will affect the whole economy. We want to thank IUCN for a very diligent and in-depth presentation but we would like to also bring to the attention to the Member States that the boundaries meet the requirements set out in the Operational Guidelines. IUCN also spoke that the management plan had yet not been developed and in the same paragraph? IUCN correctly said that the number of visitors of this site is not high enough to challenge the site at the early stage. It is clear for Barbados that this is work in progress. It is important that the regional cooperation is given to this site by New Zealand Australia and others as it is the case. Because of this, Barbados is very confident and feels assured that this site should be nominated as a property and we made a recommendation for an amendment to the Draft Resolution to that effect.

The Chairperson

Thank you Barbados. I give the floor to Bahrain.

Bahrain

Bahrain would like to first congratulate the State Party for nominating this site. As we have listened to the Advisory Body, this is the largest Marine protect area in the world. One of the World's last intact oceanic coral ecosystems with habitats, key seamounts, deep-sea habitats. This is a pristine nature. The recovery of coral bleaching is a very interesting case worldwide and we have learnt that from the report. That is a very interesting phenomena being discovered there. The OUV, as Barbados already mentioned, is very clear and has been recognized by IUCN, specific criteria (vii) and (ix). Protection is present and the regulation is implemented. The management issue is still questionable regarding the large area we are talking about. Bahrain believes that marine sites need to be considered positively and that this is the first property nominated for the country. Moreover we would like to ask a specific question to the State Party regarding the monitoring program that is implemented now. If there is a specific methodology and requirement they are implementing at this stage. Thank you Mister Chair.

The Chairperson

Thank you Bahrain. State Party to reply regarding the monitoring program.

Kiribati

Thank you Mister Chair. Kiribati is a member of the regional body Forum Fisheries Agency and also the secretary of the Pacific Commission including the Western Central Pacific Tuna Commission and this helps Kiribati mainly in the surveillance of the large revenue. Tuna revenue is the largest revenue for the country. Therefore Kiribati since 1978 has established monitoring programs because this is mainly to secure the resources because it is the main source of the revenue. Already we have established a number of surveillance programs with signing an agreement with the US to the ship rider agreement. This has enabled the country to enhance its surveillance program. We have cooperation with the New England Aquarium and the Conservation International together with the sister agreement that has been signed with the Papahānaumokuākea, this has greatly enhanced its capacity. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.

Australia

Thank you very much Mister Chair. As the representative has noted, we have interest in this site. We strongly congratulate Kiribati for this nomination. The nomination itself has been very thoroughly prepared indeed and endorsed at the highest levels within Kiribati government and also is underpinned by an existing protected area in its entirety. The nomination is also particularly welcomed because the Pacific remains underrepresented in the World Heritage List in many of its natural and cultural manifestations. It has been a great pleasure that this has been improved with the inscription of Bikini Atoll yesterday. Mister Chairperson, in our view, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area has clearly Outstanding Universal Value and I think that is clearly accepted by everybody in the room. It is one of the last intact coral archipelago ecosystems. It has a very big mix of biodiversity, landforms, seamounts and many many other features. Clearly Mister Chairman, the issue is related to the size but size is a double sided sword. It is the best way to protection, in some ways it is also envisaged as it biggest challenge. And it is on the management issues, we are looking forward to hearing further from the State Party. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.

Brazil

Thank you very much Mister Chair. Brazil would like to congratulate IUCN on the quality of the report and the State Party on the nomination before us. For this site, Brazil acknowledges the importance of protected marine conservation areas and the need to extend their global coverage. Looking at the report of IUCN, what Brazil finds striking is that there are perhaps parts of the nomination where the State Party needs to give more information. This may be a matter of formality really and should not prevent it from being inscribed on the World Heritage List. Quiet on the contrary, inscription on the World Heritage List would be an incentive for them to apply the necessary corrective measures and the proper management of the property and so Brazil would like to support the proposal made by Barbados to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. Thank you Mister Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. The last speaker, Nigeria, you have the floor.

Nigeria

Thank you Mister Chairperson. We noticed that the mayor issue concerning this nomination relate to questions of management. It has been stated that the property has OUV. However apart from the issue of management, following the discussion by the distinguished colleague from Australia, this has a great potential to address this that the issue of representativeness as correctly argued by the distinguished colleague from Australia. We also believe that the inscription will even strengthen the Outstanding Universal Value of the property because it will now it will have international support and we do not believe that lack of resources should hinder an inscription in the World Heritage List. As long as the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been established, it is the task of State Parties to assist other State Parties to ensure that this OUV is protected by strengthening the management of the property. So we strongly support the position of the other countries that the property should be inscribed to assist the proper management of the property. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. IUCN would you like to comment?

IUCN

Just to respond to a couple of points which in part were made repeatedly (Chair interrupts: Very briefly. Would you like to reply briefly please)... Yes, the key point would be Outstanding Universal Value which was repeatedly mentioned as being met. We believe that the values have been met but that this is only part of meeting OUV. I would like to recall that OUV is constituted by meeting the criteria and the requirements for integrity, protection and management. So we fully agree that this site has the values. I do not think that there is any discussion about that. What we do think, as mentioned by Barbados, it is work in progress and important questions need to be addressed. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. So I would like to give the floor to our Rapporteur for the exam and the adoption of the Decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson. The Draft Decision 8B.2 is on page 4 of the English and page 4 of the French version of document 8B and I have received two amendments to the Draft Decision by Barbados and Australia. The first amendments of Barbados points towards the inscription of the property, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area in Kiribati on the World Heritage List under criteria (vii) and (ix). The second amendment, Mister Chairperson, by Australia introduces the idea of a referral of the examination of the nomination. Now I need your guidance whether you want me to introduce both amendments in detail or start with the first amendment at this point.

The Chairperson

Australia you have the floor Sir.

Australia

Mister Chairman, in light of the discussion, we would be happy to withdraw our amendment and enable consideration of the amendment proposed by Barbados

The Chairperson

Thank you Australia. Rapporteur.

Rapporteur

Thank you Mister Chairperson. The amendment from Barbados addresses all paragraphs of the current draft decision except paragraph 1 which would be retained. Paragraph 2 would be deleted and a new paragraph 2 would be inserted which would read: "Highly commends the State Party on the efforts that have been made towards the establishment and protection of the Phoenix Islands Protected Area which comprises one of the world's largest marine protected areas and commends the State Party for its exemplary multi-agency approach, its comprehensive and strategic management plan, its successes with island restoration projects, and the proposal to progressively expand the no-take zones over time". Barbados suggests the following paragraph 3 which would then read: "Inscribes the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, Kiribati, on the World Heritage List under criteria (vii) and (ix)". In the following paragraph 4 a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would follow which would again be distributed to the members of the Committee for examination. A following paragraph 5 would retain parts of the former recommendations under paragraph 3. 5 would read in an umbrella paragraph: "Recommends the State Party to: a) Strengthen the management framework for fisheries, including the extension of no-take areas, measures to prevent degradation of seamounts and concrete timelines for the phasing out of tuna fishing". A slight revised version of the former paragraph which would then read: "b) Ensure an appropriate and sustainable budget towards the management of Phoenix Islands Protected Area through a funded and functional trust fund or through other appropriate mechanisms". A new small c) would then retain former small f) in the original version and finally former paragraphs 6 and 7 would be retained as paragraphs 6 and 7. Thank you Mister Chairperson.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.2 as been amended. Brazil, you do not have the floor.

Brazil

Point of Order. Just in English to get it faster. I would like to propose, now that I know the amendment because I was listening to it, I would like to propose another paragraph and I would like if that is still possible. Ok if that is the case and I have the floor, I would like to propose a final paragraph which should request the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012 a report on the State of Conservation and perhaps the recommendations above or something in that regard. If that is possible and if it is agreed by my colleagues. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Next first of February? 2011? 2012, ok thank you.

Rapporteur

I would then repeat the suggestion by Brazil which would add a new paragraph 8 to the draft decision which would read as follows: "Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012 a State of Conservation report on the recommendations above for examination at its 36th session in 2012."

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.2** as amended? I see none. So adopted (Applause) Congratulations to the State Party and this is the first site to be inscribed for the State Party on the list of World Heritage. Now we are moving to the next site...sorry I give the floor to the State Party for two minutes.

Kiribati

Thank you Mister Chairman. On behalf of the people of Kiribati, I would like to thank the distinguished Committee for its decision to inscribe the Phoenix Islands Protected Area. As a Small Island Developing State, Kiribati is honored and thankful for be given this opportunity to prove over the coming years the government's and partner's approach for managing the World Heritage site and I would like to give the Committee my assurances and commitment to conserve and protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the protected area. Thank you Chairman (Applause)

The Chairperson

Just to remind that this is the first site to be inscribed for the State Party. Now I like to give the floor to IUCN for the next site, **Tajik National Park, Mountains of the Pamirs**.

IUCN

Page 27 in the English and page 31 in the French IUCN technical evaluation report, Document INF/8B.2. The property named Tajik National Park is located in the northeastern part of Tajikistan in the region of Pamir-Alai, bordering Kyrgyzstan. The Pamir Mountains form part of the Central-Asia uplands. The nominated property comprises a large area of more than 1.2 Million ha and is surrounded by a buffer zone of more than 1.3 Million ha. Jointly, the area of the core and buffer zones cover the entirety of Tajik National Park, roughly 11% of the national territory. The property is nominated according to all four natural criteria. The Pamir ranges are affected by two continental seismic zones, the south-dipping Pamir seismic zone and the north-dipping Hindu Kush seismic zone, and are considered one of the geologically active zones in the world. Tajik National Park offers a dramatic and mostly unspoilt high-mountain landscape that rises to an altitude of up to 4,000 m above sea level.

Pik Ismoil Somoni, the highest peak in the nominated property, almost reaches 7,500 m above sea-level. The terrain is rugged and contains a lot of spectacular and deep canyons. More than 1,000 recorded glaciers are the integral part of the visually stunning landscape and include the largest valley glacier of Eurasia, the Fedchenko glacier. There are 170 rivers, most of them originate in the property and form part of the Aral Sea Basin. More than 400 lakes are recorded in the park including the largest lake of the Pamirs both in terms of volume and surface. The World's highest salt lake is located in the buffer zone. In terms of flora, there is a considerable number of relic and endemic species of vascular plants. The fauna includes species such as the snow leopard and the Marco Polo Argali. The Tajik National Park is also home to an important centre for wild forms of cultivated plants. In summary, IUCN considers that the property meets criterion (vii) and (viii). The case of both criterions could be strengthened as important values are located in what is currently proposed as a buffer zone. IUCN considers that the property does not meet criteria (ix) or (x), the protection status is adequate in IUCN's view. However IUCN does consider that the boundaries do not meet the requirement of the Operational Guidelines as essential values are currently located in the buffer zones. Likewise IUCN considers the management requirements are currently not met as the level of staffing and funding are currently insufficient. IUCN therefore recommends that the Committee defers the examination of the nomination of the Tajik National Park in Tajikistan. The draft decision is on page 5 of both the English and the French of the working document 8B. Thank you Mister Chairman.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Now I invite the Member of the Committee to express their comments. I see none. So I give the floor to our rapporteur for the exam of the draft decision 34COM 8B.3.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson The Draft Decision 8B.3 is on page 5 of the English and page 4 of the French version of document and I have not received any written amendments. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.3**? I see none. Adopted. Thank you.

Now we are moving to the next site, **Pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island**. IUCN.

IUCN

Thank you Sir. The pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island is one of the islands archipelago with two volcanic massifs. Piton des Neiges is one of them and the other one is Piton de la Fournaise. The Piton de la Fournaise rises to 2,632 m and is one of the world's most continuously active volcanoes. The nominated property includes the middle and upper slopes and peaks of the two volcanoes and a linking section between them. The property has been nominated under all four natural criteria. The nominated property compares favourably with other volcanic properties that have been inscribed on the World Heritage List under criterion (vii). Whilst the Piton de la Fournaise is notable for the frequency of its eruptions, IUCN considers that there are other more significant World Heritage properties exhibiting a much wider and significant variety of volcanic landforms or that are representative of volcanic processes IUCN considers that this property does not fulfill criterion (viii). Even though there are some exceptional survivals of ecosystems within tropical islands in the Indian Ocean and a large number of distinct habitat types, there are exceptional examples of ecosystem survival, there are island ecosystems that are variously more intact, more extensive and display more clearly the processes of island endemism.

IUCN therefore considers that criterion (ix) is not fully complied with. This site is an example for plant diversity with a high degree of endemism. It contains the most significant remaining natural habitats for the conservation of the terrestrial biodiversity of the Mascarene Islands, including a range of rare forest types. In light of the irreversible human impacts on the environment in the Mascarene archipelago, this property would be the last refuge for the survival of a large number of endemic, threatened and endangered species. Therefore criterion (x) is fully met. Integrity, there is integrity on the basis of efforts made to keep up the environment and the forests soon after the adoption by France of a new law on national parks of 2006. There is therefore a legal framework to guarantee the protection of the property. A number of recommendations were proposed to the State Party for reviewing the boundaries of the nominated property both for enhancing the representation of its key values as well as for strengthening its integrity. The revised boundaries are fully clear. Due to the fact that there is OUV, there must be an effective application of the management plan and necessary financial and human resources in the long term. Integrity is threatened by a number of factors in spite of the permanent management efforts. The invasive alien species are a threat to the values of the property where biodiversity is concerned. The national park management depends on exhaustive consultations with governmental players, civil society and there is also interaction of the scientific, economic and cultural communities. Effective consultation with all people involved including the communities in the buffer zones. All of this is essential. IUCN believes that criteria (vii) and (x) are met, conditions for integrity and whatever is necessary for protection and management. Inscription is therefore recommended according to the guidelines and IUCN recommends that the Committee inscribes the pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island on the list of the World Heritage. The draft decision can be found on page 5 of the English and French version of document 8B. Thank you Sir.

The Chairperson

Thank you IUCN. I think we should have a look immediately at the draft decision. Rapporteur, you have the floor. I am sorry Mexico has asked for the floor. Mexico? Rapporteur.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson. The Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.4 is on page 5 of the English as well as page 5 of the French version of document 8B and I have not received any amendments. Thank you.

The Chairperson

So are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.4** recommending the inscription of the site? I see none. Adopted. (Applause) The State Party you have the floor for State Party for two minutes.

France

Merci Monsieur le Président. La France est particulièrement heureuse de l'inscription du site pitons, cirques et remparts de l'île de la Réunion au patrimoine mondial en cette année de la biodiversité. C'est un dossier dont nous sommes fiers et qui est unanimement porté par toutes les collectivités de la Réunion. C'est un sentiment de vive émotion que j'éprouve en ce moment. J'adresse mes remerciements aux organisations consultatives et aux membres du comité. Je rends hommage à l'engagement constructif des élus et représentants de ce département d'outre-mer, ceux qui sont ici autour de moi et ceux qui sont restés dans l'Océan Indien, ils sont avec nous par le cœur. La France s'attachera naturellement à accompagner les autorités locales en faveur de la conservation du patrimoine naturel exceptionnel des Mascarene, la France s'emploiera également à développer encore des liens de coopération dans l'Océan Indien, afin d'illustrer l'esprit de solidarité qui anime la convention. Elle attache une importance particulière à ce volet. Je

souhaitez pour conclure donner la parole, si vous m'autorisez Monsieur le Président, au Président du parc national de la Réunion, qui va s'exprimer au nom de la collectivité réunionnaise, ici représentée.

Président du parc national de la Réunion

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, permettez-moi de m'exprimer d'abord avec la langue de mon cœur, le Créole, (Créole), ce qui veut dire les Réunionnais sont très contents. Au nom de l'île de la Réunion, de ses élus, de ses habitants et de tous ceux qui se sont investis dans le projet du patrimoine mondial, je voudrais à mon tour vous remercier ainsi que les Etats membres de votre éminent comité, d'avoir inscrit nos pitons, cirques et remparts sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. En tant que Président du Parc national de la Réunion, coordonnateur du dossier de nomination et gestionnaire du bien, je tiens à dire notre fierté et je remercie tous ceux qui ont contribué à ce projet scientifique, associations, collectivités, services de l'Etat et bien sûr toute la population réunionnaise. Cette reconnaissance universelle est une opportunité exceptionnelle pour la notoriété internationale de notre île, mais c'est aussi un défi qui nous engage à conserver sur le long terme nos richesses naturelles et à les valoriser avec intelligence. Cette inscription est aussi l'occasion de renforcer les partenariats avec les sites du patrimoine mondial de l'Océan Indien. Qu'il me soit permis de terminer par ces vers d'un poète réunionnais Charles Marie Leconte de Lisle, célébrant la beauté à la fois exceptionnelle et universelle de notre île « Salut, je vous salue o montagnes, o cieux, du paradis perdu, vision infinie ». Je vous remercie.

The Chairperson

Thank you. Let us now move immediately to the next property, the next nomination. The **Pirin National Park, Bulgaria**. This is an extension and I call on IUCN.

IUCN

This property was inscribed in 1983 under criteria (vii), (viii) and (ix). In line with Committee recommendations, the State Party submitted a proposal for the extension of the existing property which is subject to the IUCN evaluation presented here. The area bearing the name Pirin National Park, Bulgaria is situated in southwest Bulgaria but only encompasses a part of the Pirin National Park as defined under national Bulgarian legislation. The park covers approximately 40,000 ha whereas the World Heritage property inscribed in 1983 is about 20,000 ha. The property is a limestone mountain landscape with numerous glacial lakes, waterfalls caves and pine forests mostly dominated by endemic and relict species. The proposed area of extension is mostly high mountain terrain over 2,000 m altitude and encompasses alpine meadows, rocky screes and summits. The photos presented here to provide a brief visual impression were taken in the area proposed for extension. The map gives an overview of the changes proposed. The area in blue color is the current World Heritage property as inscribed in 1983 and slightly exceeding 20,000 ha. The area in green color illustrates the area of the proposed extension of 12,136 ha. The grey color marks Bansko ski zone and Dobrinishte ski zone proposed for exclusion and designated as buffer zones with a combined area of 1,087 ha. The very small dots in yellow color refer to four areas excluded from the national park as defined by Bulgarian legislation in the years 1987 and 1999 but which are still part of the property. These are 58.1 ha at Kulinoto ski zone and two areas of jointly 76.4 ha in the Sandanski region resort area and 10.1 ha at the margin of Dobrinishte. Four areas of a total of 150.6 ha. The table that you see on the screen summarizes all proposed changes as just described. It is included in the IUCN technical evaluation report. The second map illustrates what the extended property would look like. It would be a much larger area with a relatively small area proposed as a buffer zone and a very small area excluded from the property. In summary, IUCN considers that the area of the proposed extension should be approved under the original criteria (vii), (viii) and (ix). IUCN notes that the property does not meet the additional criterion (x) as the biodiversity values

are of regional rather than global importance. The areas proposed as extension meet the conditions of integrity as outlined in the Operational Guidelines. However IUCN further notes that the values and the integrity of the property have been impacted on. There is the threat of negative impacts mostly related to tourism development. After very careful case-specific consideration, IUCN came to the conclusion that the combination of extension, removal of relatively small compromised areas at the margins of the property mitigating the adverse impacts on the property are an appropriate solution for this site. IUCN considers that the Committee should make it entirely clear that further ski development and tourism development compromising the values and the integrity of the property would not be compatible with World Heritage status. In IUCN view further damage to the property would result in the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and may eventually result in the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List. IUCN therefore recommends the Committee approves the extension of the Pirin National Park in Bulgaria inscribed under criteria (vii), (viii) and (ix). The draft decision is on page 7 of both, the English and the French version of the working document 8B. Thank you.

The Chairperson

Thank you IUCN. There are no request.. Switzerland you have the floor.

Switzerland

Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse soutient l'extension du Parc Pirin. Comme avant-hier au point 7b sur l'état de la conservation de ce bien, la délégation suisse avait proposé de discuter le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien, ensemble avec la nomination de cette extension. Parce que le rapport contenait des informations qui dépendaient de cette décision qu'on vient de prendre. Notamment la question des zones tampons. Nous proposons donc de maintenant ajouter les mêmes amendements qui ont déjà été approuvés par le comité. Nous aimerions quand même donner à l'Etat partie la parole, qu'ils puissent s'exprimer sur la question des zones tampons et qu'ils puissent nous donner d'ultérieures informations sur une question qui n'est pas encore résolue. Merci Monsieur le Président.

The Chairperson

Thank you Switzerland. Is there any representative of the State Party in the room?

Bulgaria

Thank you Mister Chairperson. In terms of the question raised by the distinguished delegate from Switzerland, I would like to provide following information. As for the possibility to declare a buffer zone which do better fit the requirements of paragraph 1 of the ... of the Operational Guidelines, it should be pointed out that a national legislation doesn't provide opportunities for designation of buffer zones surrounding the national park. The reason for this is the fact that the national parks are surrounded by an area with different ownerships and uses. This territories fall out of the scope of the national park directorate and management plans. Considering the above and in compliance with the Operational Guidelines, in the nomination, we pointed out that some other regional instruments such as Natura 2000 dedicated also to preservation of habitats and species could ensure the protection of the property. In this line I would like to point out that the property is surrounded by Natura 2000 sites which ensure enough mechanisms such as specific regimes and appropriate assessment for investment proposals that may be carried out. I am talking about the territories surrounding the World Heritage property. In terms of the buffer zones proposed by IUCN and also by the State Party in the nomination file we consider that since the ski zones do not really comply with the World Heritage Status, their exclusion and designation of buffer zones would better reflect the situation on the ground and would allow Pirin to become

once again a viable World Heritage property. Therefore we appreciate the proposal by IUCN and think that we will restrict and better control the ski development in this area and also ensure the better preservation of the World Heritage property itself.

The Chairperson

Thank you. If there are no other requests for the floor, I give the floor to our Rapporteur to go through the draft decision.

Rapporteur

Thank you very much Mister Chairperson, the Draft Decision 8B.5 is on page 7 of both the English and the French version of document and I have not received any written amendments. Thank you.

The Chairperson

So are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.8B.5** approving the extension of the site? I see none. Adopted. Congratulation to the State Party (Applause) You have two minutes for a statement. Would you make it very short Madam?

Bulgaria

Yes I will thank you dear Chairperson. Bulgaria is a country with long traditions in nature conservation. Pirin national park is one of the most valuable protected areas in Bulgaria, Europe and the entire world. It was established to protect the unique nature and rich natural and historical heritage. Besides protecting the unique nature of Pirin mountain, the park is also important for the preservation of the tradition and livelihood linked to the mountain. It should be mentioned that the preservation of this unique wealth for the future generations around the world is a duty and responsibility of our country. On behalf of the State Party, I would like to thank the distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee for their positive decision regarding the inclusion of the whole area of Pirin National Park in the World Heritage List except the ski zones. The extension of the property will contribute to its integrity and we assure its more effective management in the future. I would like to emphasize that nearly 15% of the area of the property has been designated as a strict reserve where no human activities are permitted which further guarantees the properties conservation. With the new boundaries and the exclusion of the ski zones, which had been a major source of concern, Pirin National Park will meet the requirements of the convention and we will restore its image as respectful World Heritage property. It should be also pointed out that there exists pressure on behalf of the stakeholders for new developments based on the need for local economic development that may negatively affect this site. Therefore let me assure you that the government will not allow any activities contrary to the national legislation and the requirements of the World Heritage Committee. In connection with the above, I would like to stress that the conservation of the nature in Bulgaria is one of the priorities Bulgarian government enhances. We will do the best to preserve Pirin National Park as part of the national heritage. In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that it is a great honor to us that this Bulgarian mountain represents our country on the list of sites of the World Heritage Convention and express our commitment to to preserve Pirin National Park as a World Heritage property for future generations. And finally a very much thank I would like to express my thankfulness to IUCN for finding the appropriate solution.

The Chairperson

Thank you very much and congratulations. Before I close our working session for the evening, would I thank the interpreters for their patience and their excellent work.

Monday, 2 August 2010

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Morning session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

NATURAL PROPERTIES

The Chairperson:

“Good morning. We still have three sites for nomination regarding natural property. The next site is the extension of **Monte San Giorgio (Italy)**. IUCN has the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson and good morning. IUCN’s evaluation of Monte San Giorgio is on page 93 of the English version and 99 of the French version of our report. This site is a pyramid-shaped wooded mountain that rises to an altitude of 1,000 metres above sea level. It lies to the south of Lake Lugarno and across the border from Italy and Switzerland. The nominated extension is contiguous with the property and it lies within an area which is a landscape protected zone under Italian Law. It includes the part of zone that includes the main fossil-bearing deposits that are related to the site that is already inscribed.

The existing property provides the single best known record of marine life from the middle of the Triassic period, as well as important evidence of life on land. The site has produced diverse and numerous fossils that have allowed detail reconstruction of several groups of marine organisms. The reconstruction of the original fossil here illustrates one of the additions known from the Italian portion confirming the added value from the extension to the existing inscribed property. The long history of study and the disciplined management of the resources created a thoroughly documented and well catalogued body of specimens of exceptional quality, and a rich scientific literature.

Monte San Giorgio is thus considered the principal reference for future discoveries of Triassic remains throughout the world. The existing property is under criterion (viii) and we consider the extension adds significant leads to the recognition of that criterion within the property as a whole. We also know that the extension was recommended at the time of inscription.

The extended property encompasses the complete Middle Triassic outcrop of Monte San Giorgio, including all of the main fossil-bearing areas. The resulting extended property fully meets the integrity requirements for a fossil site. The State Party of Italy will complete the establishment of a National Foundation for the Italian portion of the property and ensure the appointment of an agreed position of World Heritage site manager and it is also committed to provide sufficient funding for its portion of the management of the property.

There are also sound and developing arrangements between the State Party of Italy and Switzerland to ensure an effective transboundary management, including the establishment of a new strategic transnational board. There is a need to continue to ensure that this board functions effectively and that it is provided with adequate resources for its

work and a single coherent identity and management approach should also be ensured in the long-term, given that the establishment of this board is promised and will be set up through the following inscription. We propose to report to the Committee in three-years time to confirm the requested actions have been implemented.

In summary, IUCN considers this extension is justified with relation to the existing criterion. It adds to the integrity of the property and its effective protection and management is in place. Thus, this is a straightforward case to recommend to this Committee an approval for this extension, and you can find our Draft Decision on page 8 of the English and French document 8B. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Merci l’UICN. Juste une annonce, sur ce qui a été décidé en ce qui concerne les travaux d'aujourd'hui. Au bureau ce matin, il a été décidé de faire une session de 10 h jusqu'à 13 h 30, et ensuite il y aura une pause de une heure pour le déjeuner pour reprendre de 14 h 30 jusqu'à 19 h 30. Si personne ne souhaite faire de commentaire, je vais donner la parole au rapporteur pour l'examen du projet de Décision ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. Draft Decision 8B.6 is on page 8 of both the English and French versions of your document, and I have not received any written amendment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.6** approving the extension to Monte San Giorgio? I see none. It is adopted and congratulations to the State Party. The Representative of the State Party, you now have the floor for a two minute statement.”

Italy:

“Thank you Mr. President. On behalf of the Italian government and also on behalf on the local and regional authorities concerned, I would like to thank the distinguished members of the Committee for the inscription of Monte San Giorgio. I would also thank IUCN for the high scientific level of its work.

As you know, when the Swiss portion of Monte San Giorgio was inscribed in 2003, IUCN asked Italy to present a nomination of the extension of the site in order to guarantee its integrity. A few months later, the local authority with the support of the central authority began to work to prepare the dossier, and above all, they started to work from the very beginning with the local Swiss authorities for the common management of the site.

I would like to thank all our Swiss colleagues for their operational and friendly working approach. Today, with the Committee’s decision, we have reached a very important goal for the conservation of this transboundary heritage. I want to confirm that Italy is engaged in the implementation of the recommendation from the Committee for Monte San Giorgio, and more generally in the implementation of the World Heritage *Convention* in our country.

Italy remains, as well, committed to the fulfilment of the international legal framework regarding World Common Heritage also through its cooperation development instrument. In

the light of this, I would finally like to recall the intention of Italy to present its candidature to the Committee in 2011. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, would you like to have the floor?”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous apprécions énormément cette étroite collaboration avec les Italiens. De plus, nous sommes très contents que cette extension ait pu se faire avec en plus un plan intégral de gestion. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Congratulations to both of you.

We are now moving to the next site concerning the **Dinosaur Ichnites of the Iberian Peninsula (Spain, Portugal)**. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. You can find the IUCN evaluation of this referred site from previous sessions of the Committee on pages 51 and 57 of the French version. This nominated property consists of eleven component parts situated in 6 autonomous regions of Spain, as well as 3 components located in Portugal. The context for this evaluation is Decision 34 COM 8B.26, which recommended that the State Party of Spain, which originated the nomination with a large number of components, reconsiders the potential to strengthen the possible case for Outstanding Universal Value which was not proven at the time of 30COM, giving particular attention to three points.

The first was a definition of a more focused conceptual framework that clearly demonstrates the relationship of the Dinosaur Ichnites site in Spain to fossil sites in Portugal. Portugal was not considered in the original nomination.

The second was a thorough global comparative analysis including justification for a property based on dinosaur ichnite, dinosaur footprints to be considered as an Outstanding Universal Value.

Third was a serial nomination that is coherent and manageable.

The nominated property contains a range of both nationally and internationally significant components that together represent the known record of dinosaur ichnites found within the Iberian Peninsula. It includes some components that are of a very small size. This diagram illustrates one of these components in Spain. This red circle is of about 25 metres, so the component in this case is demonstrating footprints in an area which is a little larger than the front part of this hall.

The components selected in the revised property are a more limited selection of a previous selected nomination, as I mentioned, and they include significant sites that are found on the side of Portugal. Thus, the proposal addresses the first and the third requests of the previous Committee decision and the conceptual model, which I have shown you on a previous diagram that is offered on the nomination, is clear.

However, a global comparative analysis has not demonstrated that the nominated series can be accepted as being of Outstanding Universal Value. And no more generally than a single or serial property based on the values of dinosaur ichnites provide the bases for Outstanding Universal Value. The approach taken to the comparative analysis in designing this nomination has some quite significant problems. Based on its consideration of the nomination, IUCN concluded that the property appears to have less significance than those from properties from the age of the dinosaurs that are already included on the World Heritage List and elsewhere. And also of other sites that include both remains of trace fossils and also the direct remains of dinosaurs. IUCN also notes that this group of fossil animals, the dinosaurs and the period in which they lived on earth is already one of the rather well-represented geological periods on the World Heritage List.

Therefore, we conclude that the property does not meet criterion (viii). We consider that the protection status of the nominated property meets the requirements set out in the Operational Guidelines. The Stated Outstanding Universal Value, however, does not correspond to the attributes that are included within the boundaries of the property. And the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value by the State Party mentions a number of things that are not located inside the property. A number of components are very small, as I mentioned, and the boundaries do not always correspond to the relevant geological strata. We consider that the boundaries as they are currently being set up do not meet the integrity requirements set up by the Operational Guidelines.

We consider that the management of the property does not meet the requirements overall, although much of the management of its components appear to be satisfactory, in some cases demonstrating best practice globally. Ongoing quarrying activity in one component is not compatible with inscription on the World Heritage List.

We finally return to the issue of the demonstration of Outstanding Universal Value in relation to sites related to dinosaur ichnites. And we note that four different nominations including the previous, the third nomination, have not provided evidence so far that properties based on dinosaur ichnites alone provide a basis for the demonstration of Outstanding Universal Value. When the Committee recommended a deferral of the property at the 33rd session, that question was left open and after three further evaluations, we consider with some regret the balance of evidence suggests that, potentially, the World Heritage Convention is not the most appropriate route to pursue the recognition of this type of fossil remains where we see a distribution of footprints that is very widespread, unlike the site based on body fossils which are much more restricted. In fact, the site Monte San Giorgio gives a good example of the rarity and specificity of that type of phenomenon.

In summary, we conclude that the nominated property does not meet criterion (viii), nor fully the integrity and protection and management requirements, and that a serial approach at this stage is not appropriate. Therefore, we recommend the Committee does not inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. The Draft Decision can be found on page 8 of both versions of document 8B. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now open the floor for comments from the members of the Committee. I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Sir. Sweden wants to commend IUCN for a comprehensive and convincing evaluation report. This report is convincing, as Sweden supports the Draft Decision not to inscribe the property. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

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

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je suis satisfait de l'exposé de l'UICN, cependant Monsieur le Président, je souhaiterais revenir sur un certain nombre d'éléments qui ont été développés par l'UICN et qui semblent être des éléments qui apportent certains éclaircissements mais aussi satisfactions. On a parlé d'analyse comparative, d'un lien qui a été prouvé entre les dinosaures des deux pays, c'est un lien transfrontalier.

On a aussi également parlé des demandes d'inscriptions en série, tout cela a été bien étayé et accepté par l'UICN, mais il y a quand même des lacunes. Je souhaiterais écouter l'État partie sur un certain nombre d'éléments Monsieur le Président. J'aimerais savoir ce qui a été fait par l'État partie en termes d'amélioration de l'analyse comparative, mais aussi en ce qui concerne la gestion et la protection du site. Je m'adresse plus particulièrement à l'État Partie de l'Espagne. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci Mali, avec votre permission, je vais donner la parole au Mexique puis ensuite ce sera l'État partie.

Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Chair. We would like to thank IUCN for its report and congratulate the State Parties on the efforts that they have made for this nomination file. We would like to ask the State Parties to what extent they have added to the observations made at the World Heritage Committee of Seville. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would also like to ask the State Party which universities and scientists have supported the nomination? Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. The floor is to the representative of the State Parties, both Spain and Portugal.”

Portugal :

“Thank you very much Chairman. I would like to talk about the nomination and after, with your authorization, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the floor to the experts on this matter.”

The Chairperson ^[interrupting the speaker].

“Just reply to the questions asked by the member States without getting into the details of the process of nomination. Thank you.”

Portugal :

“I do not want to talk about the nomination process. I want to answer the question that was asked to us concerning the management problems confronting the two sites. We have already set up a Coordination Committee for the nomination and we already have a long experience of joint work and partnership between Portugal and Spain and between the local authorities of the two countries. The Spanish autonomous regions involved have set up a special Committee to manage the site and to promote it and they already have a website online for that purpose.

We are very confident that we will continue to work jointly with Spain along the same lines. Could I please give the floor to my expert now?”

The Chairperson:

“You have the floor.”

Spanish expert:

“Thank you very much. Could I outline some of the aspects of my response concerning the question on the comparative analysis? You need to take into account the fact that this nomination has a group of eleven sites which outline the history of a very important era in the history of the world, through the dinosaur track ways. We are comparing eleven different track sites with the various other dinosaur track ways around the world, which are often isolated sites. We have created the concept of geo-sites to express what these sites are, what they have in common. The Iberian tectonic plate is a geo-site that functions as a linking point between the two supercontinents Gondwana and Eurasia in a large period of the Mesozoic era.

We compared these sites with other major deposits that have similar surface area to our geo-site. From these comparisons, we have concluded that the geo-sites from the Iberian Peninsula provide additional information on the history of dinosaurs compare to other sites in the world. I do not know if we have enough time to get into the details.

I move on to answering the second aspect on the experts and universities that have worked on this nomination. First, of course, several dozen Spanish and Portuguese experts from 14 institutions, universities and museums have not only assessed the nomination, but have also taken part in the development of our nomination file. They were also various international experts in Ichnites that visited this track way and they have also published papers. The major experts are Dr. Martin Lockley from Denver in the United States, Christian Meyer from Basel, Switzerland, Jean Leleuvre from France, Marco Avanzini from Trento in Italy, another American and a Korean expert. We have engaged in very fruitful discussions with these experts. We have worked jointly with them, even on the assessment of the deposits themselves. And they have stated in public their support for this nomination.

The Chairperson:

“IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN :

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I am not sure if they were questions, but it's very good to hear these explanations and the explanation and information that we well know in relation with the degree of work that is ongoing in these and other ichnite sites. That is well understood. The question we address with a fossil site is in relation to whether the site corresponds to the decision the Committee has taken and the Operative Guidelines in terms of the requirements for comparative analysis and so on. We have a very clear case law, case history of inscribing fossil site on this List and it is within that framework that we assess the nomination.

I have no disagreement with anything that was said and as we noted, we regard management of many of these individual components as being extremely good. It is not what we have been assessing in the nomination and it does not contradict the conclusions that we reached. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Iraq you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you, Chair. My question has already been answered by the State Party. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you, Chair. I need some clarification, maybe from IUCN. This candidature has reduced dramatically the number of paleontological sites following the recommendation of IUCN. At which point this reduction that has been fulfilled by Spain and Portugal affects the conceptual framework of the candidature. And another question, you said that there are lots of sites on the World Heritage List already concerning dinosaurs. Why don't the State

Parties, maybe with your recommendation IUCN, considers the possibility to join this case to serial nomination, so it would be like a net of such sites. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Russian Federation. I give the floor to the next speakers, then IUCN will answer. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson, and to IUCN, for this excellent presentation of the nomination. I think in this case the international scientific framework is very clear and IUCN has drawn the derived conclusion from that. We would like to share the views already exposed by Switzerland and we do not consider that the site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. The floor is to Jordan.”

Jordan:

“Thank you, Chair. In the light of the report of IUCN and the comments made by the distinguished members of the Committee and the State Party, Jordan is interested to continue the work on this property and we would go for referral of the nomination. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. There were two questions from the Russian Federation, one about the reduction of sites and the relationship to the conceptual framework. This is about designing a site within a context of the Iberian Peninsula. It is certain that the number of sites has been reduced within the number of sites that has been selected. Most of the sites are ichnites sites, others are really quite small but complement the record in the context of the Iberian Peninsula. I think it is clear that in terms of the conceptual framework there has been a reduction and I complimented the work on that and in terms of the understanding of what the fossil records in the Iberian Peninsula tell us.

What would further reduction do in terms of recognition in the site? I think we need further assessment within the site that we cannot deliver on the podium. Clearly, there is a challenge with the smaller sites. As soon as you inscribe a series with very small components where there are many other sites spread across the site and it is difficult to then see what the integrity of the series is.

The second question was about whether this site could be joined in a serial nomination to existing sites on the World heritage List. It is certainly the case for fossil sites where we are dealing with massive changes on the surface of the earth, that we are not

dealing with a situation where State boundaries or even current regional boundaries make a great deal of sense. There is, in principle, no reason why a property of a transboundary nature cannot be an extension of another site. Obviously the challenge there is firstly to have the agreement of the State Parties to work in that way and secondly have a management system which is meaningful and able to be delivered, and thirdly the same issue applies to designing a site which is not an open-ended series which can be added to indefinitely. I think these were some of the questions.

Regarding the comment from Jordan about referral, generally we would see referral as a matter to recommend where the criteria have been demonstrated to be met, whereas deferral is what is appropriate when a case is not proven and I just wanted to draw that distinction to the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you. I understood that you are going to give the floor to ICOMOS after we heard from the State Parties. Are we going to hear from ICOMOS? It has been done, I am sorry. In that case Mr. Chairman, Brazil considers that the value of this nomination is clearly demonstrated. I apologise. Earlier I meant IUCN not ICOMOS.

The IUCN report does not completely deny the value of the property, so Brazil feels that it would be possible to reassess this nomination giving the State Party the opportunity to review their nomination files. Brazil would like to support what the Jordanian Delegation said; that this nomination should be referred back to the State Party. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je me réjouis beaucoup des informations complémentaires qui ont été fournies par l'État partie. Je suis entièrement satisfait des efforts qui ont été accomplis en matière d'élaboration des analyses comparatives et je tiens également à être informé sur un élément extrêmement important qui est l'existence d'une documentation académique confirmée. On a parlé de 14 universités et instituts qui travaillent sur le site, cela veut dire qu'il y a une coopération internationale autour du site et qui pourrait aider à contribuer à la protection, à la gestion et à la conservation du site. Au vu de ces différents éléments, Monsieur le Président, la Délégation du Mali propose l'inscription du bien et a proposé un projet de Décision. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. La parole est à la Thaïlande. »

Thailand:

“Thank you, Chair. Thailand would like to see more research done on the site and I would like to go with the colleague from Jordan regarding the referral. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Thailand. France, you have the floor.”

France:

“Merci Monsieur le Président. Au fil du débat qui se déroule, je dois avouer que la Délégation française a des difficultés à comprendre la recommandation de non inscription. Nous avons des précisions importantes qui nous ont été apportées. La réduction du nombre de sites a eu, nous dit-on, des effets très positifs sur la présentation de cette candidature. Les onze éléments de la candidature témoignent de la vie de presque tous les groupes de dinosaures sur des temps suffisamment longs pour qu'ils traduisent une évolution de ces animaux.

L'autre aspect que je voudrais souligner concerne la complémentarité des sites qui sont proposés du bien proposé, par rapport aux trois biens qui sont déjà inscrits. Nous avons entendu qu'il y a eu un immense travail, un très gros travail, devrais-je dire même, en ce qui concerne l'analyse comparative.

Par ailleurs, dernier point, en ce qui concerne le statut de protection et la pertinence de la gestion des sites proposés, nous avons eu des assurances qui sont d'ailleurs soulignées dans le rapport de l'UICN. Donc, nous ne comprenons pas cette recommandation de non inscription après le débat qui a eu lieu ici et les précisions apportées par l'État partie ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. La parole est à l'Irak ».

Iraq:

“Mr. Chairman, I had the same questions in my mind as the gentleman from France. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the United Arab emirates.”

United Arab Emirates:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We support Jordan. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mexico.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The IUCN recognizes that the representation of ichnites on the World Heritage List does not constitute a solid base for the establishment of the Outstanding Universal Value. However, there is a specialty in paleontology, which is ichnology: The study of fossil tracks. Universities have participated in the research on these sites; there are very few sites of fossil track ways in the world, they are only minimally represented. Do we not believe that it is important to conserve them, given their rarity? I would like to hear from the State Party what their opinion is in that regard.”

The Chairperson:

“You do not have the right to ask the State Party their point of view. If you have a precise question, please ask it. Switzerland, you have the floor before IUCN.”

Switzerland:

“Merci Monsieur le Président. La Suisse soutient le rapport des Organisations consultatives. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial a mené de nombreuses discussions sur la méthodologie d'évaluation des sites d'empreintes fossiles. Dans la décision 30COM8B.26, le Comité du patrimoine mondial demandait la réalisation d'une analyse comparative mondiale exhaustive comprenant la justification de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle d'un bien basée uniquement sur des ichno-fossiles de dinosaures. L'Organe consultatif constate, comptant toutes les évaluations précédentes, que la représentation d'ichno-fossile sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, n'a pas une base solide pour établir la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Pour cette raison, deux nominations recommandées à la non-inscription: celle de la Bolivie en 2007 et celle de la République de Corée en 2009 ont été retirées par ces États membres.

Dans cette situation, un renvoi est une solution qui n'est pas acceptable et ne donne pas la possibilité de faire les travaux qui seront à effectuer pour mettre ce bien dans une série. Pour effectuer ces travaux, il faudrait un *deferral* pour arriver avec les autres États à un plan de gestion intégré et pour faire une étude pour mieux intégrer ces sites dans une série de biens qui contiennent des fossiles. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci à la Suisse. La parole est à l'Estonie ».

Estonia:

“Thanks for the floor. Estonia fully supports Switzerland. According to the explanations, the options we should consider should be *deferral* not *referral*, as it gives the State Party more time to reconsider the matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mexico.”

Mexico :

“Thank you, Chair. We would like to ask the State party to be kind enough to tell us why the ichnites in the Iberian Peninsula are important for the World Heritage. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“This is a not a technical, direct question to be asked in a Plenary when we started a nomination of the site of the concerned State Party.”

Mexico :

“Mr. Chairman, I would appeal to you understanding. We are asking for a clarification which we believe is key to the understanding of this. We should hear the State Party on this very important clarification. Thank you, Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“You have the answer in the document. The State Party provided a file and they gave the reason why they thought this site should be examined by the members of the Committee. You have the information you asked for in the document.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We are going to alter our question. We are asking the State Party whether there are any additional elements over and beyond those that appear within the report in relation to this question, additional elements that have not yet been considered.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. State Party you have the floor.”

Spain :

“If I have understood correctly the context for this question...”

The Chairperson ^[interrupting the speaker] **:**

“Excuse me, the question is: Do you have any additional information?”

Spain :

“Yes, I would like to add that dinosaur ichnites are true fossils, they should be considered as sedimentary structures. This is something that we can now say on the basis of all investigations and research carried out. They are as valuable as the direct fossils and as bones themselves, which in some areas of the planet are on the World Heritage List. Ichnite deposits are not second rank deposits, nor are they tremendously abandoned. In fact you have more dinosaur bone deposits than track deposits.

The track deposits require exceptional conservation measures because they are in the open air, whereas the big dinosaur bones are already housed in the main museums in the world. This is the defence of the value of the ichnites. At the time we did not think it was necessary when we made the file available to you, but we are now putting this defence as an additional element. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Clearly dinosaur sites are spread all over the world and it is a very exciting thing. In Australia we have a site on our national Heritage List that records several fossils from 450 million years ago, involving several hundreds of dinosaurs. We would not consider that to be of Outstanding Universal Value, even though it is clearly important. Mr. Chairman, if I can put through you a question to IUCN: I was wondering, though it is clear from their evaluation, but I just want to ensure that it is the case, not regarding the scientific interest of the site but whether there is a rarity or an exceptional demonstration of another dimension of complexity that does warrant having Outstanding Universal Value. The issue relates to rarity or the complexity of what they are demonstrating.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. President. Firstly, to respond to the State Party of France who asked why the recommendation is not to be inscribed. I think I was clear in the presentation that there were three points that the Committee asked to be addressed in its previous deferral. There were two of those that had been acted on, but the one remaining issue is related to the comparative analysis.

Secondly, to respond to the intervention of Mexico, who said that there are very few sites globally and stressed the importance of conservation. It is not in our view the case that you can say that there are very few of these sites globally. In fact, there are a large number of previous serial nominations considered, 200 in Spain alone, as the basis for the series. These are spread throughout the globe in many strata where dinosaurs occurred. You can find these in many places, and the numbers are reasonably large. Clearly major concentrations are rarer.

To respond to the issue of conservation: Of course, we are saying that conservation of these sites is important. The question we are relating to here is the inscription of these sites on the World Heritage List and these sites are actually conserved sites.

Lastly, to respond to the State Party of Australia's question: I cannot do a lot more than repeat what is already in the documentation. We certainly recognise that dinosaur ichnites and trace fossils more generally are a complementary part of the fossil record. They certainly do convey information that is not found elsewhere in terms of how animals lived and their physical structure.

The last point was about more bones than tracks. In terms of the distribution of bone sites, that may be true, but the World Heritage List in terms of concentration of fossils has always looked into what we call major concentrations of fossils which are extremely rare. In fact, we will look into a minor modification of one of them later and we dealt with one of those sites in the previous extension. It is those very exceptional concentrations that we noted in our comparative analysis, also sometimes including trace fossils as well. This has been the focus of our evaluation in this case. I think that covers all the questions."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Ethiopia."

Ethiopia:

"Listening to the State Party and the recommendation of the Delegations which believe it is good to refer, I believe they have to redo the comparative analysis and come back next time. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I think we should move on to the examination of the Draft Decision and I invite our rapporteur to give us more information."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Decision 8B.7 is on page 10 of the English and of the French versions of document 8B. I have received one written amendment by the State parties of Mali and Mexico which amends paragraph 2, 3 and 4 of the Draft Decision. The first paragraph would remain identical. The second would read as follow:

Decides to inscribe the dinosaur ichnites of the Iberian Peninsula (Portugal, Spain) on the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criterion (viii)

The Decision would further insert a new paragraph 3 to adapt the statement of Outstanding Universal Value. And the current paragraph 3 and 4 would be deleted. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to the representative of the Russian Federation before Switzerland.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you. Due to the fact that IUCN proposes not to inscribe the site and the other proposal is to be inscribed, it seems to me that it would be quite difficult and maybe I propose to defer. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

“J’aimerais soutenir la proposition de la Russie. Merci Monsieur le Président.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Mexico has the floor.”

Mexico :

“In the light of the discussions we have just held in the Committee, we would go along with the proposal made by the Russian Federation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali, do you also agree with Mexico?”

Mali:

« Oui, je rejoins le Mexique ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup. La Suède vous avez la parole ».

Sweden:

“Sweden supports the Russian suggestion to defer the property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, Chair. Bahrain goes with the Russian suggestion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. South Africa also supports this. We have now one amendment proposed by the Russian Federation and supported by other member States, to defer the examination of this site. I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Chair. I noted that at least, four State parties have requested a deferral. I am ready to formulate the text for such a decision. However, the standing text of deferral would read approximately like this:

*Defers the examination of the nomination of **Dinosaur Ichnites of the Iberian Peninsula, Portugal/Spain**, to the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria in order to allow the State Party to develop...*

And then we would probably need some guidance from the Committee, what they would want the State Party to do. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. This is an observation, and taking the mood of the Committee is that the obvious point to make is that there is a previously adopted deferral which I mentioned which had three points within it. One of those points relates to the outstanding matter which is the basis for our recommendation. If the Committee is to encourage further work on this then this is the focus. It would maybe then possible to adopt that element of the past decision to address the point the rapporteur is raising.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. I give the floor to the rapporteur for clarification and information regarding the Draft Decision.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Considering the recommendation of IUCN to include previous recommendations into the Draft Decision: The Draft Decision would read as follows: Paragraph 1 would remain identical, paragraph 2 would read:

*Defers the examination of the nomination of **Dinosaur Ichnites of the Iberian Peninsula, Portugal/Spain**, to the World Heritage List on the basis of natural criteria in order to allow the State Party to*

Then, there would be sub-paragraph a:

develop a thorough global comparative analysis, including justification for a property based on dinosaur ichnites to be considered as being of Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding this Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.7 and amendment? Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« La Fédération Russe a fait une proposition envers un bien en série, donc on aimerait qu'en plus de ces considérations sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, soient incluses des réflexions sur un bien en série ».

The Chairperson:

“It could be possible to be added in the recommendations. Coming back to the adoption of the Russian Federation amendment to defer the examination of the inscription of the dinosaur ichnite sites of the Iberian Peninsula, are there any objections regarding its adoption? I see none, **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.7** is adopted.

Let's examine the last site on our list, regarding the **Putorana Plateau in the Russian Federation**. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Putorana Plateau (Russian Federation) can be found in page 65 of the English and page 71 of the French versions of document INF/8B.2. It is a previously deferred nomination. The property nominated under criteria (vii) and (ix) is located in northern central Siberia in the Russian Federation. Its boundaries coincide with the Putoransky State Nature Reserve, a strict Nature Reserve, or Zapovednik, since 1997. Situated far north of the arctic circle, the nearest town is more than 200 kilometres away.

The Nature Reserve is of more than 1.8 million hectares, surrounded by an extensive buffer zone of approximately the same size. The nominated property harvests a complete set of sub-arctic and arctic ecosystems in an isolated plateau, including pristine taiga, forest tundra and arctic desert systems, as well as untouched cold water lake and river systems. The combination of remoteness, naturalness and strict protections ensure that ecological and biological processes continue on a very large scale with a minimum of human influence.

The property provides a dramatic demonstration of ecological processes, including the interaction between populations of the full range of arctic fauna. Major reindeer migrations cross part of the property. The property is also one of the very few centres of botanical richness in the arctic.

In terms of potential future threats, geological information suggests that mining could potentially extend to areas close to the property. Discussions with a mining company during both IUCN field missions stated that they have no plans to mine within the nominated property. The Federal law which protects natural areas does not allow mining or prospecting within the nominated property.

In summary, IUCN considers the property meets criteria (vii) and (ix), the necessary conditions of integrity, and its management standard meets the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. In the view of IUCN, this revised nomination is an excellent example to illustrate how additional time provided for the deferral in 2008 and additional effort can help to improve the quality of the nomination and indeed the management of the property.

IUCN therefore recommends that the World Heritage Committee inscribes the Putorana Plateau (Russian Federation) on the basis of criteria (vii) and (ix). The Draft Decision is on page 10 of both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. I suggest giving the floor to the rapporteur for examination of the Decision.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chair. The representative of IUCN has just mentioned the location of the Decision, and I can only add that I have not received any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, rapporteur. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.8** approving the inscription of the Putorana Plateau (Russian Federation)? I see none. The Draft Decision is adopted, thank you.

State Party, you have a two- minute statement.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. On behalf of the government of the Russian Federation, I would like to express our gratitude to the World Heritage Centre, the World Heritage Committee and IUCN for their great help and support. As you know, a previous nomination attempt of this property was deferred by the Committee in 2008. Since that time the Russian Federation, through efficient engagement with IUCN and our German colleagues—to whom I want to give special thanks—successfully managed to refocus the nomination on the values and features within the Putorana Nature Reserve in relation to the respective criteria: Natural beauty, ecological and biological processes. The Russian government provided a clear statement of support. The Natural Reserve has all the necessary human and financial resources to ensure the untouched beauty of an arctic and boreal landscape of 25,000 fjord-like lakes, hundreds of waterfalls and canyons more than 500 metres deep.

Putorana Plateau is a mosaic of an extremely diverse range of habitats, such as untouched taiga, tundra and arctic desert systems, as well as pristine cold water lake and river systems. Thank you very much once more for your support.”

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

The Chairperson:

“Thank you and congratulations. We are moving to the second part concerning the nomination of minor modifications to the boundaries of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. The floor is to IUCN and ICOMOS, starting with IUCN regarding natural properties.”

IUCN:

“Thank you. We will start with the **Three Parallel Rivers of the Yunnan Protected Areas (China)**. IUCN's examination of this minor modification is on page 107 of the English version of the IUCN evaluation report and on page 113 of the French version. This is a complex boundary modification proposal of a very large serial property with amendments to all 8 sub-areas of the inscribed property and the sub-areas themselves have component parts that are serial in nature, as detailed in the report.

There is a history of Committee decisions regarding possible amendments to this property that are summarised in our report, and the State Party has put forward a series of amendments in which they compromised a small overall percentage increase in the area of the property, a very different impact in relation to the different components of this serial site. We regard three of the amendments to be straightforward and certainly of a minor nature, which are all positives. This comprised amendments to the Gaoligong Shan, Baima-Meili Xueshan, Laowo and Qianhushan components of the properties. Two proposals have required expert reviews through IUCN expert networks, but we also consider that they can be judged to be acceptable as minor boundary modifications.

The amendment to the Yunlingshan Sub-unit is considered to result in a better configuration in relation to key forest areas and the boundaries are supported by well-referenced evidence of the distribution of a key species, the Yunnan Snub-nosed Monkey. This information is of a similar level to that which we would expect in a normal evaluation process and with such a species it would normally not be able to deal with the evaluation of its distribution during a field mission.

The amendment to Laojunshan is similarly more extensive in nature, but is also supported by appropriate review material regarding natural values, that have been validated through our network. We thereby, have a high level of confidence in the improvement of these amendments in relation to the property as it is currently configured. We recommend these two components to be accepted through the minor boundary modification process.

The last two components are more extensively altered than those already mentioned above. Whilst the State Party asserts that these components are degraded due to the grazing of forestry, the key issue in the view of IUCN is the presence of mining within the components. They are 16 mines reported in one of the components, and IUCN was able to visit some of these at the invitation of the Chinese partners late last year, in a short visit which was something not requested by the Committee. We regret and it is clear and well substantiated by evidence through the missions that there were mines active at the time of inscription. They were not detected either in the State Party nomination file or during the IUCN evaluation mission. The mission did not visit the particular valley where these mines are located. The areas where mining is actually taking place and is legally licensed are small.

But there is a much larger area including mining exploration licenses and it is shown in the diagram within the evaluation report that we presented.

The effect of the boundary modification is to exclude the whole of the mining exploration area from the property. We consider, given the long history, that the discussion of mining has an impact on protected areas and World Heritage sites to this Committee, that it is not possible to recommend to you in any way the acceptance of a variation of boundary of a property in relation to mining utilizing the process for a boundary modification, but rather it should have the intention of a major boundary modification, with the attention that gets through a mission that would be requested by this Committee.

We now also have a number of points in our evaluation. There is a proposal to have established a number of influencing areas that we noted is interesting, but does not correspond to any concept of the guidelines. At this stage we cannot recommend it. In this case we have a complex recommendation to put to you, which I would describe in summary as a partial acceptance of the minor boundary modification, recommendation for part of the proposal to be considered through the process of a major boundary modification, and we have given some guidance, considering the somewhat delicate situation we have in this situation, as to how that might be carried forward by the State Party of China. The Decision is outlined in the working document. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN, though I hope next time you could be shorter. I would suggest giving the floor to our rapporteur directly to proceed to the examination of the Draft Decision.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Draft Decision is on page 35 of both English and French versions of the document. I have received two written amendments and I have to apologise to one of the State Parties, I cannot remember who it is, since the name is not indicated on the amendment. One of the amendments is from Brazil, the other from a different member of the Committee. If they could let us know, we would be very grateful, so we can have it on record.

The Draft Decision affects in both cases because the submissions are identical; paragraphs 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Draft Decision. Paragraph 2 is amended in order to include Haba Snow Mountain and Cangshan Mountain into the approval. It would then read:

Approves as minor modifications the changes proposed by the State Party within the areas referred to as the Gaoigongshan, Baima-Meili Snow Mountains, Laowo Mountain, Yunling Mountain, Laojun Mountain and Qianhu Mountain sub-units of the property, Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain component parts of the Three parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected areas (China).

Paragraph 3 would then accordingly reads:

Does not approve the addition of the three proposed influencing areas to the property.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 would remain unchanged. Paragraphs 6 and 7 according to the proposal would be deleted completely. Paragraph currently 8 would then turn into paragraph 6, with a minor modification, to read:

Requests the State Party to take all necessary steps to ensure that the mining operations that have already become established within this sector of the property and its buffer zone conform to appropriate international standards regarding the risk to the environment, including human health.

Paragraph 9 is then suggested to be deleted and paragraphs 10 and 11 would become as they are, but become paragraph 7 and 8 considering the earlier deletion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'avais levé la plaquette mais cela n'avait pas été vu. C'est bel et bien le Mali qui a fait cet amendement. Nous rejoignons ce que vient de dire l'UICN parce que le réexamen des limites est très intéressant, car cela permet qu'on l'insère dans le plan de gestion. Ceci est le premier élément. L'autre étant que nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition de l'UICN qui consiste à envoyer une mission sur le terrain. Donc, le fait de revoir les limites du bien ne veut pas dire que nous sommes contre une mission d'expert. Pour l'instant, passons à l'extension des limites pour mieux protéger le site et ensuite on peut toujours accepter l'envoi d'experts pour pouvoir négocier avec les autorités. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you very much. First of all I would like to ask a question to the State Party...”

The Chairperson [interrupting the speaker]:

“I am sorry, it's too late.”

Russian Federation:

“Ok, then; we approve the minor modification to the first formulation.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Just a clarification, Mr. Chairman please. Can we make a statement on this item, is it possible?”

The Chairperson:

“Now we are examining the recommendation.”

Brazil:

“So, it is too late. Ok, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. Nigeria would also like to support this boundary modification that has been carried out. We notice that not only has it excluded the degraded area, but also included high-quality areas. The net result is that both the core and the buffer zones have been increased in size and that will help in the management of the property. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Jordan also approves the modifications made by the State Party. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“No, you mean you support the amendment by Brazil?”

Jordan:

“Yes, we support the amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Certainly in substance, the proposed changes to the property do appear to be likely to improve it. But on the procedural matter, we would support the

Decision as originally drafted just because of the procedures we have in relation to minor and other modification, but this does not question the value of the proposed extension. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Cambodia, you have the floor.”

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous appuyons l'État Partie sur l'exclusion des limites nouvellement définies de Hongshan ».

The Chairperson:

“Iraq, you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thanks Chair. I think we should speak to the amendment that we have heard. I think we do advise the Committee that we would regard with a great deal of concern adopting an amendment that would accept such an acceptance of a change of boundaries relating to mining exploration without an assessment on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property that is possible and a very clear procedure set up in the Operational Guidelines for how that sort of issue should be addressed. We have dealt as far as we can with the matters that are minor and that we have been able to establish in relation to the value of the site as it exists. I would just note, considering this decision, that the Committee should reflect on the number of sites where mining is an issue in relation to protection.

This is a *Convention* about the protection of Heritage and I really have a fear that the Decision as amended would set a precedent that would have extreme consequences when we look at these sorts of issues in relation with many heritage sites where mining is a factor. I lastly note that this *Convention* is regarded at the highest level by industry partners such as the International Council on Metals and Mining who are frequently referenced in decisions as respecting a no go commitment to mining in World Heritage sites. They adopt this principal because they regard this as being a *Convention* that takes decisions about inscription of World Heritage sites that are of the highest quality and they can have confidence in them. I think it would be extremely worrying to deal with a mining issue related to a heritage site without the mission that is needed, as specified in the Operational Guidelines, to deal with this issue in a correct way.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Estonia, you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Thank you. Estonia supports the original Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. On peut complètement suivre les explications données par l'Organe consultatif qui sont reliées aux questions de *minor et major modifications* et nous soutenons le projet de Décision original ».

The Chairperson:

“Ethiopia, you have the floor.”

Ethiopia:

“Thank you, Chair. I heard that guidelines do not limit the acceptance of the boundary. So, I believe we support the amendment by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you, Chair. Sweden also supports the original Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, do you have anything to add?”

Brazil:

“I would like to address a question to the State Party. Is there really mining on the site? [chair interrupting, Brazil continues] Because the focus of the discussion is over, whether there is or not. So, I think the State Parties should know from the State Party what is really happening because there are different opinions on that. Mr. Chairman, I do request respectfully, if the State Party can express its views about this question. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Brazil. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was about to raise a point of order and I would like to back you in the conduct of the proceedings. I recall there are two issues before us. And it is with reluctance that we feel that we have to speak on this. There is the issue with mining which has been outlined very clearly. There is the issue of following the Operational Guidelines, and the way the Committee has agreed to internal procedures. There are two issues. I think both lead to the same conclusion and in our view to the conclusion that has been proposed originally and is proposed on the screen in front of us. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I can just assist the delegate of Brazil in response to the question. If you have the IUCN evaluation report in front you, please turn to page 120 and it shows a map...”

Brazil *[interrupting the speaker]*.

“I am sorry Sir. I did not ask IUCN, I asked the State Party...”

The Chairperson *[interrupting Brazil]*.

“I am sorry Brazil, but I do not have the right to give the floor to the State Party.”

Brazil *[interrupting The Chairperson]*.

“I am sorry Sir, but I read the report of IUCN and it is needless to repeat that report.”

The Chairperson *[interrupting Brazil]*.

“Thank you. I give the floor to France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je sais que nous sommes passés déjà à l'examen du projet de Décision et je le reconnais bien sûr, mais nous n'avons pas eu de discussions au préalable. Je crois qu'il ressort des débats qu'en effet il nous faut obtenir des précisions sur cette question de l'aspect de l'activité minière, c'est très important. Comme nous n'avons pas eu de discussions avant l'examen du projet de Décision, est-ce que nous pourrions donner la parole sur ce point très précis à l'État Partie à ce stade de la discussion, puisque nous n'avons pas eu d'échanges auparavant ».

The Chairperson:

“State Party, you have one minute to bring clarifications regarding the question raised by Brazil.”

China:

“Thank you, Chair. Just to clarify regarding the mining issue: Firstly, the mining is very localised. It is only on the Hongshan Sub-Unit part, only about 13 percent of that area. Secondly, the mining problem is an historical issue and goes back hundreds of years. Thirdly, this area was included in the World Heritage site by negligence; the IUCN report has made it clear that at the time they had no time to visit all areas. So, now is the time to take it out so we can promote the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you China. The floor is to Nigeria.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to support Brazil, who asked for clarification, and now that we have heard this clarification we are satisfied.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“Thank you. We back the request from France to give the floor to the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The State Party replied to the question from Brazil. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision...^[Brazil interrupts The Chairperson] Brazil has a point of order.”

Brazil:

“If you give the floor to IUCN now, we are in the process of the Decision, so you will reopen the debate if the floor is given to IUCN and all members here are allowed to express their views. I ask you kindly to track back to your previous conduct of the debate.”

The Chairperson:

“I would like to go further with the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.44, paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 remains unchanged. Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraph 1? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 2, I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 2 would read:

2. Approves the minor modifications within the areas referred to as the Gaoligongshan, Baima-Meili Snow Mountains, Laowo Mountain, Yunling Mountain, Laojun Mountain, Qianhu Mountain, Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain, component parts of the Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas, China.

And I apologise to the State Party for the mispronunciation of all the mountain names.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Sweden wants a secret ballot for paragraph 2. Thank you Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. Is it supported? Estonia you have the floor.”

Estonia:

“Estonia supports Sweden’s proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are going for the voting on paragraph 2, knowing that the adoption of paragraph 3 is more or less dependent on the adoption of paragraph 2.

I give the floor to the legal advisor for clarification on the majority required. Barbados before would like to take the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I do not want to delay things unnecessarily, but I want to understand from the legal advisor whether it is possible to disrupt the process of

adopting a decision. We made a start, we adopted paragraph 1. Is it possible to adopt in the middle for this kind of intervention? Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Legal advisor, you have the floor.”

Legal advisor:

“Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding from the rapporteur that there was an amendment that has been presented. The amendment proposes a modification to paragraph 2. You have the amendment you will vote on. There is no consensus on paragraph 2, it has to be voted on and because it concerns the substance of the *Convention* it needs to have a two-thirds majority. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados?”

Barbados:

“My question was solely related to the process we undertake for this Decision. We started the adoption without a secret ballot and you are saying, and I want to be very clear: can you simply stop that process and adopt another process in the midst of the decision?”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the legal advisor. First a point of order from Brazil.”

Brazil:

“I think it is very clear, what my colleague of Barbados is asking. You established that we were adopting the text, so in the middle of the adoption there is a request for a vote. We want to know from the legal advisor if we can interrupt the adoption of a resolution, of a decision on this matter by asking for a vote. It is very clear and I did not have a clear answer from the legal advisor. What he answered is not the question that we raised, if I understood rightly.”

The Chairperson:

“Legal advisor you have the floor.”

Legal advisor:

“You have proposed to the Committee to proceed paragraph by paragraph. The first paragraph was put forward to the Committee for your approval. You are proceeding in a manner for which each paragraph is decided on separately so the procedure of voting can be applied to each paragraph separately. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think it is now clear for Barbados and Brazil. The floor is now to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Keeping in mind that we decide on the amendment to part of paragraph 2 and not on the entire paragraph, we formulated the text of your voting paper to be focused on the amendment to the paragraph and the amendment is the insertion of Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain as part of the approved minor boundaries for modification. Your voting paper will ask you if you: *approve the minor boundary modification to the Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. China, you do not have the right to ask for the floor.”

Brazil:

“Could you clarify please? Why do you not give the floor to China, Sir, and what is the advice of the legal advisor?”

The Chairperson:

“Legal advisor, you have the floor.”

Legal advisor:

“Mr. Chairman, if China has a point of order on the voting procedure or a question about it, it can obviously take the floor. If it wishes to advocate, to take position, or to talk on the merits of the site that would not be possible.”

The Chairperson:

“Can I give the floor to China?”

Legal advisor:

“If the questions concern anything other than advocating the site you may give it to China.”

The Chairperson

“China, does your question concern the site? No, so you have the floor.”

China:

“May I ask to clarify the situation? I think the basis of voting is not correct because in the Operational Guidelines we are acting according to the principles established by the Operational Guidelines. In it, it never mentions that the requirement of a modification of boundaries in a series nomination, inscription or a heritage site should be calculated piece by piece. It should be taken in its totality, in its wholeness. We should act according to the principles established in the Guidelines, which should not deviate from our working principles. Now, we vote on two...”

The Chairperson ^[interrupting China]:

“I have a point of order from Australia. Thank you.”

China ^[continuing]:

“Which is not correct...”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chairman, I do this with great reluctance, but I think we have agreed to a voting process. The secret vote has been called for by two parties in front of us. I think we have to proceed to that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. Legal advisor, do you have anything to add? No. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“I think the legal advisor did not answer the question raised by the distinguished delegate of China. I mean, from the legal point of view, even the substance of what we are discussing: can it be submitted to a vote, yes or no? I would like to know which article in the Operational Guidelines clearly indicates this.”

The Chairperson ^[interrupting Brazil]:

“Legal advisor, can you reply to the question raised by Australia and it depends if you are going to reply to the questions raised by China and Brazil.”

Legal advisor:

“Mr. Chairman, the Committee has heard the different points of view from the Advisory Bodies, and from various member States. The procedure has moved to a vote. States can ask questions for clarification about the voting procedure, but nothing else. That is the situation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think it is now clear to all members of the Committee, so we are proceeding to the voting process. I give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“The legal advisor did not answer my question. He keeps repeating the same thing. I heard it three times. So, I will kindly ask through you, respectfully Mr. Chairman, if he can answer my question, as he does not answer it and even the question raised by the Delegation of China has not been answered by him. He keeps repeating the same thing and not listening. Thank you Sir.”

Rapporteur:

“Perhaps, I can clarify Mr. Chairperson?”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur please.”

Rapporteur:

“I think the question raised by China was legitimate ^[applauds from the floor], as there is a misunderstanding on the text that was read out. The reason why we only included Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain on the voting paper was that otherwise the text would have got very long. The fact is that the amendment and the original paragraph on all other mountains are identical.

So, both amendments are the same and no decision needs to be taken on the other mountains which are approved in the original text and in the amendment. The only difference is the Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain and the assumption is, I repeat, is that if you approve Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain you also approve all the other mountains that were recommended to be approved by IUCN, but we have not printed all the names on the voting paper. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think it is clear now, so we can start the voting process. Suggestions for two tellers? Mexico, you would like to come as a teller? Thank you, and Bahrain also. These will be our tellers. I am going to ask the rapporteur to repeat the statement again.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. We want to be very clear so that every Committee member understands. Your voting paper says: *Do you approve the minor modification of Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain?* We have only listed these two mountains because they are the only difference between the original text and the amendment. If you approve *Haba Snow Mountain and Hongshan Mountain*, you will approve at the same time the minor modifications of the area of: Gaoligongshan, Baima-Meili Snow Mountains, Laowo Mountain, Yunling Mountain, Laojun Mountain and Qianhu Mountain as component parts of the Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan protected area, China. We have listed only these two mountains because they were different. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We are starting the voting process: Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Egypt, Estonia, Egypt is first then Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates: the voting is complete.

Number of valid votes 21, majority required 14, Committee members voting “yes” 14, voting “no” 7, so the amendment is agreed, thank you. I think that **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.44** as amended by Brazil is adopted. No objections? Congratulations to the State Party.

I now give the floor to IUCN for the next site.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. It is the **Messel Pit Fossil Site (Germany)**. The review is on page 123 of the English and 129 of the French. You appealed to me to be brief in your last comment on my presentation, and I can be. This is a very simple amendment to adopt with the addition of a buffer zone. It does nothing but good to improve the conservation of this property and we recommend it for approval. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you IUCN. I suggest going directly to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.45. Are there any objections regarding that? I see none. No requests of amendments? No, so the **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.45** concerning the modification of site boundary is adopted, thank you.

We are moving to the next site. The floor is to ICOMOS and IUCN.”

MIXED PROPERTIES

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. This is a mixed property, **Tasmanian Wilderness in Australia**. I will just speak briefly followed by ICOMOS. For IUCN this is also a relatively straightforward proposal of minor modification. You will find it on page 161 of the English and 167 of the French versions. This is a modification which has been previously requested by the Committee following the last reactive monitoring mission to this property, which was a joint IUCN-ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre monitoring mission.

The State Party has responded to all the recommendations bar one, which will be a future extension of the Melaleuca-Cox Bight element of this property. We noticed that the last point in the Draft Decision is a history of state of conservation issues being dealt with for the Tasmanian wilderness related to the boundary effects of adjoining forestry areas, so we simply recall those decisions in relation to the adoption of this very boundary. So that essentially the same principles apply from previous decisions to the property as it amended. Otherwise it is a simple matter for us to recognise that this boundary matter is approved. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Chair. ICOMOS also recommends the proposed boundary modifications. We have two recommendations. The first recommendation: We consider the State Party to consider further minor modifications which might allow the inclusion of appropriate cultural sites relating and complementing those within the property. We also request the State Party to consider augmenting this site with cultural heritage specialists to reflect the mixed nature of this property for the sites of cultural values within the property and immediately outside its boundaries. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“As the Advisory Bodies recommend to approve the modifications: Are there any objections regarding the approval examining and adopting of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.46**? No amendments so it is adopted. Thank you.

Now, we are moving to cultural properties. The floor is to ICOMOS.”

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. The next property is the **Amphitheatre of El Jem in Tunisia**. ICOMOS recommends that the proposed buffer zone for the property be approved.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you ICOMOS. Are there any objections regarding the approval examining and adopting **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.47**? No, so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next site is **Medina of Kairouan in Tunisia**, where was also proposed a minor modification for the boundaries and a proposed buffer zone. Both of these we recommend for approval.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.48**, minor modifications in Kairouan, Tunisia? No so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next site is **the Medina of Sousse, also in Tunisia**. This is a proposal for a new buffer zone and ICOMOS recommends it should be approved.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.49**, Medina of Sousse, Tunisia? No so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next site is the **Medina of Tunis in Tunisia**. There are two proposals. One is a minor modification of the boundary and the second one is the proposed buffer zone. Both of these we recommend for approval.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.50**, Medina of Tunis, Tunisia? No, so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next site is the **Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis in Tunisia**. This is a proposal for a buffer zone. In this instance, ICOMOS recommends it should be referred back to the State Party in order to provide clear delineation of the proposed buffer zone. The plans provided at the moment are unfortunately inadequate to clearly delineate the plots included in the proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.51?** No so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next site is the **Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens in Australia**. This was suggested at the time by the IUCN evaluation. The State Party has established the buffer zone as well as a strategy plan and ICOMOS recommends that the proposed buffer zone is to be approved. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.52?**
No, so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“**Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape, Japan.** This is a proposal which has been accepted by ICOMOS. So ICOMOS recommends that this extension of the property be approved. ICOMOS has also received a letter of factual errors regarding the ownership status of the properties and ICOMOS acknowledges these errors. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.53?**
No, so it is adopted. Thank you. Next site?”

ICOMOS:

“Next one is **Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha, Nepal.** This is a request for a minor modification of the property and a new buffer zone. ICOMOS does not recommend this minor modification should be approved as minor and considers that it is in fact a major modification. Chair, I seek guidance to the fact that you would like me to explain in more details? Yes, thank you.

The site in question is the famous garden of Lumbini where Lord Buddha was born in 623 BC. The site is now a Buddhist pilgrimage centre where the archaeological remains are associated with the birth of Lord Buddha and form the central feature. The boundary of the World Heritage property enclosed an area around a pool where the mother of Buddha is supposed to have bathed; excavated remains commemorating the birth place and thirdly the Ashoka Pillar also are enclosed in the boundaries. Currently there is a buffer zone surrounding those areas which covers many monasteries and memorial shrines and excavated remains relating to facilities for pilgrims from the 3rd century BC to the 15th century AD. The buffer zone also includes the mound and the ancient Lumbini village to the southwest, as well as archaeological remains and other buildings. Beyond the present boundaries is an area defined as the Sacred Garden, providing an appropriate environment for one of the world's most holy places.

What the State Party is proposing is that the current buffer zone should be incorporated within the property and a new buffer zone should be created beyond the current one to include the area of the Sacred Garden. This proposed modification would increase the area almost thirteen times to around 25 hectares from the very small area it currently covers.

No specific details have been provided for the protection and management of the proposed area or for the proposed buffer zone. Also, ICOMOS supports in principle the creation of this larger property and the buffer zone. We do consider that more details are needed for the area being suggested in terms of descriptions, plans, photographs and detailed maps. We also consider that a mission is needed to visit the property to understand more clearly the rationale for the boundary and the adequacy of the management and protection arrangement.

The request from the State Party refers to the development of a Management Plan, and it would clearly be desirable if this plan was completed and implemented before the boundary was enlarged. Taking all these factors into consideration, ICOMOS considers that

this request cannot be considered as a minor modification and suggests reformulating it with the extra material suggested and resubmitting it with a major modification.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.54**? I see none. State Party, you will have the floor after adoption of the Draft Decision. Thank you. It is adopted. State Party, if you want to have the floor it is yours.”

Nepal:

“Thank you, Chair. I also thank ICOMOS for its hard-working evaluation. The State Party submitted the report on 1 February 2010 and from what ICOMOS has stated minor modifications, is that the modification of the boundary and of the buffer zone was proposed based on a discussion with international experts within the integrated management plan, as discussed and recommended by the experts and participants of UNESCO and the Heritage Mission in Lumbini in September 2008, with regard to the Lumbini development.

We called it minor modification as it is for the extension of the buffer zone and of the boundary without touching the Outstanding Universal Value of the heritage. Also, the Operational Guidelines do not state nor indicate any size for the minor and major modification. The extension of the proposed boundary and buffer zone enhances the value of the universal heritage by securing more protection from natural calamities and human encroachment.

With regard to the proposed map and accurate measurements taken by the experts back in 1978 and approved by UNESCO and the UN Committee on the development of Lumbini in the 1980s: The plan may not be considered as semantic and to provide accurate measurement of the proposed extension scheme. Our State Party feels that the minor and major should not be considered based on the land and its fence, as the core area is not touched. We have not touched the house but the fence is extended to protect from other natural calamity as well as human encroachment, so we feel it is a minor modification.

With regard to the management of this cultural heritage, it is the responsibility of the Lumbini Development Trust and Archaeological Department. In the statement by ICOMOS, there is a small mistake: After the change of political line of Nepal, now it is under the patronage of the Prime Minister, not under Royal patronage. We feel that, since the core value of the heritage is not touched and will live, ^[The Chairperson interrupts the speaker to ask him to conclude] so the extent of the boundary should not be considered as measurements. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next site.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Chair. The Remains of the Neolithic settlements of **Choirokoitia in Cyprus** were inscribed in 1998. At the time, the property comprised part of the settlement that was excavated in 1977 until 1998. After recent excavations, the State Party has proposed minor modification of the boundary to include these areas. This new evidence enriches the knowledge of this complex Neolithic society. However, ICOMOS considers that the new excavated area should be inscribed on the World Heritage List, but considers it is likely that the entire peninsula where the settlements was based and where are the new

excavations and the previous ones which revealed these traces is likely to confirm to having a larger area that is comprised within these settlements.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the proposed modification should be referred back to the State Party, in order to allow it to consider whether the boundary of the World Heritage property could be extended to further enclose all the State owned land of the peninsula, as it is likely to reveal further evidence of this settlement. To confirm as well that the controlled zone is the buffer zone according to the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention, and to consider also to enlarge the buffer zone to north, south and east of the peninsula in order to ensure better protection of this modification and of the site itself. Thank you.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.55**? I see none. It is adopted. Next site.”

ICOMOS:

“The next one is the **Abbey Alten Munster in Lorsch, Germany**. The proposal concerns the buffer zone surrounding the two parts of the World Heritage property. ICOMOS has considered this and believes that what has been suggested gives adequate protection for the archaeological remains around the Abbey. However, we do also consider that the buffer zone should give protection to the views and approaches to the property. Accordingly, we are recommending that this proposal be referred back to the State Party in order for it to be allowed if the buffer zone can be extended to the west and the north of the property, in which case the buffer zone could coincide with existing protected areas. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.56**? I see none. It is adopted. Germany, the State Party, you have the floor.”

Germany:

“Thank you very much. We thank ICOMOS for its advice and will consider this. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, next site please?”

ICOMOS:

“**Würzburg Residence with the Court Gardens and Residence Square, Germany**. This is a proposal for the nomination of a buffer zone for the inscribed property. ICOMOS considers that protection and management requirements have been satisfied and therefore propose that the proposed buffer zone is approved. However, ICOMOS is concerned about the size of the parking lot in front of the square itself and recommends that the State Party

considers reducing considerably the parking lot to improve the visual integrity of the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You ICOMOS. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.57**? I see none, it is adopted, Next site.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, chair. The next one is for the **Residences of the Royal houses of Savoy in Italy**. This is a proposal for minor extension of the property and an extension to a buffer zone of the same element of this nomination; the creation of individual buffer zones for four other residencies in the property and finally for the extension of the buffer zone for four residencies in the property.

ICOMOS recommends that the extension of the buffer zone should be approved. However, we would like to also recommend that the State Party considers, whenever possible, that future extensions to the buffer zone could be considered in terms of the visual and historical connections between the residencies which make up the inscribed property on what is called the command Centre in Turin, from which all these residencies radiate. We would like to see some recognition of the sort of actual relationships of views and vistas between the residencies and what is called the Command Centre, and this was something which was identified at the time of inscription. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You ICOMOS. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.58**? I see none, it is adopted, Next site.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. This is a proposal for the establishment of a buffer zone in the **Historic centre of Krakow in Poland**. The protection and management requirements have been satisfied and therefore ICOMOS recommends that proposed buffer zone to the inscribed property is to be approved. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.59**? I see none, it is adopted, Next site.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you. It is the **Old of Avila and its Extra-Muros churches in Spain**. At the 33rd meeting of the Committee, the Committee referred a proposed buffer zone for this property backed by the State Party in order to allow it to finalise the Management Plan. In February, the State Party finalised a document outlining a concept Management Plan and giving some details of progress towards its implementation. ICOMOS notes these progresses and recommends that the proposed buffer zone be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to finalise the Management Plan. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You ICOMOS. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.60**, site in Spain? I see none, it is adopted. Last site to be reviewed.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. This is for the **Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain)**. This is a proposal for a proposed buffer zone for this site. ICOMOS considers this should be approved. We note that the City Council has agreed to undertake the remaining catalogue of properties for sectors within the buffer zone. We urge that this is undertaken as soon as possible. We note that development outside the buffer zone in the wider setting will be subjected to impact assessment on the inscribed property under the 2011 Historical Heritage Act and we urge the State Party to ensure that these are implied rigorously. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You ICOMOS. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8B.61**, the modification regarding Seville in Spain? I see none, it is adopted.

I give the floor to the rapporteur for additional information.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. We have to keep the Ad.8B open because you are still supposed to adapt the statement of Outstanding Universal Value of some of the nominations. However, after reviewing some of the information we received on the five cases where the Advisory Bodies initially proposed a deferral, and that would be inscribed at the wish of the Committee, we would like to make a suggestion to you.

It would be that the Outstanding Universal Value statements we adopt this session on the basis of a submission by the State Party could be considered provisional statements of Outstanding Universal Value and we would take the opportunity to have the Secretariat review them in terms of consistency with the nomination file received, and then during the session in the upcoming year we would confirm them, with eventually the small modification to the final statement of Outstanding Universal Value. This is the suggestion from the Secretariat as apparently some of them are still incomplete or in slight inconsistency. Thank you.”

ITEM8D: CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY

Document: WHC-10/34COM/8D

Decision: 34 COM 8D

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Moving to the next item on our agenda, 8D; clarification of Property sizes and boundaries by State Parties in response to the retrospective inventory. You can refer to

document WHC-10/34.COM/8D. I would like to invite Ms. Anne Lemaistre to present this item. Please, you have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Ce document présente 24 clarifications de limites reçues par douze États parties dans la période entre avril 2009 et mars 2010 en réponse à l'inventaire rétrospectif. Le Comité est invité à prendre note de ces clarifications. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci Anne. Any members of the Committee would like to take the floor to make a comment? No, ok so let's move to Draft Decision 34 COM 8D and I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 8D is on page 3 of both the English and French versions of document 8D and I have received an amendment to the current paragraph 6. The amendment was submitted by Egypt and I will read in the French language, as it was originally submitted:

Demande aux Etats parties européens et arabes n'ayant pas encore répondu aux questions.. I am sorry I cannot decipher the hand writing, I will just ask my typist behind me to give me a printed version of the amendment. I apologise. Sorry for the delay. I have received the amendment in English language, so I read it in English to make it easier:

*Requests the European and Arab States Parties, which have not yet answered the questions raised in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, to provide all requested clarifications and documentation as soon as possible and by **1 December 2011** at the latest.”*

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Rapporteur, you have the floor again.”

Rapporteur:

“I apologise, but I received the original version and the amendment is a change of the date to *1 April 2011* and no longer *1 December 2011*, according to the amendment of Egypt. So, the last part of the sentence reads in the French language, as it was submitted:

*de bien vouloir fournir toutes les clarifications ainsi que la documentation demandée le plus rapidement possible et au plus tard le **1^{er} avril 2011** ».*

The Chairperson:

“Secretariat, would you like to comment?”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je comprends ce souci d'amendement, néanmoins pour une plus grande clarté en ce qui concerne les dates butoirs nous aimerions toujours rester aux mêmes dates butoirs qui, pour les clarifications de limites sont décembre et de manière à ce que le 1er février soit une autre date butoir pour les rapports d'inscription et d'état de conservation. Nous aimerions donc éviter, dans la mesure du possible, de créer de nouvelles dates et de les insérer dans ce calendrier pour plus de clarté. Je vous remercie, j'espère que ceci est acceptable par l'Égypte ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Cambodia you have the floor."

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le Cambodge soutient la proposition de l'Égypte. Reporter la date de soumission du 1er décembre 2010 au 1er avril 2011 ne constitue pas un grand délai. Les quelques mois vont permettre à certains États du groupe arabe de compléter leur documentation et de soumettre dans les meilleures conditions le rapport requis ».

The Chairperson:

"*Merci au Cambodge.* Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8D** as amended by Egypt and supported by Cambodia? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

8E: ADOPTION OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/8E, 8E ADD et ADD.2

Decision: 34 COM 8E

Next item on our agenda is the point 8E review and approval of retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value. I invite you to refer to document WHC-10/34.COM/8E and 8E.ADD. Secretariat, you have the floor."

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme vous le savez, à la suite du premier cycle de rapport périodique et au second cycle de l'exercice de soumission de rapport périodique dans les régions Arabe et Afrique, de nombreux États parties ont rédigé des déclarations rétrospectives de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle pour tous les biens du patrimoine mondial situés sur leur territoire.

Vous avez sous les yeux 81 projets de déclarations rétrospectives qui sont présentés au Comité du patrimoine mondial pour adoption et qui figurent dans les annexes de trois documents. Donc, les annexes du document 8E, du document 8E.ad et du document 8E.ad2. Le Secrétariat s'excuse d'avoir sorti ce dernier document à la dernière minute, mais

vous comprendrez bien que comme ce sont des déclarations de valeur rétrospectives, nous ne voulions pas faire patienter les États parties concernés une année supplémentaire, si bien que nous avons diligemment la sortie de ce document.

Ces textes proposés par les États Parties ont donc été révisés par les Organisations consultatives et approuvés par les États parties concernés. Le Secrétariat et les Organisations consultatives souhaitent à ce stade féliciter chaleureusement tous les États parties pour les efforts investis dans le cadre de ces déclarations de valeur exceptionnelle rétrospectives du rapport périodique.

Le Secrétariat et les Organisations consultatives souhaitent informer le Comité que la charge de travail qu'occasionne la revue de ces déclarations de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle dépasse les capacités actuelles des Organisations consultatives ainsi que celles du Secrétariat et comme je l'ai dit précédemment, ce n'est pas une question d'argent mais de temps, en raison du volume impressionnant des textes à réviser puis à traduire.

Aussi, le Secrétariat serait reconnaissant que, comme il est mentionné dans le projet de Décision, l'ordre de priorité de revue de ces déclarations rétrospectives suive l'ordre de priorité du deuxième cycle de rapport périodique, à savoir la région Arabe, l'Afrique, l'Asie Pacifique, l'Amérique Latine, l'Europe et l'Amérique du Nord. Nous remercions les États parties de leur compréhension. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président."

The Chairperson:

"*Merci au Secrétariat.* I now would like to invite Committee members for the examination and adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM.8E. I give the floor to our rapporteur in case she may have received an amendment."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. I have not received any written amendments to the two Draft Decisions. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Any objections to the adoption of Draft Decision 8E? France you have the floor."

France:

« Ce n'est pas une objection Monsieur le Président. Je voulais savoir simplement combien il y avait de documents, s'il y en a deux ou trois ? »

The Chairperson:

"Secretariat, please, you have the floor."

The Secretariat:

"Merci. Il y en a trois. Le 8E, le 8E.ad et le 8E.ad2 qui a été imprimé ici à Brasília. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. »

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Y a-t-il des objections pour l'adoption des projets du **Projet de Décision 34 COM 8E**? Non, ils sont adoptés.

Conclusion of proceedings for the morning session of 02 August, 2010

Monday, 2 August 2010

NINETEENTH SESSION

Afternoon session

**Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira and
H.E. Mrs Eleonora Mitrofanova (Vice-Chairperson)**

ITEM 10: PERIODIC REPORTS

10A: Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States

Document: WHC-10/34COM/10A

Decision: 34 COM 10A

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon. We have reached the quorum, so we can start. Before the power cut I was on item 10A, Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States. I would like to invite Ms. Veronique Dauge from the World Heritage Centre to introduce this item. You have the floor.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme vous le savez, le deuxième cycle du rapport périodique pour les États arabes a été lancé par le Comité à sa 32^e session en 2008. Il concernait 18 États parties et 64 biens. Depuis cette date, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a mis en œuvre le plan de travail qui vous a été présenté à ce moment-là. Les points focaux nationaux de 17 pays et les gestionnaires de 59 sites ont participé à l'exercice. Ils ont été soutenus dans ce travail par quatre mentors, les Organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Deux réunions régionales et trois réunions sous régionales se sont tenues à Manama, Amman, Doha, Mekhnès et Alger entre décembre 2008 et février 2010. Je saisis cette occasion pour remercier les autorités du Bahreïn, qui ont entièrement pris en charge cette première réunion, les autorités algériennes qui nous ont accueillis à Alger pour la réunion de clôture et la Commission nationale des Pays-Bas pour son soutien financier.

Durant ces réunions, outre le travail d'information et d'explication relatif aux deux sections du questionnaire, la rédaction des déclarations rétrospectives de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle a également été engagée. Beaucoup des États parties ont soumis les réponses aux questionnaires à la date prévue, c'est-à-dire le 31 juillet 2009. D'autres ont suivi ainsi que les déclarations de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle que vous avez déjà eu l'occasion de voir dans le document 8E. Enfin, le Secrétariat, en coordination avec les Organisations consultatives, a commencé le dépouillement des résultats des questionnaires qui ont été présentés aux points focaux nationaux lors de la réunion d'Alger en février 2010.

Le document 10A, que vous avez devant vous, présente une synthèse et une analyse des documents communiqués par les États arabes sur la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*, c'est-à-dire la section 1 et sur les biens du patrimoine mondial dans leurs pays, c'est-à-dire la section 2. Le document inclut aussi les plans d'action sous régionaux qui ont

été formulés par les points focaux durant cette réunion, qui serviront de plateforme pour l'élaboration d'un programme régional pour les années à venir.

Monsieur le Président, considérant que cet exercice des rapports périodiques est avant tout le fait des États parties eux-mêmes et que les informations contenues dans le document sont le fruit de leur travail, j'ai le plaisir, si vous me le permettez, de passer la parole au point focal du Maroc M. Ahmed Skounti qui est mieux à même que moi de vous présenter les résultats de ces dix-huit mois de travail intensif ».

The Chairperson:

« Monsieur Skounti, vous avez la parole ».

Skounti:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président, merci beaucoup Véronique. Cette présentation comprendra deux sections. La première a trait à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial dans la région et la seconde présente une synthèse des réponses qui ont été apportées à la section 2 par les conservateurs des sites.

Les 18 États parties de la région arabe représentent 9,7 % du total des États parties à la *Convention*, par contre les 65 biens que comptent les États arabes ne représentent que 7,3 % du total des biens du patrimoine mondial. S'agissant des inventaires, deux États parties indiquent qu'il n'y a pas d'inventaire. De manière générale les inventaires sont le fait des organismes gouvernementaux. Les inventaires régionaux ou locaux sont peu utilisés. On observe en effet que dans plusieurs États parties de la région arabe les inventaires du patrimoine sont uniquement préparés à l'échelon national. Les inventaires sont fréquemment utilisés par sept États parties sur quatorze pour protéger le patrimoine culturel identifié. L'usage fréquent des inventaires est signalé par huit États parties pour protéger le patrimoine culturel identifié.

En ce qui concerne l'implication dans la préparation des listes indicatives, les États parties assument en général la responsabilité principale dans la préparation de ces listes. Les entités les plus engagées dans la préparation des listes indicatives sont les administrations gouvernementales, les consultants et les gestionnaires de site.

Quelques données sur les sites du patrimoine mondial dans les États arabes. ^[diapo] Les 59 biens pour lesquels ont été reçus des rapports sont classés ci-dessous de la manière suivante. Vous avez le patrimoine naturel, qui est évidemment largement sous représenté avec seulement 7 %, comme l'a souligné le Comité. Les sites archéologiques et les villes historiques sont par contre mieux représentés avec respectivement 49 % et 27 %. Enfin, une quatrième catégorie qui comprend 17 % avec l'architecture de terre, les sites mixtes, etc. Il y a un léger déséquilibre en faveur de la sous-région du Golfe qui comprend seulement 10 biens sur 59 et le Moyen-Orient et le Maghreb sont à peu près à égalité avec 24 et 25 sites inscrits.

S'agissant de l'implication dans la préparation des propositions d'inscriptions, comme pour les listes indicatives, les administrations gouvernementales, les consultants et les gestionnaires de site sont les premiers impliqués. S'y ajoutent les autorités locales dont relève la responsabilité des biens proposés. En ce qui concerne les effets de l'inscription, globalement les États parties sont unanimes à considérer que l'inscription a des effets positifs sur les sites quant à leur conservation, leur protection, leur image et leur attrait pour le tourisme.

En ce qui concerne la protection juridique des sites : 71 % des États parties pensent que la mise en œuvre du cadre légal pourrait être renforcée pour mieux protéger les sites et 79 % des États parties jugent le cadre légal existant adéquat pour protéger le patrimoine mondial.

S'agissant de la coopération des principales agences impliquées : 50 % des États estiment qu'il existe quelques coopérations entre les diverses agences impliquées dans la gestion des sites et 29 % jugent effective la coopération entre ces agences alors que 21 % la jugent limitée.

En ce qui concerne les questions des ressources financières : les sources de financement viennent principalement des gouvernements nationaux. Ils s'accompagnent parfois de sources secondaires, y compris d'autres échelons gouvernementaux, de fonds multilatéraux au niveau international et du Fonds du patrimoine mondial : 29 % des États disent soutenir la mise en place de fondations et d'associations, pour aider à lever des fonds en faveur de la protection des sites ; 43 % des sites répondent que les politiques d'affectation des ressources générées par les sites sont entreprises à des fins de conservation ; 64 % des États parties estiment que le budget disponible est acceptable.

En ce qui concerne les ressources humaines : deux États parties les disent adéquates, mais des effectifs supplémentaires permettraient une meilleure gestion. Globalement les ressources humaines existent, mais elles sont insuffisantes pour les besoins de la conservation et beaucoup de profils font défaut. Les besoins de formation sont donc très importants et presque dans tous les domaines de la conservation jusqu'à l'éducation, la gestion des visiteurs et la préparation au risque qui sont des besoins pressants.

S'agissant de la coopération internationale, il n'y a pas à proprement parler de coopération entre les États parties. Il existe des programmes et des projets épars de formes latérales ou multilatérales ou avec des organismes internationaux.

En ce qui concerne, l'éducation, la formation et la sensibilisation : la plupart des pays indiquent qu'ils n'ont aucune stratégie de sensibilisation et qu'ils entreprennent des actions sur le mode ad hoc. Par contre, il faut souligner qu'il y a eu prise de conscience progressive dans les États de la nécessité d'informer et de mobiliser les autorités locales et les communautés en matière de gestion.

Le soutien apporté à la préparation périodique est globalement positivement jugé par les États parties s'agissant des partenaires internationaux et notamment le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

J'en viens maintenant, Monsieur le Président, à la synthèse de la seconde partie qui concerne notamment les sites du patrimoine mondial. ^[diapo] Nous avons ici une présentation des sites par États parties et des sous-régions. Une prédominance, comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, de sites archéologiques et de cités historiques très claire, les sites naturels, comme je l'ai souligné, sont très minoritaires avec seulement 4 sur 59. Les catégories de sites par régions font ressortir encore plus de déséquilibre.

En ce qui concerne la protection, la gestion et le suivi des biens : 42 biens sur 59, c'est-à-dire 74 %, ont une zone tampon, 11 % n'ont pas de zone tampon et trouvent qu'il n'y en a pas besoin. Neuf biens, c'est-à-dire 16 %, n'ont aucune zone tampon, mais indiquent qu'il en faudrait une.

En ce qui concerne les facteurs qui affectent les biens : ils sont de deux catégories. Pour le patrimoine naturel, les rapports soulignent principalement les structures hydrauliques, la conservation des terres, la sécheresse, la désertification, la collecte de plantes sauvages, l'impact, limité mais en augmentation, du tourisme.

En ce qui concerne le patrimoine culturel, la liste est plus longue : les bâtiments et le développement commercial, la construction d'infrastructures, les déchets solides, le tourisme et les loisirs, la pollution, le changement climatique, la conversion des terres, l'humidité relative, la poussière, les parasites, les variations de température, les inondations, les micro-organismes, l'entraînement militaire, la guerre et le terrorisme.

S'agissant des mesures qui sont prises par les États pour protéger les sites : le cadre juridique est jugé adéquat dans 47 % des sites ; déficient dans sa mise en œuvre dans 43 % et inadéquat dans 10 % des sites. Le cadre juridique de la zone qui entoure le bien du patrimoine mondial et de la zone tampon est considéré comme adéquat dans 47 % des sites. Dans 38 %, des lacunes sont relevées dans la mise en œuvre, dans six cas, le cadre juridique est jugé inadéquat. Il y a un mouvement général, et il faut le souligner, des autorités et des professionnels qui s'occupent du patrimoine mondial pour mettre à jour le cadre juridique et améliorer sa mise en œuvre.

En ce qui concerne le plan de gestion : la coordination entre les institutions chargées de la gestion du bien pourrait s'améliorer dans 69 % des sites. Le plan de gestion est jugé adéquat ou partiellement adéquat dans 74 % des sites. Le plan de gestion est mis en œuvre seulement dans 25 % des 59 sites examinés. La mise en œuvre est en cours ou partielle dans 53 %, les autres ne disposant pas d'un tel document.

S'agissant des partenaires de la protection, de la gestion et du suivi des biens : la gestion repose sur la coopération avec les chercheurs, les autorités municipales, les habitants et les visiteurs essentiellement. L'industrie, les populations autochtones, et le tourisme sont moins présents. Les États parties répondent que les communautés locales sont globalement associées à la gestion des sites sauf là où elles n'existent pas.

En ce qui concerne les ressources financières : elles sont allouées à la gestion et la protection du patrimoine mondial dans les États arabes et proviennent essentiellement de l'État. Au deuxième niveau, il y a les administrations régionales, les fonds multilatéraux et les donations internationales comme il a été souligné pour la première section. ^[diapo] Nous avons ici un exemple de la part des financements des gouvernements, celui des pays du Golfe.

En ce qui concerne la connaissance de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle des sites : 24 biens sur 58, c'est-à-dire 41 %, indiquent qu'il y a une connaissance suffisante des valeurs. 47 % relèvent certaines lacunes ; six biens relèvent des connaissances insuffisantes et un seul bien peu ou pas de connaissances. Il existe une information suffisante sur les indicateurs clés de la conservation dans seulement 16 % des sites et dans la majorité, 55 %, elle demande à être améliorée.

En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial : selon les catégories de sites, entre 53 et 80 % répondent que les décisions du Comité sont en cours de mise en œuvre.

En conclusion Monsieur le Président, nous pouvons dire, à partir de ce résultat, que 70 % des biens ont jugé leur authenticité préservée, 81 % jugent leur intégrité intacte, 81 % des biens conservent leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle et 37 conservateurs de biens, c'est-à-dire 65 %, ont jugé meilleure leur connaissance de la Convention du patrimoine mondial après cet exercice. Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

«Merci. Madame Dauge vous avez la parole ».

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président et Monsieur Skounti. Comme je le disais au début de cette présentation, la réunion de clôture avec les points focaux a permis de revoir et d'ajuster les résultats de l'exercice, d'identifier des identités communes entre les pays de la région et d'esquisser les grandes lignes des plans d'action sous-régionaux, reflétant les spécificités et les besoins de chaque sous-région. Vous les avez en annexe du document 10A. Je vais simplement souligner certains traits saillants de nos discussions pendant nos réunions et des recommandations émises.

Dans l'ensemble, ainsi que l'a souligné Monsieur Skounti, les participants ont apprécié l'exercice et l'ont trouvé utile même si certaines questions ont parfois été trouvées assez difficiles. Ils souhaitent poursuivre la coopération engagée, en particulier renforcer le réseau de professionnels dans la région qui a été établi pendant l'exercice.

Les principaux problèmes soulignés pendant la réunion ont été : la pénurie de ressources humaines et financières, le manque d'implication des communautés, certaines lacunes dans la gestion des biens et le déséquilibre entre patrimoines naturel et culturel. Cependant, nombre de réussites et de progrès depuis le premier cycle ont également été soulignés.

Pour chacun des grands chapitres de la section 1, les participants se sont divisés en groupes de travail sous-régionaux et ont suggéré un certain nombre d'activités et d'actions à entreprendre. Ces activités sont détaillées dans les annexes du document. En résumé, je citerai :

- La révision et l'harmonisation des listes indicatives, la priorité à donner aux propositions d'inscription de sites naturels ;
- La coordination à l'échelon national entre les différents services et à l'échelon régional ;
- La mise à jour des législations nationales afin qu'elles répondent aux législations internationales ;
- La collaboration et l'implication des communautés locales dans tout le processus ;
- Le renforcement de la formation ;
- L'intégration du concept de développement durable dans la gestion des biens ;
- L'élargissement de la coopération internationale ;
- La diffusion de la documentation en arabe et pour cela une coopération avec le Centre régional pour la région arabe qui vient d'être créé à Bahreïn et l'ALECSO.

L'essentiel pour les mois à venir sera de traduire ces plans d'action en un programme régional et d'entamer dès que possible, certaines des activités envisagées. Comme vous pouvez le constater, plutôt qu'une fin en soi, à travers cet exercice, les États parties de la région arabe ont ouvert un nouveau chapitre, celui du renforcement de la mise en œuvre de la convention dans leur pays. Plus proche des cinq objectifs stratégiques et dans un esprit de collaboration interrégionale accru.

Je tiens juste à dire au nom du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des Organisations consultatives que nous sommes là pour les soutenir dans le travail à venir et surtout à les féliciter pour le travail considérable accompli ces derniers mois, leur enthousiasme, et leurs engagements sans défaut ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci Madame Dauge et aussi merci à Monsieur Skounti pour la qualité d'analyse de votre rapport. Je remercie aussi les États arabes qui ont participé au rapport et maintenant je vais inviter les membres du Comité à nous faire part de leurs commentaires et à formuler des questions. La parole est à la Jordanie ».

Jordan:

“Thank you Mr. Chair and thanks for the presentation concerning the second cycle of periodic reporting of the Arab States. Jordan and other Arab representatives are wondering why Jerusalem is not included in the report. We request clarification concerning Jerusalem in this Decision because of its special status and occupation. What is required is periodic reporting to the UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee with this information. We hope that this request is taken seriously. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Jordanie. Le Secrétariat, Madame Dauge, vous avez la parole ».

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Comme vous le savez, cet exercice est assumé par les États qui gèrent directement les sites. Jérusalem, vous le savez tous, est un cas particulier et vous comprendrez bien qu'il n'y avait pas d'État responsable à qui l'on pouvait demander de remplir le questionnaire. Je ne sais pas si cette réponse vous satisfait ».

The Chairperson:

“Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“Excuse-me Sir, but no this does not satisfy Jordan. I am just wondering, even if there is a special status for Jerusalem, why is the periodic reporting not followed in this case. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Secretariat, would you like to answer?”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have taken the comment of the distinguished representative of Jordan into account and we will get back to you subsequently.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Mali vous avez la parole ».

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, et je remercie également l'équipe pour sa brillante prestation. Nous avons eu une analyse du rapport très intéressante. Cette fois-ci j'interviens

en tant que gestionnaire de site et je me rends compte qu'il y a une grande différence entre la représentation des sites naturels dans la région arabe et les sites culturels, les naturels ne représentant que 10 % du total des sites si j'ai bien compris l'exposé.

Je voudrais savoir quelle en est la ou les raisons, car nous sommes ici pour veiller à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*, pour créer une liste équitable, équilibrée. J'aimerais savoir ce qui a été fait pour un peu corriger cet écart entre le naturel et le culturel ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Monsieur Skounti, vous avez la parole ».

Mr. Skounti:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. C'est effectivement une question importante, mais je pense que de par le fonctionnement de la *Convention*, c'est une question qui relève des États parties. Sur les listes indicatives, il y a un certain nombre de sites naturels et effectivement l'on comprend bien que la proposition d'inscription pour les sites naturels est beaucoup plus ardue que pour les sites culturels. J'en sais quelque chose, car nous avons fait l'expérience avec un site qui n'avait pas été inscrit à Vilnius en 2006.

Les exigences sont beaucoup plus importantes, le travail demandé est beaucoup plus important. Je me rappelle, cela nous avait demandé plus de quatre ans pour préparer cette demande d'inscription. C'est une question qui relève des États parties. Effectivement, la stratégie globale pour une Liste représentative équilibrée va dans le sens d'un équilibre entre les sites culturels et naturels, mais il faudrait inciter — et probablement aussi l'inclure dans l'ébauche de plan d'action qui vient d'être énoncé par Véronique — les États à mener, à proposer à l'avenir davantage de sites naturels. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. La Jordanie vous avez la parole ».

Jordan:

"We do realize that there is under-representation of natural properties compared to natural ones, and maybe one of the reasons has been mentioned now by the presenter, but there are also other reasons. We certainly would like to get experience in the Arab countries in preparing files concerning natural properties and we do hope that workshop can be organized with the help of UNESCO to proceed with some of the natural properties.

As you know, in the entire Arabian Peninsula and in Syria, Palestine, Jordan and Lebanon, there is only one listed site, which is Socotra, and Jordan has prepared a file for one other site to be presented next year in Bahrain. But this under-representation is very well taken and we hope that something can be done. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Jordan. I give the floor to Bahrain."

Bahrain:

“Just responding to the issue relating to natural sites compared to cultural sites. One of the thematic and focus themes we are putting for the Arab Regional Centre is to concentrate on the natural aspect and we hope that Arab States will cooperate in that regard. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain. Iraq you have the floor.”

Iraq:

“Thank you very much. We were on the verge of presenting a dossier about the marshland of Mesopotamia, but the lack of support from Turkey and Iran distorted the whole project. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. No more requests for the floor? Let’s then move on to the examination and adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 10A. Rapporteur, do you have any amendments?”

Rapporteur:

“Yes I do Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 10A is on page 68 of the English and 73 of the French version of document 10A. I have one amendment from the Delegation of Jordan, which concerns paragraphs 4 and 6 of the current Draft Decision.

In paragraph 4 the proposal is to delete approximately the first half of the paragraph and replace it by the following text, so that the whole paragraph reads:

4. Notes that some States Parties did not participate in the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting and that two States Parties, while participating in the exercise, did not submit Section I of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire and encourages them to provide this information to complete the database.

In paragraph 6, the amendment proposed is an addition to the end of the paragraph which would then read:

thanks the Bahraini and Algerian authorities for hosting respectively the launch and closure meetings for the Periodic Reporting exercise and The Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO for its financial support and also thanks ALECSO for translating the questionnaire of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not think that there is a need for re-reading the amendment as it was really clear. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 10A** as amended by Jordan? I see none, it is adopted, and thank you Mr. Skounti and bon voyage.

Jordan, you have the floor.”

Jordan:

“We would like also to extend our sincere thanks to the Secretariat. Thank you.”

ITEM 8C: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER

Document: WHC-10/34/COM/8C; WHC-10/34.COM/7B, WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add, WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2 and WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.3, WHC-10/34.COM/8B, WHC-10/34.COM/8B.Add; WHC-10/34.COM/7A, WHC-10/34.COM/7A.Add and WHC-10/34.COM/7A.Add.2

Decision: 34 COM 8C.1, 8C.2 and 8C.3

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Returning to the agenda, we are now starting with item 8C, regarding the update of the World Heritage List and the list of World Heritage in Danger. The floor is to the Secretariat to introduce this item.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. The relevant document has been distributed to you this morning, WHC-10/34/COM/8C. Let me briefly provide you with the customary outline of the Decision taken by the Committee concerning inscription on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Committee at its 34th session inscribed 21 new properties on the World Heritage List. Five were natural, fifteen cultural and one mixed, approved the extension of seven properties already on the list and inscribed under additional cultural criteria one natural property turning it to a mixed property.

Following the debates of item 8B, two properties were referred and six deferred. At this session, in sixteen cases the Committee changed the Advisory Bodies’ recommendation as presented in the Draft Decision. Eight referrals became seven inscriptions and one approved extension. Two referrals became deferrals, five deferrals became inscriptions and one inscription became a deferral. The new overall figures on the list count a total of 911 properties of which 704 are cultural, 180 natural and 27 mixed.

This year the Committee allocated approximately 23 hours of discussion to examine 28 nominations. This resulted in, roughly, an average of 35 minutes for the discussion of each nomination and we would like to bear this in mind when preparing the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

As a result of the decisions related to the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List and the decisions and nominations to the World Heritage List, the Committee decided to inscribe the following properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger: Georgia, Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery decision 34 COM 7B.88, Madagascar, Rainforests of Atsinanana, 34 COM 7B.2, Uganda, Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi, Decision 34 COM 7B.53, United States of America, Everglades National Park, Decision 34 COM 7B.29. At the same time one property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, Equator Galapagos Islands, Decision 34 COM 7A.15.

In accordance with these decisions, there are now 34 properties inscribed on the list of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now invite members of the Committee to adopt Draft Decision 34 COM 8C.1 and 34 COM 8C.2 and 34 COM 8C.3. I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. En fait, j’ai demandé la parole avant que nous entrions en matière, d’abord pour remercier le Secrétariat pour sa présentation. J’aimerais me référer à cette présentation qui vient d’être faite, des statistiques qui nous ont été présentées concernant la Liste du patrimoine mondial et la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elles ont illustré que de nombreuses propositions d’inscription, je crois qu’il y en a eu 16, si j’ai bien compris, sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ont été rejetées et de nombreuses propositions de non inscription ont été différées au cours de cette session. Cela m’interpelle Monsieur le Président.

Cela s’est passé à la suite de longues discussions pilotées par des considérations qui, de l’avis de la Délégation Suisse, ont très peu à faire avec un examen objectif de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle ou du péril dans lequel se trouve un bien ou un site. Les méthodes de travail et les processus de décision ont besoin d’être soumis à un examen approfondi. Il nous paraît indispensable de créer un dialogue plus constructif et une relation de confiance plus solide entre les membres du Comité et les Organisations consultatives qui, comme cela a été souligné à plusieurs reprises par certains membres du Comité, fournissent un travail exceptionnel répondant aux standards exigés par toute expertise de nature scientifique.

La mise en question constante de leurs évaluations et des recommandations ne contribue pas, Monsieur le Président, à la bonne marche de nos travaux et du processus de décision. Il va sans dire que le processus de préparation des dossiers doit être plus participatif, afin qu’il reflète ces dossiers, au mieux les sentiments des membres du Comité, et nous permette d’envisager plus de décisions consensuelles. Nous sommes en train de discuter de manière intense de l’avenir de la *Convention*. Le point crucial, le centre du débat, va tourner autour de la crédibilité de la *Convention*. Monsieur le Président, de l’avis de la Délégation suisse, elle est en danger. Nous devons œuvrer en commun pour y remédier. Je vous remercie, ainsi que les membres du Comité, de votre attention. J’ajoute encore un point, je suis tout à fait d’accord avec le projet de Décision. Merci Monsieur le Président de m’avoir donné la parole ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. La parole est à la Barbade ».

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. I wish to thank our Swiss colleague for bringing this item to our attention. I am in total support of his point of view, with respect to the need to clarify and make better progress in terms of our decision making processes. It seems to me, Chair, that often, when we come to examining sites for potential inscription or other potential statuses, there are times when we do not have sufficient opportunities to engage closely in examining the actual contents and both the excellent work of the Advisory Bodies, but also taking into account the different perspectives which may surround these points.

In particular what I am concerned about is that we do not have opportunities to look, for example, at some of the complex issues around comparative analysis. I am sure one or two cases spring to mind. We also need to take this into account while there is a great deal of expertise, which lies with the Advisory Bodies and their extended partners. We also need to pay close attention to the potential for the State Parties to themselves embody the knowledge and experience necessary about new and emerging forms of heritage which have not been closely examined in previous sessions of this Committee, or have not been presented as potentially having Outstanding Universal Value and therefore deserving of our attention.

It seems to me, that we do need to have some possibilities of engagement on the issue of particular potential area of analysis rather than in relation with a particular site. This I believe would help both the Advisory Bodies to advance their views and also the State Parties to look at the issues first and to determine how far we may advance with the work in terms of nomination. I also may point out that in some instances, we could have a dilemma, because for example the annex that relates to the recommendations on science and technology to me, and I know for others too, are now in doubt on how we may apply them in relation to sites in the future and this I would hope we can seek resolution on before we have other sites before our attention. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We’d certainly like to endorse warmly the sentiment of both speakers that have just spoken. One of the challenges that faces everybody in preparing for this meeting is the volume of documentation. I understand there were some 22,000 pages to prepare for this meeting, with nominations, but that does not include the appendix, additional information and complementary information that come with the nomination. It is an extraordinary volume. Probably, the only people in this process that come across them are the Advisory Bodies. That is a feat for which we should be very thankful and grateful to them for.

This obviously does highlight the challenge which they and we face. Our approach as the Australian Delegation is, when we see something that is not working, to try and find ways to improve it. Can I in that respect refer to a couple of areas? These are not things that Australia does take credit for, but where we found improvement that has happened. For example in the Asia-Pacific region, there has not previously been a great deal of expertise in the development of cultural understandings in recent years. But a couple of years ago cultural experts in the region formed ICOMOS Pacifica and I must say that this was with the full support of ICOMOS itself. This is a small but important step to have recognised different

perspectives and analyses, and to increase the depth of expertise, above all on the cultural side.

Can I also, Mr Chairman, refer to the context into which the Advisory Bodies work, and there are two things which I would like to mention here: Resources and policy guidance. On resources, we all are aware of the enormous efforts we require of the Advisory Bodies, including those 22,000 and more pages. The money that we give for this in that context is extraordinary small. We know that the Advisory Bodies undertake a great deal of volunteer labour; this is something we should be considerably and eternally grateful for.

On policy guidance, the Committee sets the policy framework and the Committee has left areas of ambiguity that relate for example to serial sites, to setting too many areas on our agenda. In some of these we have taken steps to reduce the ambiguity, but while it is unclear, it is within the committee's ability to improve this ambiguity. We could not be critical of the Advisory Bodies for taking positions that are different from those that are preferred by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman this is by way of noting some of the complexity of the relationships of the Advisory Bodies with the work of the Committee and I think we should conclude with a lot of thanks for the Advisory Bodies for the enormous efforts they do and we hope that they will have an enormous influence in the future in the way that we work. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor."

Brazil :

"Thank you. As far as I am concerned, first of all, I would like to join in expressing the thanks that the Australian Delegation has just expressed to the Advisory Bodies. We would also like to reaffirm our commitment not just to reinforcing the Advisory Bodies, but also to building up prestige. Brazil shares the view expressed by the Australian Delegation concerning the means provided to the Advisory Bodies. Those resources are too limited. We need to give the resources to the Advisory Bodies to properly carry out their task.

I would also like to express my agreement with my colleague from Barbados. It is clear that we need to reinforce the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the State Parties. That dialogue cannot be intermittent; it must be ongoing. Brazil believes the more dialogue, the more interaction there will be between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the State Parties, and the easier it will then be to take decisions by consensus. And, the easier it would be to avoid conflicting points of view.

Concerning the decision proposed or recommended by the Advisory Bodies, I think that the State Parties should be more involved in the drafting of those recommended decisions, so the State Parties will appropriate them as their own and the Advisory Bodies will not limit themselves. I know that this only happens in some very limited cases, but sometimes the decision is taken by the Advisory Bodies with a true participation by the State Parties and I think we need more such participation in the preparatory stages of drafting such decisions.

You know that Brazil has worked towards strengthening the Convention but also towards meeting the challenges of today's world. It is important to stress that the entire system requires in-depth review and analysis. This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why I think

this particular session marks a turning point, a milestone in the history of the World Heritage *Convention*, because the time has come to launch into an in-depth, consensual, constructive exercise based on dialogue in which the Advisory Bodies will be heard and respected, as they should be, and through the World Heritage Centre and into which the State Parties will have their points of view heard. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mexico.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Chair. Mr. Chairman, Mexico fully shares the comments that have been made before us, from representatives of other Delegations. We, too, are very concerned about the future of the *Convention*. Our country is a State, which since it ratified the Convention in 1984, has been very enthusiastic and ready to operate with this instrument for international cooperation, which was created in 1972, with the noblest possible aim: The conservation of heritage, cultural or natural, which is common to humanity.

I would like, if I may abuse your time and good will for a moment, to remind you that exactly ten years ago in Cairns in Australia, I remember very clearly, there was a huge debate concerning exactly what direction the *Convention* was going in. The warning signs were the alarming points that were appearing on the horizon of a certain number of imbalances, if I can put it that way, on the World Heritage List that we see not only in the representative List but also in the sites that were being inscribed on the List in Danger. We were trying to look at the instruments that we were developing six years after having established the strategic plans to achieve greater credibility of the List. That’s why we had drafted the global strategy, we wanted to try and address those issues and stick to very clear principles.

In some of the comments that we have made in the recent past at UNESCO, we had a sentence which is perhaps cast in strong terms, but which is true, and that is the description that we had given is that the World Heritage List is the faithful reflection of the interest and of the power balances within organizations associated with the development of the *Convention* and its historic evolution. That perhaps says a lot and nothing at the same time. But this is an observation that there is an issue that we should address now. Ten years after Cairns, decisions were adopted when we said we needed to slow down the rate of inscriptions on the World Heritage List because after the year 2000 some 60 or 70 sites were listed every year...”

The Chairperson [interrupting the speaker].

“Could you please conclude Mexico?”

Mexico :

“I apologise Mr Chairman. Now the situation has changed and there are new challenges confronting us and it is absolutely essential to engage in in-depth reflection now to understand what are the objectives common to all and what are those goals that we are all aiming to further. Finally, we would like to say that we must establish new balances between the players and engage in dialogue.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique. Le Zimbabwe vous avez la parole ».

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Chair for giving me the floor. I believe that the substance of my intervention is relevant to this discussion. First and foremost, it is to underline the fact—it goes without saying—that the outcomes of our deliberation have not been in the favour of Africa, and for obvious reasons. The playing field has changed, whereas it was obvious the rules of Operational Guidelines and of the *Convention* were clear, it is clear that those rules are not being abided by.

The fact is that it is now increasingly a political field, whereas the *Convention* has anticipated fair play in the context of cultural and natural heritage, and that is no longer the case. We regret it sincerely, because we do not have the critical mass to challenge what is going on.

Thirdly Mr. Chairman, I believe in the context of the implementation of the World Heritage *Convention* in the future, if the pace and ideas continue to be along these lines, the *Convention* is dead as far as the developing World, in particular Africa, is concerned. I do not want to highlight what has taken place in this institution but for us it has been a black day.

Lastly Mr. Chairman, we would like to be noted that please, please, this is a plea from an Observer State that the fact that Africa is under-represented on the World Heritage *Convention* is a cause for concern. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I have two further requests for the floor, Hungary and Japan and I will close the list. Hungary please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I really like the fact that this issue has been raised. If you allow me, Hungary as a State Party is committed to a successful implementation of the *Convention* for the protection of the World Cultural Heritage. I would also like to make some observations in my personal capacity as a former Chair of the World Heritage Committee and as a heritage conservator who has been involved in the implementation of the *Convention* for the last 20 years.

In this spirit, I would like to make the following observations and suggestions. A lot of reflection work has been done recently on the Future of the *Convention*; I would however like to reflect on the present of the *Convention*. It seems to us that a recent climate change has occurred during the present Session of the Committee with regard to the way Committee decisions have been reached. I cannot recall any previous sessions of the Committee when in such a great number of cases, and to such a degree, the Committee overturned the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies of the *Convention*.

We would therefore like to offer for the consideration of the Committee the possibility of carrying out an evaluation of the Committee’s current decision taken under agenda item 7 and 8. This evaluation should assess how this decision of the Committee advances the five ‘Cs’ of the strategic objectives. We suggest this evaluation to make sure that the World Heritage List and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee remain reliable points of

guidance for all conservation stakeholders and partners. We are convinced that the World Heritage Committee as a Committee expert in the different fields of cultural and natural heritage is and will be able to meet its present and future challenges.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Japan.”

Japan:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for giving us this opportunity to speak. Given the time I should be very brief, but I believe like previous speakers that the Committee this time has highlighted the challenges that we face in the implementation of the *Convention* for which we have been aware in the recent years and the process of the future of the *Convention* is intended to address these challenges.

We believe that there are two areas where we will need necessary guidance. One is the togetherness of all the Parties concerned, member States, in particular Committee members, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in advancing the scheme of the *Convention* to meet the current requirements and challenges.

Secondly, the credibility: It is very important that we safeguard the credibility of the Convention. With those areas we believe that the future of the *Convention* for which many of us have put so much effort will bear fruit for deliberation to be carried out in the next couple of years and hopefully come out with something very constructive by the 40th anniversary. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Japan. I have a further request, but we will close the debate and save some time. I think we should continue dialogue and exchange in a positive and constructive spirit. We are now moving to the examination of Draft Decisions. Do you agree? Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 8C.1, 34 COM 8C.2 and 34 COM 8C.3?** I see none. They are adopted. Thank you very much.

ITEM 9A. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND PACT AS REQUESTED BY RESOLUTION 17GA 9

Document WHC-10/34.COM/9A

Decision: 34 COM 9A

The Chairperson:

Next item on the agenda is Item 9A regarding the terms of reference of the evaluation of the global strategy and PACT as requested by resolution 17GA9. Madame Lemaistre will introduce this item.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Vous vous souviendrez que par la résolution 17GA9, l'Assemblée générale a demandé, lors de sa 17^e session, que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives remettent à l'Assemblée générale, lors de sa 18^e

session c'est-à-dire la prochaine en 2011, une évaluation réalisée de façon indépendante par un audit externe à l'UNESCO, de sa création en 1994 jusqu'en 2011, et du PACTE qui est donc l'initiative de partenariat pour la conservation.

Les termes de référence de ses deux évaluations ont été établis par le Secrétariat en collaboration avec les Organisations consultatives et les auditeurs externes concernés afin d'être examinés et adoptés par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de la 34^e session. Je ne vais pas rentrer dans le détail de ces termes de référence, mais dans le a) vous avez ce qui concerne la stratégie globale, c'est un document assez court. En b) vous trouvez les termes de référence en partenariat pour la conservation. Tout ceci figure dans le document 9A. Je vous remercie de votre attention et merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. J'invite les membres du Comité à nous faire part de leurs commentaires. La France vous avez la parole ».

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je remercie également le Secrétariat concernant les termes de référence des deux évaluations. J'aurais des commentaires et des questions concernant les termes de référence et les cahiers des charges concernant l'initiative PACTE. Nous estimons, et nous avons déposé un amendement en ce sens, que les termes de référence, le cahier des charges de cette évaluation, devraient être davantage en cohérence avec les éléments que nous a déjà donnés l'auditeur externe dans sa recommandation 12 sur l'ensemble du patrimoine mondial. Donc, le projet d'amendement que nous avons déposé va en ce sens.

J'avais une question sur un point précis que je souhaitais poser au Secrétariat, qui concerne le paragraphe 10 du cahier des charges sur l'évaluation de PACTE. On fait référence, dans ce paragraphe 10, à des indicateurs de performance développés dans le cadre du 32C5 qui porte sur une période déjà ancienne 2004-2005. Est-ce que ces indicateurs de performance ont été modifiés, mis à jour dans les exercices du C5 qui suivent ? Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. La parole est au Secrétariat ».

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. To respond to the delegate of France, these indicators have indeed been modified in the subsequent C5, but I believe the external auditors wanted to take up the indicators from two previous biannuals, to be able to establish clearly the degree to which these have been implemented and what has been the achievement. This is why they chose two previous biannuals, but they have evolved in subsequent C5 also. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Mali.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je ne sais pas si le projet d'amendement par la France vous est parvenu, mais il a posé une question intéressante sur l'emblème du patrimoine mondial. C'est au verso de cet amendement. Il parle de l'utilisation du patrimoine mondial par des entités privées et souhaiterait que des dispositions soient prises sur ce point.

Je me pose d'abord la question de savoir si l'emblème est une marque déposée, c'est une question que je pose au conseiller juridique. Sinon, chacun est autorisé à l'utiliser, mais une fois que c'est une marque déposée juridiquement, pour s'en servir il faudra des conditions ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Malheureusement le conseiller juridique n'est pas sur le podium. Le Secrétariat vous avez la parole ».

The Secretariat:

"I am not the legal advisor, but I can provide some information. The emblem is deposited, but the words 'World Heritage' are not. So, they can be freely used, but the emblem is a deposited mark which has been done through the Paris Convention which the countries have ratified."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Secretariat. Mali do you want to answer?"

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Merci pour cette information. Donc toutes compagnies ou personnes privées qui souhaiteraient se servir de l'emblème comme marque déposée doivent s'expliquer. N'importe qui n'est pas autorisé à l'utiliser, notamment les privés. C'est ce que dit la France et son argument est bien fondé. Désormais, il faudrait donc que des dispositions soient prises pour l'utilisation de l'emblème. Toutes les personnes qui souhaitent utiliser cet emblème doivent être soumises à un certain nombre de conditions. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. We are starting to examine Draft Decision 34 COM 9A and I give the floor to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I have received amendments for Decision 9A from France and Switzerland, which mostly concern additions to paragraph 3. I will read those in the English language although they have been submitted in French, but at the moment I seem to have only the English version in front of me. Paragraph 3 would be continued:

Adopts the Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List, and completing the Terms of Reference with the following information:

And then the further sub paragraphs would be:

Evaluate the contents of the respective engagements of the World Heritage Centre and its private sector partners and appreciate the equitable character of these engagements,

Then a further sub paragraph and I can continue with the French because I have the French version in front of me:

b) évaluer les conditions d'utilisation de l'emblème de la Convention par les partenaires privés, afin de déterminer si elles sont en adéquation avec les objectifs et les dispositions de la Convention,

Following this there is an additional paragraph which was only submitted by Switzerland and is not carried by France I believe. I again read the French version:

c) évaluer l'apport du PACTE sur le développement de partenariats aux niveaux régional et local afin d'identifier le potentiel d'établissement de tels partenariats à ces niveaux, ainsi que la nécessité de fournir des orientations en la matière ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Le Cambodge vous avez la parole ».

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous partageons complètement la préoccupation de la France en ce qui concerne ce point. Il nous paraît nécessaire que le cahier des charges du PACTE soit le plus complet possible. Nous appuyons donc les évaluations sur le caractère équilibré des engagements et sur les conditions d'utilisation de l'emblème de la *Convention*. Nous soutenons donc les amendements proposés par la France ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci au Cambodge*. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 9A as being amended by France and Switzerland? Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Pouvons-nous demander au rapporteur de lire le paragraphe 2 de la Décision pour lequel nous avons proposé un amendement ? Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« C'est exactement ce que j'allais faire, merci ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. President. I admit and I apologise as we have had some confusion since the Draft Decision was submitted on two pages and two papers and I believe we have had only the inserted one and that’s why I only have an English version of it.

There is, indeed, an amendment to paragraph 2 and I read it again in the French version:

2. Adopte le cahier des charges de l'évaluation de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, équilibrée et crédible en supprimant son paragraphe 1.a). »

The Chairperson:

« La Suisse et la France êtes-vous d'accord sur l'amendement du paragraphe 2 ? Oui, merci beaucoup. On va procéder à l'adoption paragraphe par paragraphe.

Any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 1, which remains unchanged? I see none. It is adopted.

Moving to paragraph 2 and the floor is to the rapporteur for a re-read.”

Rapporteur:

« 2. Adopte le cahier des charges de l'évaluation de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, équilibrée et crédible en supprimant son paragraphe 1.a). »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 2 as amended? I see none. It is adopted.

Paragraph 3?”

Rapporteur:

« 3. Adopte le cahier des charges de l'évaluation de l'Initiative de partenariat pour la conservation (PACTE), en modifiant la formulation de son paragraphe 5 comme suit en ajoutant « et de leur traçabilité » et en complétant le cahier des charges et les évaluations suivantes :

a) évaluer la teneur des engagements respectifs du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des partenaires privés, et apprécier le caractère équilibré de ces engagements,

b) évaluer les conditions d'utilisation de l'emblème de la Convention par les partenaires privés, afin de déterminer si elles sont en adéquation avec les objectifs et les dispositions de la Convention,

c) évaluer l'apport du PACTE sur le développement de partenariats aux niveaux régional et local afin d'identifier le potentiel d'établissement de tels partenariats à ces niveaux, ainsi que la nécessité de fournir des orientations en la matière. »

The Chairperson:

« La France, vous avez la parole ».

France:

« Monsieur le Président, vous avez devancé mes pensées en demandant au rapporteur de lire à nouveau donc je n'ai pas de commentaires à faire. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections regarding the adoption of paragraph 3, as it has been amended? No? It is adopted and **Draft Decision 34 COM 9A** is adopted.

ITEM 9B. REPORT ON SERIAL NOMINATIONS AND PROPERTIES

Document WHC-10/34.COM/9B

Decision: 34 COM 9B

The Chairperson:

Next item on the agenda is the report on serial nominations and properties, and Ms. Rössler from the World Heritage Centre and Mr. Oliver Martin from the Swiss Delegation will introduce this item.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. President. You have document 9B in front of you. It was requested at the 32nd and 33rd session of the Committee and the meeting was held in Switzerland in February 2010 with 29 participants from 17 countries. You can see them here in the photo. The meeting concluded that serial nominations would be treated like any other nominations in terms of procedural process by recognising broader approaches including serial nominations, as a tool for international collaboration, shared approaches and exchanging experiences for effective conservation.

I believe the Committee discussed some of these points during the nomination item. Finally I would like to refer to the link with Item 13 on the Operational Guidelines and not touching this as the working group will report back later on. As you said Mr. Chair, Switzerland would like to take the floor on this item. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je vais être bref. Les dispositions dans les orientations concernant les biens sériels ont besoin de clarifications et de précisions. Ce besoin avait été reconnu par le Comité lors de ses 32^e et 33^e sessions respectivement à Québec et Séville. Des questions concernant des propositions d'inscriptions sérielles ont également surgi de nombreuses fois pendant les discussions de notre session ici à Brasília.

Les transcriptions sérielles transnationales renforcent de manière importante l'esprit de la *Convention*, la coopération entre les États parties. Les séries offrent ainsi de grandes opportunités. Comme nous le savons et l'avons remarqué, elles représentent aussi de grands défis. Les États parties ont besoin d'orientations plus claires afin de mener avec succès leur projet souvent très complexe. Trois réunions ont eu lieu entre 2008 et 2010 à ce sujet, deux à Vilm en Allemagne et une à Ittingen en Suisse. Les recommandations, comme l'a mentionné le Secrétariat, sont présentées au Comité dans le document 9B.

Ces recommandations ne représentent pas de vraies révolutions dans l'approche sérielle telle qu'elle a été pratiquée jusqu'à maintenant, mais elles aident à mieux comprendre, définir et présenter les biens sériels, leur gestion et les procédures respectives. Nous tenons à remercier les experts venus de toutes les régions du monde qui ont contribué aux réunions avec un grand engagement. Nous pouvons aussi annoncer une publication sur les résultats de la réunion et nous sommes convaincus qu'il faut continuer ces réflexions et les institutionnaliser. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to both of you. I would like to open the floor for comment from members of the Committee. South Africa you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“South Africa would like to congratulate the World Heritage Centre, the Swiss authorities, the expert Advisory Bodies and everyone who took part in the expert meetings on serial nominations and properties. We would like to support the recommendations and a proposed amendment, especially on points 2 and 5 of the Operational Guidelines. South Africa appreciates the guidance that these recommendations, once adopted, would provide all State Parties involved in their preparations of serial nominations a better understanding of what would be required and thus try to ensure a more cohesive nomination dossier that should be submitted. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you South Africa. Sweden you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chair. Sweden has participated in expert meetings in Germany and Switzerland regarding serial nominations. We think that these meetings have identified many of the problems of transnational heritage properties. We also think that the proposals of the meeting should be used in a concrete manner to improve the Operational Guidelines in these matters. Sweden therefore suggests that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies should be requested to work out additional rules for the Operational Guidelines on the basis of the

conclusion and recommendations of the meeting in Ittigen for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its session next year. An amendment to the Decision has been submitted together with Switzerland. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Mexico.”

Mexico :

“Thank you Chair. Of course Mexico offers congratulations to the Secretariat for the work that it has done, as well as expressing our thanks to the Swiss government for the Ittigen meeting. This is an essential subject, serial nominations. In the light of what has been said by the delegate of Switzerland, we feel that it is necessary to continue the discussion, it seems to us that it is far from having been exhausted. We think that we need to call an intergovernmental meeting to discuss this in-depth, and reach agreement that will enable us to introduce the necessary amendment to the Operational Guidelines.

We had a lot of discussions in that meeting concerning various confusions that remain with regard to serial nominations and other categories that can be interconnected. We would like to formulate a draft amendment. We submitted that proposal to the Secretariat a minute ago. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. China you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you Chair. China would like to congratulate the excellent work of the Swiss government and the World Heritage Centre on organizing the expert meeting including series of property, especially transnational ones, which are an important contribution to the implementation of the *Convention*. We highly appreciate the efforts and achievements the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the State Parties have made in advancing the concept and notion of series nomination, internal links between the component sites and their relationship to the *Convention*.

We think that conducting a profile study is crucial to defining a property as a whole and to establish methodology and criteria for selecting the component sites, before the actual nomination is conducted. An early involvement of the Advisory Bodies at this stage is particularly important and should be encouraged and supported and relevant rules must be also fully respected. China fully endorses the Draft Decision and would like to make a contribution to this aspect in the future. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. À mon tour, je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat, la Suisse, mais aussi l'Allemagne — qui je crois en 2008 avait organisé un séminaire — pour leur contribution extrêmement positive à la réflexion très délicate sur les nominations des biens en séries. Je crois en effet qu'il est nécessaire d'avoir des clarifications. Nous avons entendu les nombreuses questions qui ont été posées lors de cette session du Comité sur les candidatures des biens en séries.

Nous sommes passés effectivement à un moment de l'histoire du Comité où il y avait un, deux, trois, quatre biens parfois présentés dans leur ensemble à des séries beaucoup plus nombreuses, complexes, difficiles aussi à identifier et documenter. Je voudrais faire quatre remarques de principe très rapidement si vous me le permettez.

La première est qu'un bien en série ne doit pas être plus compliqué qu'un autre à inscrire sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Il faut que partout les mêmes critères s'appliquent. Cependant, nous savons que si théoriquement les mêmes critères s'appliquent partout, il y a des difficultés particulières pour le bien en série et il ne faut pas que le bien en série soit pénalisé justement par sa complexité propre pour l'inscription. Voilà pour le premier point de principe.

Le deuxième point c'est le lien entre la partie et l'ensemble, et le tout. Nous sommes bien sûr pour l'application dans toute sa rigueur, sa portée, de l'orientation 137 qui définit bien que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle ne doit pas être dans chacune des parties de la série, mais dans l'ensemble de la série et pour nous c'est un point extrêmement important.

Troisième point de principe pour la Délégation française, la série n'a pas à être complète a priori. Nous voyons ça et là des recommandations qui disent "*il n'y aura pas d'extensions*". La série n'a pas à être complète, elle peut par la suite être étendue et je crois qu'il ne faut pas immédiatement fermer cette porte lorsque l'inscription est commencée.

Enfin, je crois qu'il nous faut pour la suite de notre réflexion faire la différence entre deux types de séries. Il y a celle présentée dans un cadre national et celle présentée dans un cadre transfrontalier entre plusieurs pays. Là, je crois qu'il est nécessaire, c'est indispensable même, d'avoir une formule d'arrangement entre les États dans le cadre de séries transnationales qui prennent des engagements précis sur la nature de la conservation, sur le plan de gestion, etc. Mais je ne crois pas que nous puissions aller jusqu'à un accord intergouvernemental. C'est une formule qui est extrêmement contraignante, qui compliquerait encore l'inscription de biens en séries ou la présentation de candidature et je crois qu'il ne faut pas alourdir. Qu'il y ait des arrangements entre États, des engagements concernant la gestion, bien sûr, pour satisfaire au critère de la *Convention*, mais sans doute pas d'accord gouvernemental. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la France. Personne ne souhaite prendre la parole, nous passons donc à l'examen de la Décision 34 COM 9B et je donne la parole à notre rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le projet de Décision se trouve page 6 dans la version anglaise et française du document 9B. J'ai reçu une révision du projet de Décision présentée par la Délégation du Mexique. Elle propose d'ajouter le paragraphe 6 ci-après :

Propose la confirmation d'un Comité intergouvernemental pour discuter et approfondir sur les implications du Document 9B après le changement des annexes 2 et 5 des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

Je relis :

Propose la confirmation d'un Comité intergouvernemental pour discuter et approfondir sur les implications du Document 9B après le changement des annexes 2 et 5 des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à notre rapporteur et je souhaiterais donner la parole à notre Secrétariat pour apporter plus d'informations sur cet amendement proposé par le Mexique ».

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to clarify that as part of the working group that has been set up to review and recommended the changes to the Operational Guidelines, this work is already being done and will continue. So, I am not sure that the creation of another intergovernmental group will actually add any value. It might duplicate the whole purpose and I wonder if the distinguished delegate of Switzerland would like to comment on this amendment as well. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Mexico, would you like the floor?”

Mexico :

“I do think that there is a small detail that I would like to correct here. Of course we are not asking for a Committee, we are talking about a group that would work on the issues that we have been discussing before we come to any decisions regarding the Operational Guidelines. That is really what we are aiming for. The discussion should continue by such a group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mexique. Je donne la parole à la Suisse ».

Switzerland:

« Ce que Monsieur Rao vient de rappeler correspond à notre lecture des travaux et je crois que la proposition du Mexique est en surplus. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“I think that while listening to Switzerland and Mexico we formulated a text and we will ask your point of view on it. I give the floor to the rapporteur to read this text.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I apologise to the Mexican Delegation for formulating this text in English and not in French as per the original proposal. The text would then be as follows:

Takes note of the discussions of the working group established during the 34th session of the Committee and recommends that these discussions continue after the changes to the annex 2 and 5 of the Operational Guidelines in order to further guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

I read once more:

Takes note of the discussions of the working group established during the 34th session of the Committee and recommends to continue the discussion on this matter after the change to the annex 2 and 5 of the Operational Guidelines to further guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico, are you satisfied with the text?”

Mexico :

“Mexico recognises the work that has been done by the rapporteur; we would just have the comment that this work was done before the changes and of course it would not be appropriate before we adopt the Decision. Can we just do that change before the changes and then Mexico would be entirely satisfied with that? Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Oui Monsieur le Président. Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec la proposition du rapporteur avec l'ajout du Mexique, pour plus de clarification et parce que nous n'avons pas encore discuté du point 13, le point qui a trait au rapport de ce groupe de travail, dont il est fait état dans la proposition de Madame la rapporteur. J'aimerais que l'on ajoute les deux mots *groupe de travail sur les orientations*. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci. Rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

I take note of these two changes and the text would then read as follows:

Takes note of the discussions of the working group on the Operational Guidelines established during the 34th session of the Committee and recommends to continue the discussions before any changes to annex 2 and 5 of the Operational Guidelines to further guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding this additional paragraph 6? No, so let’s move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 9B. Any objections to the approval of this **Draft Decision 34 COM 9B** including paragraphs 1 to 5 which remain unchanged and paragraph 6 as read by the rapporteur? No? It is adopted. Thank you.

ITEM 9C. PROGRESS REPORT ON GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY (INCLUDING CATEGORY 2 CENTRES)

Document WHC-10/34.COM/9C and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.9C
Decision: 34 COM 9C

The Chairperson:

The next item on our agenda is item 9C regarding the Global Training Strategy and Priority Action Plan of world cultural and natural heritage. This was adopted during the 21st session in Helsinki in 2001. The situation for training has changed significantly since that time. A significant change in training landscape being determined by the global establishment of the World Heritage related Category 2 Centres. Recalling for instance that last Monday UNESCO and the government of Brazil signed an agreement for a regional Heritage Management Training centre in Rio de Janeiro as a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO. Now I would like to invite Mr. Joseph King from ICCROM to present the progress report of the category 2 Centres. Then I will give the floor Bruno Walder from the Swiss Delegation.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you very much. I will give a report on the progress on the revision of the Global Training Strategy and as The Chairperson mentioned I will be passing the floor to my colleague Bruno Walder from the Swiss Delegation during the presentation.

Due to the short time allocated, I am not going to go in the history and background of the situation. I will pass right on. The Global Training Strategy was launched in 2001 and subsequently in the last ten years we have been carrying out many activities, specifically training courses but also the preparation of the resource manual. For example, the first one being the one on Disaster Risk which was mentioned earlier in the meeting. What we find is that in the recent past, there has been a large change in the context for training. This is due to the fact that there are new actors on the scene. You mentioned the Category 2 Centres,

there are currently six of them: One in China covering Asia and the Pacific, Bahrain for the Arab States, two in Latin America, one in Brazil and one in Mexico, and of course the Nordic World Heritage Foundation and the African World Heritage Fund.

There are then six current and there are two or three which are in the process of being created. These Category 2 Centres are new actors and did not exist at the time the Global Training Strategy was originally adopted in 2001. So, they have become important actors in the capacity building for World Heritage. There was, during this session, an informal meeting of the Category 2 Centres that was held during the week and there was chance for the various Category 2 Centres to exchange ideas, to talk about the progress being made. And, in fact, there is a desire to continue to build a network between Category 2 Centres and that will lead in December to a meeting for Category 2 Centres that will take place in Bahrain. So, there is a will to continue and build a network of Category 2 Centres.

In addition to Category 2 Centres, there are also other actors that now exist and did not exist when the Global Training Strategy was adopted. For example, there are several university programmes or courses around the world, for example in Tsukuba in Japan and Cottbus in Germany just to name two, but there are many more. There are also other training institutions that are dealing with heritage issues that were not in existence at that time. Of course the UNESCO Chairs Programme has been strengthened and the Forum UNESCO Programme, which was in its infancy in 1999 and 2000 when the Global Strategy Training was developed, is now ten years of age.

Essentially, there are a variety of new actors that are involved in training and capacity building. And any new strategy or any revision of this Global Strategy has to take into account these new actors. In addition, there are also changes in delivery mechanisms. We now have internet which allows us to do online training. We have social networking which is a much more social way of building capacity by something that is very effective. And we also have things like video conferencing.

The final change in the context is that we have also been discussing new issues. The issue of Disaster Risk Management, for example, is much more important now that it was ten years ago. The issue of the impact of climate change has become much more important, and we are also placing a much stronger focus on sustainable development.

Because of this changing context, it was decided that there was a need for a revision of the Global Training Strategy and we have already begun undertaking that effort to revise the strategy. The two meetings that you see on the screen now are meetings that took place last year. They were organised in partnership between ICCROM and IUCN representing the cultural and natural side but also in strong collaboration with ICOMOS and generously supported by the Federal Office of the Government of Switzerland. The first meeting was in November last year and we invited many of the participants of those new actors that I talked to you about. Category 2 Centres, university programmes, UNESCO chairs and other people active in training were all represented there. That meeting was carried out to review the existing Global Training Strategy to identify new training needs and opportunities and technologies and to review a proposed capacity building strategy for national heritage.

A second meeting was held in Rome in May of this year. It gathered a smaller number of participants, 14, but still represented the various categories that exist. At that meeting we discussed much more in-depth the issue of training versus capacity building and we developed a more detailed framework for the proposed revised Draft Capacity Building Strategy. We also developed a final timetable for the revision of the Global Strategy.

At those meetings, there were a series of principles that were discussed that we thought would be very important to share with you, members of the Committee, as to the way the revision of the Global Training Strategy is moving. The first point, which I think is very

important, is a shift from what we would call a more narrowed focus on training to a much wider focus on capacity building.

The idea is that the traditional method of training, sitting in a classroom, although sometimes still the best way to do things, is not always the best way to reach the target audience. So, we need to think of new ways and means of making sure we are building capacities in a much larger sense than what traditional training would have been. And in fact in those discussions we have talked about, maybe, changing the name of the World Heritage Global Training Strategy to the Capacity Building Strategy.

In addition, we agreed that there is a need to add one more level to the strategy. The old strategy dealt mostly with training at the international and regional levels. We felt it was important to make sure that the individual countries had their own strategy to develop capacity building and part of this strategy would be to give them the tools to be able to do these capacity building strategies. Obviously, the strategy itself will not get to that level, but the idea is to give to the countries the tool to develop national capacity building strategies.

We also talked about the need to take advantage of new technologies, to broaden our target audiences. Not only to focus on professionals but to focus on a much larger target audience of people who have impacts on World Heritage sites, to build their capacities on the way they are working with World Heritage sites. We thought that it would be very important to foster better cooperation and collaboration between training institutions that exist. Finally, this is something we all believe very strongly in, using the periodic reporting more effectively, not just to identify particular conditions on a site or on a group of site, but actually pulling out training needs, understanding training needs for the World Heritage through the periodic reporting process.

In terms of the modality for implementation: Obviously with the Global Training Strategy which is very large and covers many different things, it is not that one organisation will be responsible for the implementation. Individual activities and programmes would be implemented by a wide category of partners (Category 2 Centres, ICCROM, IUCN and Universities and etc.). There is also an important issue relating to monitoring. As these important activities are carried out, there is a need to have a group which will be responsible for monitoring activities and programmes, so we can report back to you, the Committee, to know what capacity building is taking place and how its is affecting the conservation and preservation of World Heritage properties.

Finally, on the implementation side, this is also a very important point. We would note that capacity building has a tendency to be under-funded and, as a result, it would be very important for us to develop a robust fundraising strategy for us to be able to actually carry out long-term capacity building international programmes in the various regions and in the long-term.

Here is the strategy for action. This is in your document but the one point that I would like to raise on it, is when we have a draft of the revised World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, we would like to circulate it to the State Parties next year to be able to get comments, before we present the final strategy to this body at the next Committee meeting. I think it is very important to ask for your input sooner or later, so we can make sure that the Capacity Building Strategy is in fact meeting the needs of the State Parties. Now I would like to ask The Chairpersonman to pass the floor to my colleague from Switzerland.”

The Chairperson:

“You have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Merci aussi pour cette vue d'ensemble de ce qui est en cours pour la révision de la stratégie globale de formation. La Suisse a le plaisir de vous fournir des informations complémentaires sur notre contribution à cette révision. Elle avait pris l'initiative lors de la 33^e réunion du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Séville de rassembler les trois Organisations consultatives, l'ICCROM, l'ICOMOS, l'UICN et le Centre du patrimoine mondial afin de relancer la révision de cette stratégie de formation.

La formation est l'une des priorités de la Suisse, étant membre du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Nous sommes persuadés qu'il faut unir les acteurs tant du monde culturel que naturel, c'est à cette fin que nous avons décidé d'y inclure et de conclure un contrat avec l'UICN en collaboration avec l'ICCROM et l'ICOMOS. Ce contrat soutient des actions et des événements de formation à court terme. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que les Centres de catégorie 2 sont associés pour coordonner et faciliter les actions. Le financement de ce programme trisannuel s'élève à 660 000 \$ US. Un premier événement a déjà été organisé au mois de mai dernier au Costa Rica pour renforcer les capacités des experts ICOMOS et UICN dans la région Amérique latine et caraïbe.

Juste pour vous présenter en bref les lignes d'activités de ce programme. La priorité est axée avec une allocation de 60 % des ressources sur les événements de renforcement des capacités avec le but de former des experts dans cette région. Cette priorité soutient essentiellement l'objectif d'équilibrer les compétences des experts sur les différentes régions. C'est un premier pas et la Suisse appelle d'autres États parties à soutenir cette initiative en apportant des financements.

En automne prochain, un événement de ce genre se tiendra en Afrique francophone. En 2011, pour les pays arabes et d'Afrique et pour 2012 dans la région associée à la 36^e session du Comité et en Afrique. En outre, en 2011 se tiendra une réunion pour intégrer les compétences professionnelles dans le tourisme durable. Pour arrêter la Stratégie globale de formation et le rapport périodique, le programme y alloue 15 % des ressources. Dans cette activité se trouve la traduction du questionnaire du rapport périodique en ligne en portugais, ce qui a déjà facilité aux pays africains lusitains leur travail et facilitera aussi celui du Brésil et du Portugal. Les recommandations pour les déclarations de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle sont en cours de traduction en portugais. La troisième ligne d'activité porte sur la communication et les publications.

Passons aux perspectives : l'initiative de la Suisse a pour but de faciliter le début des activités tout à fait nécessaires pour renforcer les capacités dans la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* et qui sont incluses dans un programme à développer au sein de la révision de la Stratégie globale de formation.

Pour conclure, la Suisse est très satisfaite et remercie la coopération qui s'est établie depuis Séville et ses progrès significatifs, grâce à cette collaboration avec les Organisations consultatives. Nous invitons très sincèrement d'autres États parties à se joindre au cofinancement de la mise en œuvre de la nouvelle Stratégie du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités. Je donne la parole pour terminer à Monsieur King. Merci beaucoup ».

ICCROM:

“Thank you very much. Chairman, the last thing to mention, though I know many of you noted it already, ICCROM and IUCN signed an agreement protocol during this session to bring us together towards improving capacity building in this region and that agreement was signed by the Directors General of both organisations. They are actually seated behind here. We are grateful to IUCN for their partnership and also to the Swiss for their support. I

conclude the presentation and I believe IUCN has a short comment, they would like to make.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Chair. IUCN has been concerned about the relative lack of resources put into capacity building for implementation of the *Convention* and is committed to working with the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, the Category 2 Centres and the State Parties to address this imbalance in the short term. IUCN notes with great appreciation the financial support of Switzerland at the global level. We also note the close and effective collaboration with ICCROM so we can do effective training both on natural and cultural heritage resources and we are particularly pleased to note the commitment from Brazil to support capacity building activities in Latin America through the Rio de Janeiro Category 2 Centre.

IUCN is committed to continued collaboration with ICCROM, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre, the State Parties and the Category 2 Centres to further the rhythm and pace with which we are able to address capacity building in each of the regions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to all. Now, I open the floor to the members of the Committee to address their comments. Mali you have the floor.”

Mali:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je pense que ce projet est extrêmement intéressant et fondamental pour la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*. La formation est très intéressante et on ne peut que la recommander si l'on veut réellement améliorer la mise en œuvre de notre *Convention*, si on comble le fossé qui existe en termes de représentativité des biens entre les différentes régions, et aussi réduire l'écart qui existe entre différentes régions en termes de représentation de certaines catégories de biens.

Je voudrais, Monsieur le Président, si vous le voulez bien, m'appesantir sur le cas particulier de l'Afrique dans la mesure où, sur ce continent africain qui est caractérisé par une sous représentation sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, nous avons certes un Centre de catégorie 2, notamment le Fonds Africain pour le patrimoine mondial qui fait extrêmement de choses, mais nous avons aussi des relais, des centres de formation, l'École du patrimoine qui sont en train de faire également des progrès considérables.

Monsieur le Président, je voudrais aussi rappeler le succès que nous avons eu pour le Programme Africa 2009 qui, après douze ans d'existence, a apporté des progrès considérables et je souhaiterais que des efforts soient consentis en faveur de ce Programme Africa 2009, que des soutiens supplémentaires soient accordés aux institutions qui existent déjà et également pour la création d'un Institut Académique durable en termes de formation sur le patrimoine. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to the representative of Iraq.”

Iraq:

“Mr. Chairman, what we saw is very interesting and very encouraging. My question regards the Bahraini Centre which is going to be established soon, as I heard. Is it going to offer some of these programmes? So that instead of sending our trainees to expensive places around the world, will we be able to send them to Bahrain instead? Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Brazil would like to thank the Secretariat for the report and presentation and we would like also to congratulate the government of Switzerland for its commitment and everything it has done to foster training. Brazil would also like to congratulate the Secretariat for all the efforts they have made in coordinating the different Category 2 Centres. During this session we have talked about these important matters and Brazil would like to express its gratefulness to the Secretariat. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Chair. Bahrain is committed to participation through the Arab region Centre to establish strong relationships of the network of the Category 2 Centres. However, we would like to acknowledge and appreciate the initiative by Switzerland for the capacity building programmes they are initiating, especially the 2011 programmes they are implementing in the Arab region. To answer the delegate of Iraq, the Regional centre which is based in Bahrain will also concentrate on capacity building and will act as a facilitator to implement the training and capacity programme in the region in close cooperation with the Advisory bodies and the Centre. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to France.”

France :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais aborder deux points. Le premier concerne justement les acteurs de cette stratégie de formation. Il y a bien sûr les Centres de catégorie

2 qui sont importants et il y a les Chaires UNESCO et je voudrais insister sur la qualité du travail qui est fait par les Chaires UNESCO en ce domaine. Il y a aussi les acteurs de la société civile, le Secrétariat et les Organisations consultatives qui illustrent la diversité de ces acteurs. Je voudrais en profiter pour rendre hommage au Brésil, car j'ai été très impressionné par le Forum des jeunes sur le patrimoine lors de l'ouverture de cette session du Comité. Je remercie le Brésil, mais en même temps je sais que c'est une initiative régionale, qu'il y a plusieurs composantes de pays de la région dans ce forum notamment l'Argentine, le Paraguay et je pense que c'est une très bonne initiative pour sensibiliser en matière de patrimoine.

Un autre élément important, ce sont les collaborations bilatérales, et la France, dans le cadre de ces relations France-UNESCO, essaie d'œuvrer en faveur du renforcement des capacités avec des collaborations qui sont établies avec les universités de Bamako, de Dakar ou de Nouakchott. Je voudrais aborder en second point la question du changement des méthodes.

Il y a effectivement eu une évolution des méthodes de formation du renforcement des capacités. Je ne pense pas toutefois que l'on puisse qualifier la méthode d'enseignement traditionnelle de méthode étroite. Nous avons donc déposé un amendement en ce sens pour qu'il y ait une formulation qui stigmatise un peu moins les méthodes traditionnelles que nous avons tous employées pendant des années, qui ont montré leur efficacité et doivent rester complémentaires des nouveaux instruments, de nouvelles méthodes qui, fort heureusement, sont mis aujourd'hui à notre disposition ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“We would like to speak in the same way as other members of the Committee who have acknowledged the important work of the Committee as well as of the Advisory Bodies. We would also like to say that Mexico is actively involved with the World Heritage Centre in establishing a Category 2 Centre and Mexico has supported and been involved in the Swiss organised meeting in San José, Costa Rica, in May. And Mexico through that meeting tried to be involved in projects in Caribbean and Latin America and we are now in touch with different partners in the region.”

The Chairperson:

“Zimbabwe the last request, you have the floor, no more than two minutes.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. May I just say that we welcome the presentation that has been made, since this is related to Global Strategy in training, but what is conspicuously absent is ICOMOS. Do they have a strategy? What role are they going to play and if you could give them the floor in order to find out what they are doing especially with respect to Africa. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Senegal, I believe, I cannot see the sign, you have the floor.”

Senegal:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'ai écouté avec beaucoup d'attention le rapport de Jo King sur la stratégie globale en matière de formation. Je pense que c'est très important pour nous et de regarder ce que toutes ces formations ont apporté. Je pense qu'elles ont apporté beaucoup de choses, mais en termes de résultat on voit bien que la place de l'Afrique sur les listes va dans le mauvais sens.

Je pense que le renforcement des capacités a des limites et qu'il faudrait commencer par la capacitation et je pèse mes mots. Je pense que l'on fait du renforcement de capacités à partir d'une capacité qui existe déjà ; or dans la plupart de nos institutions, il n'y avait pas jusqu'à très récemment, de véritables modules de formation sur les métiers du patrimoine. J'aimerais que dans les modules en cours, vous fassiez un inventaire de l'existant dans les métiers du patrimoine. Aujourd'hui la physionomie a beaucoup changé, des universités sont consacrées à l'étude du patrimoine, des instituts sont en train d'être mis en place dans de nombreux pays. Je pense que ces formations formelles, traditionnelles sont, comme le disait tout à l'heure le représentant de la France, essentielles et je crois qu'il est très important de nous appuyer sur cela.

Cependant, pour s'appuyer il faut en faire l'inventaire, et j'aimerais demander aux honorables membres qui prennent les décisions de nous aider à faire cet inventaire-là afin que nous sachions ce que nous avons en termes de formation afin que l'on puisse mutualiser ces formations pour réellement prendre en compte le patrimoine dans les curriculums africains. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mr. King you have the floor if you wish.”

Mr. King:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. Also, thank you to the distinguished members of the Committee and Observers for their comments. I will just pick up a few. Regarding capacity building in Africa, there will be a presentation later on the AFRICA 2009 Programme where more information will be given. But I think it is worthy to stress what the delegate from Mali talked about regarding the African World Heritage Fund and other existing institutions.

Certainly the École du patrimoine africain in Benin and Kenya are very important institutions for capacity building. They have been partnering with us on AFRICA 2009 and they are partnering with the World Heritage African Fund on many of the activities that the African World Heritage Fund is carrying out. There were also discussions on the matter that these institutions themselves could become Category 2, but it is premature to discuss that. Anyhow, I fully agree with you that we need to support these institutions as much as possible.

In regard to the question from Iraq: I just wanted to raise the point, as the distinguished delegate asked a matter on the very important issue of training in the region. I believe this a valid point not only for the Arab States region but also for all regions in the

world. The idea is that the Category 2 Centres, and also other Centres, are places where people can do training in their regions. That will indeed be one of the things that we will identify in the revision of the Global Strategy training. But I also hope that this will not replace international training, because sometimes it is very important to have people from Asia meeting people from Africa, or from Latin America meeting people from Europe and so on. So, there is also a role and a place for these international kinds of courses.

Finally, I wanted to tackle one question from France and give the floor to my colleague and that is on the traditional method of teaching, a point also mentioned by Senegal. This is a very valid point. By no means, would we want to imply that the traditional training techniques are no good or obsolete. Certainly ICCROM does traditional courses regularly in Rome or other parts of the world. The intention would be by no means to forget about the traditional ways of training. We will certainly be continuing to do that but to add to these traditional methods with other ways so that we can reach larger audiences, so we can build capacity with a much larger number of people than we would be otherwise able to do. With that I turn the floor to the Secretariat for comment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Before giving the floor to the Secretariat, IUCN, would you like to add something?”

IUCN:

“Yes thank you. I think we have been really impressed by the rhythm, the way things are picking up and I am glad to hear there is a lot of interest from the State Party because the amount of resources that have been available have been pitiful and thanks to the initiative led by the Swiss, this has been picking up. I think we can look forward to an increasing number of activities, but there is still a long way to go.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Je voudrais juste répondre au commentaire de l'honorable délégué de la France. En ce qui concerne le rôle de la société civile et des Chaires UNESCO. Tout d'abord en vous remerciant pour avoir soulevé ce point, et je peux vous assurer que le rôle de la société civile, des universités et institutions est essentiel dans la constitution de cette stratégie et de ce paysage enrichi.

Pour vous assurer que les Chaires UNESCO ainsi que les Chaires UNITWIN avec le patrimoine mondial seront invités avec les Centres de catégorie 2 à la première réunion annuelle qui se tiendra au Bahreïn à la fin de l'année tel que demandé par l'Assemblée générale des États parties à sa dernière session. Et pour vous assurer aussi que le Centre du patrimoine mondial avec les Organismes consultatifs agissent comme facilitateurs dans ce paysage enrichi qui est construit non seulement par les Centres de catégorie 2 mais par une multitude d'acteurs et donc le rôle de la société civile et des universités est en effet essentiel. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Let’s move to the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 9C. I give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. Draft Decision 9C is on page 10 of the document of the same name in both the French and English versions. I have received two draft amendments from Sweden and France.

Sweden suggests a new paragraph to be inserted between the current paragraphs 3 and 4. The new paragraph 3bis would read as follow:

Welcomes the further development of the existing World Heritage Category 2 Centres and encourages these centres to develop strategic plans in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, and to coordinate their activities where relevant and further welcomes the offer of the Kingdom of Bahrain to host a meeting of the Category 2 Centres in December 2010.

The second amendment of France requests a minor revision of paragraph 5 where in the English version at the end of the first line we speak of a *more narrow focus on training* which would be replaced by *a more traditional focus on training*.

En Français le terme *étroite* est remplacé par *traditionnelle*.

Le paragraphe 5 se lit comme suit après les révisions proposées par la France :

Approuve l'idée de la Stratégie révisée qui passe progressivement d'une vision traditionnelle de la formation à une approche plus large du renforcement des capacités, conformément aux directions stratégiques du Comité du patrimoine mondial (les 5 C) ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 9C** as amended by Sweden and France? I see none. It is adopted.

ITEM 10B: PROGRESS REPORT ON PERIODIC REPORTING IN ALL REGIONS

*Document WHC-10/34.COM/10B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.10B,
Decision: 34 COM 10B.1, 10B.2 and 10B.3*

The Chairperson:

Next item on the agenda, Item 10A, has been already discussed. Now we are studying item 10B regarding the Progress Report of Periodic Reporting of all regions and you can refer to documents WHC-10/34.COM/10B. I would like to draw your attention that this report is divided into three parts regarding three regions: Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Europe and North America. Regarding the first region, Africa, I would like to invite the representative of the World Heritage Centre and the focal point coordinator to introduce this chapter.”

AFRICA

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais simplement très rapidement vous signaler que dans l'intitulé du document 10B, il y a le point sur le Programme AFRICA 2009 qui sera discuté dans un document séparé en point 10B. Avant de passer la parole à mon collègue, permettez-moi de faire quelques points sur la stratégie qui a été adoptée dans l'organisation de cet exercice pour la région Afrique.

Celui-ci consiste à impliquer le plus possible dans la coordination du processus, les experts des États parties qui ont déjà une connaissance prouvée du patrimoine mondial en Afrique et qui sont basés dans la région. C'est dans cette logique d'implication que le Dr. Abungu a été sollicité pour coordonner ce processus. Il est assisté de quatre facilitateurs sous-régionaux pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest, l'Afrique Centrale, l'Afrique Australe et l'Afrique de l'Est. Ils ont pour mission d'aider les États parties dans leurs efforts de remplissage du questionnaire en ligne en leur apportant des solutions et les éclaircissements aux problèmes qu'ils rencontrent, je passe maintenant la parole au Dr. Abungu ».

Dr. Abungu:

“Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee,

Since the launching of the periodic report exercise for Africa at the last session of the Committee, the region has organised the following meetings: A training workshop in September 2009 on the online periodic reporting tool for facilitators that took place in Paris to allow them to assist in a more efficient way the State Parties from the sub-region, and I would like to thank them for the work well done, as you will subsequently see.

The launching meeting was then held in Dakar, Senegal—and a big thank you to the Senegalese government—in January 2010 on the invitation of the same government, where 44 national focal points were invited to participate. On the initiative of the Government of South Africa, a consultation meeting was held in March 2010 for national focal points and site managers from South Africa thanks to the South African government. On the invitation of the government of Kenya a sub-regional meeting which brought together national focal points and site managers of Western, Central and Eastern Africa was also organised in Nairobi in May 2010. Finally, the government of Cameroon hosted a sub-regional meeting for national focal points and site managers from francophone and lusophone African countries, which took place in June 2010.

These meetings, Mr. Chairman, were unique opportunities to discuss matters related to the filling of the report, as well as important issues to address in future. I can recall many issues that included the management system for many African sites, assistance to States in conflict areas, establishing strategies for sustainable development around sites, addressing climate change issues and putting in place a framework for prioritisation of programmes taking place in the region of Africa.

More than that Mr. Chairman, these meetings have provided opportunities to realise that lusophone countries could not easily fill these questionnaires, as they can only be filled in French and English. However, thanks to the generous contribution of the government of Switzerland, a Portuguese translation was made available. We are now happy to realise that other regions also involved in the periodic reporting exercise will benefit from this translation tool. I am happy to say that, as of today, 44 national focal points and 80 site managers have been given access to online questionnaires in Africa. 40 State Parties have progressed well

in filling section 1, section 2 is currently being filled by 70 properties, as we realised only 18 took part in the last questionnaire that took place six years ago.

The deadline set by the African group for completing and submitting the questionnaire is September 30, 2010. Mr. Chairman, you will also recall that at the time of the launching of this cycle only eight properties had statements of Outstanding Universal Value in the whole continent of Africa. The meetings we organised have also been an opportunity to have sessions on the preparation of retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value with technical assistance and support from IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM and many thanks to them. We want to thank the Advisory Bodies and through these meetings the situation is as follows as of today:

- We have 60 statements of Outstanding Universal Value that have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre from the continent.
- There are 43 of them that are currently under review by the various Advisory Bodies.
- 14 have and are possibly to be approved in this meeting that we are currently holding.
- A further deadline set for submitting all retrospective statements is August 30, 2010.

In order to complete the periodic reporting consultation meeting, Africa still plans the following meeting: In September 2010, a sub regional meeting for Southern Africa in Windhoek, Namibia will take place. In October 2010, there will be a workshop to analyse the results of these questionnaires. The workshop will bring to us a group of professionals composed of facilitators that have been mentioned by my colleague, focal points, and site managers representing all the regions. We expect the meeting to result in identifying key issues that will form part of the report that will lead to an action plan for our region. There will be a final meeting in Johannesburg in South Africa in February 2011, where discussions and issues to be included in the final report will be presented to the 44 focal points for their assessments and recommendations. We expect to present the final report of the African periodic exercise during the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee in Bahrain in 2011.

Finally Mr. Chairman and on behalf on the African region I would like to express our gratitude to all the countries, institutions, the Advisory Bodies and experts that have assisted in this noble venture. In particular Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the African World Heritage Fund, Switzerland, Norway, the Netherlands, South Africa and France for their financial support for the organisation of all the meetings that have been planned or held and are in the process of being done. I would also like to thank ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM, EPA and others for their technical support. I would also like to thank Senegal, Kenya, Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa for taking the initiative to host these meetings, and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for their assistance in facilitating this exercise together with the African State Parties.

Mr. Chairman, I have especially chosen this picture of a child to end this presentation, not only because World Heritage is about transmitting this vision for future generations but also because she looks determined to ensure that this exercise will produce results that will be beneficial to Africa and the world at large. This may not have been a very good year for Africa Mr. Chairman, but we as a global community should not lose hope. Together we can, and we will be able to address the challenges facing all of us. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I open the floor for members of the Committee to voice their views and comments. South Africa, you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. South Africa would like to express its appreciation to the Secretariat for the clear and concise report on the progress with the preparation for the periodic reporting exercise for Africa. I feel very proud reading the report and I would like to say that Africa is well on track to meet the various deadlines in this regard. Following the previous periodic report for Africa, the Africa Group has established the African World Heritage Fund. We hope that the second cycle of periodic reporting will further strengthen and enhance conservation, management and recognition of the African World Heritage. Thank you for the report.”

The Chairperson:

“I do not see any further requests for intervention, so with your permission I would like to draw your attention to the fact that for each of the regions we have to adopt a Draft Decision. For the African region we have Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.1. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.1 is on page 3 of both the English and French versions of the document. I have received draft amendments from Sweden and Mali which concern paragraph 4 and 5 of the current Draft Decision. In paragraph 4 Mali suggests to revise the current formulation by the following text, and I am reading in English according to the original language submission:

4. Commends the States Parties of the Africa region which have hosted meetings in the Periodic Reporting exercise, in particular Senegal, Kenya, Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa, for their active involvement.

Paragraph 5 is both amended by Sweden and Mali to thank additional partners and I have taken the liberty to merge the two lists and it would then read:

5. Thanks the Governments of Switzerland, Norway, the Netherlands, France, and South Africa, as well as the African World Heritage Fund and the Nordic World Heritage Foundation for their financial and technical support.

Further, Mali suggests introducing a new paragraph 5bis which would then read:

Also thanks the Advisory Bodies and regional training institutions in Africa for their support and encourages them to continue to assist the process.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not think that we need to re-read the paragraphs. Mali, you have the floor.”

Mali:

« C'est une annonce et non un commentaire. Pour donc vous annoncer que dans le cadre du soutien au Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'Afrique, le Mali a fait une contribution symbolique de 20 000 \$ US ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Mali. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.1**? I see none. It is adopted.

Let's move on to the second region, Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). The floor is to the Secretariat."

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The Secretariat:

"Thank you Chair. According to the Decision taken previously in Quebec province, the World Heritage Centre continues the follow up of the first cycle of the periodic reporting exercise. During 2009 the preparation of the second cycle to be launched in 2011 for our region was started.

A workshop was organised in Buenos Aires in November 2009 for the focal points of all LAC countries. The representatives from 24 countries were briefed on future activities regarding the launching of the second cycle of the reporting exercise for the region and the calendar of activities for 2010-2015. The Spanish Funds-in-Trust Heritage co-financed partly some of the meetings and contributed to the official translation into the Spanish language of all related documents.

The participants were also briefed in the preparation of the retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value. In the Latin America and the Caribbean region the number of declaration that needs to be prepared is 116, which represents 96 percent of all the properties inscribed. By the end of July 2010, 77 percent of all the statements were received by the World Heritage Centre and we would like to take this opportunity to thank all the State Parties involved. The two Category Centres in Zacatecas and Rio de Janeiro will assist and support the member States in the region for the implementation of the World Heritage policies. Both of them will play a very important role in supporting the periodic reporting exercise.

Six sub- regional meetings, two per sub-region, for a total of 25 focal points and 121 site managers, are to be organised between 2010 and 2011. In the Caribbean, the meetings will be held in Barbados and in the Dominican Republic in 2010-2011. The meeting in Barbados will also be a platform to discuss the implementation of the Small Islands Developing States Programme in the Caribbean and the possibility of establishing a Caribbean World Heritage Fund. Other meetings are already foreseen for Category 2 Centres and meetings in Costa Rica and Lima are foreseen.

We take advantage of all of those meetings to raise and to go deeper in the reflection of some key issues so far for our work and the way in which the Latin America and the Caribbean region implements the World Heritage Convention. We took advantage of these meetings to go ahead with discussion focused on a tentative List of Cultural goods, comparative analysis and unfortunately on Disaster Risk Management Plans, since you are all well aware that our region has suffered very, very dramatic damages from human and

climatic disasters. You remember the case of Haiti, Machu Picchu discussed over the last several days and the case of Quirigua in Guatemala. We will have time later to discuss emergency assistance request. The Draft Decision is on page 9 on the English version and 10 of the French version of document 10B. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor to the members of the Committee for comments. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. Brazil, first of all would like to thank the Secretariat for its report and for the presentation that was just made. I have a request for clarification. On page 6 of the English document you mention two meetings in 2011, including the one in Rio de Janeiro is to take place from 7 to 11 December, not 25-27 November. Brazil would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Spanish Funds-in-Trust which financed the translation into Spanish and I would like to ask the Secretariat to make an effort to ensure that those documents are also translated into Portuguese in the future. Because we talked about Africa a few minutes ago, I would also like to thank the Swiss Government which financed the translation into Portuguese for the Portuguese speaking countries in Africa. Finally Mr. Chairman, I will be asking for the floor again when we will talk about the Draft Decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Of course Brazil you may. Mexico you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you very much Chair. We would also like to congratulate and thank the Secretariat for this wonderful report on our region. We would like to reiterate that we are working very closely with the World Heritage Centre. That work is being reflected through the Category 2 Centres that have been set up in Rio and Zacatecas. Mexico is carrying out a great deal of intensive work concerning the periodic report and we will continue our close work with the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Barbados, you have the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. Through you, I would like to thank the Centre for this detailed report. We look forward to an expansion of the programme and the closer involvement of regional members of the World Heritage *Convention* and a better development of capacity in order to manage sites, because this tends to be a very minimal aspect of our work in the region.

Barbados intends to take forward however initiatives which relates to both SIDS and Caribbean countries because we find there is a need to examine very closely what are the implications for SIDS countries in the application of the Guidelines in respect to the

management and conservation of this site. So, we are looking forward to a closer examination of the issues in the Barbados meeting which outcomes we tend to take forward to the Bahrain meeting to seek and to draw some useful conclusions for the World Heritage Committee as a result. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The Secretariat has no further comment. Let’s then proceed to the examination of Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.2 and the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Decision 10B.2 is on page 9 of the English and French versions of the document and I have not received any written amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Brazil, you said you wanted the floor earlier so it’s yours.”

Brazil :

“Thank you Chair. It was just a clarification of paragraph 8 where you ask the State Parties to *submit the required retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value to the World Heritage Centre by 31 July 2010*. Unfortunately, that date has been and gone, so Brazil would like to propose an amendment to that date. Could we say December 31, 2010?”

The Chairperson:

“Secretariat, would you like to answer?”

The Secretariat:

“In fact, that was the deadline officially established in the meeting in Buenos Aires. As I said 70 percent of the draft declarations have been already submitted. We know that some of the countries have a lot of sites and the work implicates transboundary work, so we have foreseen that it may take until the end of the year. This is not a problem and the Secretariat has contacted these countries and the Advisory Bodies to have a clearer progress of the submission. There is no problem, and thank you for keeping in mind that some of the countries did not attend this deadline and it is possible to change this date according to the proposal of the Brazilian authorities. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.2** as amended? I see none. It is adopted, thank you.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Let’s move to the last part of point 10B and I give the floor to the Secretariat for the presentation of the report on North America and Europe region.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. I would like to refer to section 3 of the document in front of you and I take the opportunity to thank the national authorities for past and future meetings, because, even at this session we received some offers. We also benefited from some very lively lunchtime events and I would like to share with you Mr. President that our biggest worry for the northern hemisphere is that we deal with more than 400 retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Values. So, since our report was adopted, in 2006, we have never stopped working. With this I would like to refer to the Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, this was effective. Are there any requests from the members of the Committee for the floor? No, so we are starting with the examination of the Draft Decision, the floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Draft Decision 10B.3 is on page 11 of both the English and French versions of your document. I have received one written amendment submitted by the Delegations of Estonia, Sweden and Switzerland. It concerns paragraphs 4 and 5 of the current Draft Decision.

In paragraph 4 it is suggested to delete the last part of the sentence behind *Mediterranean sub region in 2010*. The part that is deleted would be: *welcomes the offer of the Czech authorities to host the meeting for Central, eastern and South-Western Europe in 2011*. The reason being is that the next paragraph would be inserted between paragraphs 4 and 5 and would read as follows:

Welcomes the offer of the Czech authorities to host a meeting for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe in 2011; the offer of the Estonian authorities to host a meeting for the Nordic-Baltic region in October 2010; the offer of the Maltese authorities to host a meeting for the Mediterranean region in 2011; and the offer of the authorities of the Netherlands to host a meeting for the Western European Region in December 2010; and encourages cooperation and sharing of knowledge between the European sub-regions.

Then current paragraph 5 is suggested to be amended with an addition at the end of the paragraph so that it would read, and I start from the last word of the existing paragraph:

of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting; and notes with concern the workload connected with this request in relation to the resources of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for processing the Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value as it is crucial for the States Parties to have them approved on time.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I do not think that there is any need for further reading. Any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 10B.3** as amended? I see none. It is adopted.

ITEM 10C. Progress Report on the first cycle of the Periodic Reporting and launching of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting in Asia and the Pacific

Document WHC-10/34.COM/10C

Decision: 34 COM 10 C

Moving on to next item 10C, launching of the second cycle of periodic reporting in Asia and the Pacific. I would like to invite Mr. Giovanni Boccardi to introduce this item.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. The document 10C is divided into two parts. The first part describes the progress made in implementing activities stemming from the Action Plans agreed as a result of the first cycle of periodic reporting process which for Asia and the Pacific took place in 2003. All these plans are accessible online from our website and the relevant links are provided in our document. The picture is rather positive, although, much of course remains to be done.

In Asia, progress has been made in terms of developing a tentative List and inscribing properties on the World Heritage List. You can see some figures on the slide. A large numbers of conservation initiatives are also ongoing on many countries of the region (Afghanistan, Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, the five central Asian Republics, Iran, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Indonesia and others).

Finally, capacity building has advanced through a number of workshops and the development of materials, thanks also to the establishment and active involvement of the Category 2 Centre World Heritage Institute for Training and Research for Asia Pacific in China. In the Pacific, annual regional meetings have taken place regularly over the past years with support from Australia, New Zealand, and French Polynesia among others, which have enabled the building of capacities and the development of a network of experts from the region. This has been complemented by several country-based activities that have led to the submission of a tentative List and nominations. The last few years have seen a surge of inscription from sites of the region, after so many years of preparatory work. This year the Committee has inscribed four more.

At the last regional meeting in French Polynesia an Action Plan was also developed by the State Parties of the region, which is accessible from a web link provided in your document. This includes interesting proposals such as the development of a regional hub to be originally based in the UNESCO regional Office in Samoa to facilitate communication, training resources and mobilisation. With support from Australia, the Centre is working to prepare a scoping study on how this hub could actually work in practice.

The second part of the document describes the strategy proposed for the implementation of the World Heritage Centre’s second cycle of the periodic reporting which the Committee is supposed to officially launch this year. Given the very short time and taking into account the Committee’s request that by the time the periodic report is presented the statements of Outstanding Universal Value for all the sites of the region are approved, the Centre has decided to move forward with the organisation of three sub-regional meetings for the Pacific, East, West and South Asia which have already taken place, as I mentioned, in Polynesia, in China and India for West and South Asia. These meetings have been organised with the support of the host countries, which I would like to thank. In these meetings, national focal points have been trained and detailed work plans developed for the follow-up, including on the retrospective inventory.

The follow up consists of, among other activities, a series of national and cluster workshops which are aimed at assisting State Parties in drafting the retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Values, 166 of which need to be prepared and submitted by February 1, 2011.¹ This shows you the overall scope of the exercise. You can see the retrospective inventory, which must be carried out, then draft statements of the Outstanding Universal Value for properties inscribed after 2006. Periodic reporting section 1 for all countries and section 2 for those that have sites inscribed on the List after 2006. The second picture shows the timeframe with February 2011, as the deadline for the submission of Draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value, is end of July 2011 for the submission and filling of the questionnaires and December 1, 2011, for the submission of the requested cartographic information in the context of the retrospective inventory.

As mentioned by my colleagues previously, one should note that this exercise exceeds considerably the allocation made for it by the Committee under the World Heritage Fund and the amount of UNESCO under its regular programme. Another challenge we are facing is of course the capacity of the system, including the Advisory Bodies, to absorb the very high number of Outstanding Universal Value Statements, which are expected to be submitted, reviewed and adopted. The Draft Decision is on page 7 of the English version and 8 of the French version. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor to the Committee for comments. I hope that you are still awake and not too tired. Let’s then move to the examination of Draft Decision 34 COM 10C. I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. The Draft Decision is on page 7 of the English and page 8 of the French versions of document 10C. I have not received any written amendments. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM.10C**? I see none. It is adopted.

ITEM 10D. FINAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFRICA 2009 PROGRAMME

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/10D
Decision 34 COM 10D

The Chairperson:

Next item on the agenda is 10D, the final report on the implementation of the AFRICA 2009 Programme. I invite Mr. King from ICCROM, a representative of the World Heritage Centre and Ms. Prins-Solani, Director of the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa to introduce this item.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. This is the second time I have had the opportunity to address you in a very short time. Today I guess is capacity building day. This presentation is on the AFRICA 2009 Programme which started in 1998 and came to a successful conclusion at the end of 2009. The Programme was a partnership with ICCROM, the World Heritage Centre, CRAterre based in Grenoble France and with the two regional institutions for training, the *École du Patrimoine Africain* in Benin and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa, located in Mombassa, Kenya.

I would also like to thank our financial partners for the Programme, which included SIDA through the Swedish National Board, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Norway, of Finland and of Italy, in addition to the World Heritage Fund and ICCROM. These development organisations came together to provide enough funding to make sure it was able to go along the entire length from 1998 until 2009. Having that stable basis of funding helped us to be able to focus on the activities and the results of the Programme rather than having to search for Fund raising year after year. I would like to give a strong thank you to the backers of the Programme.

The objective of the Programme was to improve the conditions for the preservation of immovable cultural heritage in sub-Saharan Africa. Those objectives were meant to be met through focusing on training of professionals; through creating a better awareness of cultural heritage; through building a strong network of professionals and finally through strengthening the training institutions that existed in the region.

I would like to present some of the results of the Programme. In relation with training activities of the Programme, you see that we carried out eleven regional courses over the twelve years of the Programme and an additional seven courses on particular technical subjects. Through that, it means that we trained over 350 professionals, and I am happy to say that over the course of the Programme we continued to use more and more African resource people to teach in these courses. And we reached a point where we had over 85 percent of the resource people coming from Sub-Sahara and the rest of Africa.

In addition, we made sure that course participants, who had been involved in the courses, moved forward and became involved in the courses, as course assistants and, eventually, as resource people. The idea again being to strengthen the capacity not just by training people, but also by getting them involved in training themselves. Here, you see that when we talk about 350 professionals we are talking about people. These are pictures of all the courses that took place and you can see that a large number of professionals from the region attended our courses.

In addition to those courses, we also carried out a series of seminars and meetings on a variety of themes, such as legal frameworks, and we had two special seminars, one on the topic of heritage conservation and how it can be used in the fight against HIV aids. We had a second one on heritage and poverty alleviation. These were two very important aspects linking heritage conservation to sustainable development, things that we consider as being very, very important.

In the area of research, we were able to carry out a certain number of projects which led to publications. You see three of them here, one related to traditional conservation practices, and two on the legal framework, both for English speaking countries and one for French speaking ones. We also had other research projects; for example, on the conservation of Rock Art and dry stone construction.

One of the biggest successes of the Programme is the issue of networking. If I look around the room and I see people that are now members of the World Heritage Committee,

that are also members of Delegations that come from sub-Saharan Africa; most of those people are part of our network. They have been trained in AFRICA 2009 activities or they have been resource people in AFRICA 2009 activities or they served on the Steering Committee of the Programme and etc. This network of over 4,000 people in total is now very strong and there is now very much activity. Even though the Programme has come to a conclusion, this network is still very strong. It is still being used by Heritage Institutions in the region, by ICCROM, by the World Heritage Centre and others. I think we can point to that as one of the biggest success of the Programme: The fact we have been able to create and strengthen this very large network.

Finally, in addition to activities at the regional level, we also did work on individual sites. I know that the wording is too small for people to read here, but the point is to say that we worked on quite a number of sites in Sub-Saharan Africa over time and the projects varied. Some of them were actual physical conservation works, some of them were developments of management plans, some were on interpretation and promotion of sites, and others were on maintenance plans. So, there were a variety of activities on the sites that we did. Of course, this was very important for us, because we learnt lessons from the sites we worked on and were able to carry them back to the regional activities and courses.

Mr. Chairman, I would like, through you, to ask my colleague to speak more specifically about the Programme and its benefits for the World Heritage system.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci. À travers ce Programme et les formations qui ont été organisées, celui-ci a eu un impact considérable sur les activités des États parties liés à la Convention du patrimoine mondial. Au total sept sites ont été inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial parmi les 35 projets qui ont été organisés et cela a été possible grâce aux formations reçues par les professionnels des différentes institutions en charge de la gestion du patrimoine culturel en Afrique.

En termes de conservation et de gestion, plusieurs plans de gestion sur les sites des biens du patrimoine mondial ont été préparés et de nombreux travaux de conservation ont été effectués sur les biens qui sont inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. J'ai déjà parlé des questions liées au rapport périodique, je voudrais simplement signaler, Monsieur le Président, que le rapport périodique actuel de l'Afrique est mis en œuvre grâce à la participation de nombreux professionnels qui ont été formés par AFRICA 2009 et je vais maintenant passer la parole à Madame Prins-Solani pour l'après AFRICA 2009 ».

Ms. Prins- Solani:

“Distinguished Chair,
Distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee,

Thank you very much for providing us with the opportunity of presenting to you the working progress, the ideas, and the objectives for a Programme following AFRICA 2009. Just in terms of background, the institutions that have been working on this post AFRICA 2009 Programme have been led by ICCROM—which also gave birth to the institutions EPA and CHDA—the African World Heritage Fund has participated in this discussion, AFRICA 2009 partners, as well as others that have been drawn in the conservation. I would like to stress that this is a work in progress and we would very much welcome inputs from yourselves, as well as other institutions that have, as yet, not been brought into the discussion and conversation.

In terms of the programme design process, we believe that an effective strategy needs to be informed by needs. Thereby a need assessment was conducted in 2008, across the African region, to look at what further issues needed to be addressed in a future programme. Some of those were tested at the AFRICA 2009 directors' seminar in Mombassa, Kenya. A programme design process continued until 2009 and earlier this year. We also used the opportunity of meeting with site managers and directors through the periodic reporting process to inform on the needs that would be addressed through this follow up programme.

Some of the needs that have been identified:

1) The optimisation and continuation education and training of the AFRICA 2009 network of professionals. We all know that education and development is ongoing and that needs and issues change as contexts change. We believe that through this network that has been mentioned by my colleagues, we need to continue this development to its highest level.

2) The next issue that has been identified is Heritage and Sustainable Development creating better livelihood and better conservation as twins, as these are not two issues that could be separated from each other.

3) Better conservation management planning of all systems.

4) The integration between cultural and natural heritage as opposed to the previous Programme, where the focus was largely on cultural heritage, we see the need for a combination and integration between the two.

5) The last one contributes to the Global Strategy on World Heritage for Africa.

The proposed aim for the new Programme is to identify and promote opportunities for sustainable development in communities in Africa through the effective conservation, management and use of heritage resources using the framework of the World Heritage *Convention*. Please allow me not to go through specific objectives because of time, but suffice to say that the objectives aim at ensuring that through the training programme, heritage professionals, as well as custodians who may not be heritage professionals, but would be members of community chiefs and etc. would benefit through the benefit of the use of heritage resources in wealth creation.

What we are proposing through this programme is that we want to move beyond the jars of honey sold in a museum shop which is visited by ten people for two weeks or in a month, as a form of saying 'This is how we can generate sustainable development resources in Africa.' We are saying we want to move beyond that, we want to ensure that there is wealth creation and not only address issues of poverty alleviation.

The principles and approaches:

- Local communities are the key focal point and stakeholders for all our activities. Sustainable development within an integrated approach with heritage which will mean that heritage professionals and custodians are enabled to work with people, State Parties and stakeholders beyond the heritage sector.
- Maintenance of a cyclical relationship between theory and fieldwork and a constructive dialogue between African heritage practices and international standards.

Please allow me to conclude by saying that we thank you for this opportunity for presenting and we are calling upon Parties here for partnerships. The AFRICA 2009 has

shown the power and effectiveness of multiple partnerships across disciplines and we are also calling upon your support in resource mobilisation. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now invite members State to make comments. Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you Chairperson. Sweden is very pleased with the final report covering the period 1998-2009. It makes it obvious that the AFRICA 2009 Programme has had a positive impact on management of heritage in Africa and has helped to produce nominations on the World Heritage List of high quality. Sweden also feels proud to have been a donor to the Programme. The aspirations of the two institutions *École du Patrimoine Africain* and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa to continue a programme along the lines of AFRICA 2009 is very welcome. We support the Draft Decision fully. Thank you Mr. Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sweden. South Africa you have the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. In line with Sweden we want to express our appreciation for the report and achievement of this important AFRICA 2009 Programme. We also appreciate the contributions that have been made by various partners and contributors and Advisory Bodies. We have been listening with interest on the proposed plans for the following programme being designed by EPA and CHDA and by other African Heritage Institutions that is scheduled to go through until 2020. Based on that, Chairperson, I would like to say that we have submitted an amendment to the rapporteur to include other points that can be dealt with at a later stage.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mali you have the floor.”

Mali :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais juste apporter un témoignage en tant que membre fondateur d'AFRICA 2009, mais aussi membre du Comité de coordination. Cette institution a été créée en 1998 à Abidjan, nous avons été un des membres fondateurs de cette création, un des animateurs et aussi membre du Comité de coordination de 1998 à 2001. Vous avez pu vérifier à travers ces exposés les immenses efforts réalisés à travers ce Programme.

Je voudrais tout simplement revenir sur ce qui a été dit et exprimé qu'AFRICA 2009 nous a légué un patrimoine extrêmement lourd, intéressant en termes de documentation, de recherche, mais aussi de mise en œuvre de réseaux de professionnels africains dans le patrimoine. Je voudrais, avec votre permission, rapporter l'importance d'un programme

ambitieux pour l'Afrique, mais qui va beaucoup contribuer à la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* sur le continent africain. Je remercie au passage tous les partenaires qui ont accompagné le Programme AFRICA 2009 depuis sa création jusqu'à la fin de la première formule et j'invite les uns et les autres à renforcer et accompagner ce programme pour la suite. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Je ne vois pas d'autres demandes de prise de parole, donc avec votre permission nous allons passer à l'examen du Projet de Décision. La parole est à notre rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. The Draft Decision is on page 6 of both language versions of the document. I have received two amendments by the Delegation of South Africa, which concern the introduction of two new paragraphs. One new paragraph would be introduced between current paragraphs 7 and 8 and this new paragraph would read:

Welcomes the offer of the Governments of Australia and Senegal to organize an expert meeting in Dakar, Senegal in mid April 2011 on strategies to address global state of conservation challenges, with a focus on Africa, and also requests a report on the outcomes of the meeting at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2011.

South Africa also suggests the introduction of a new paragraph 9 at the end of the Decision which reads:

Requests the World Heritage Centre to report to the 35th session of the Committee in 2011 on the proposed framework and modalities for the new Africa 2020 programme.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 10D**? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

Now I give the floor to the Secretariat for a statement regarding Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Très rapidement c'est un point d'information que le Secrétariat souhaite partager avec vous, en vous informant que le guide pour la préparation rétrospective des déclarations des Valeurs universelles exceptionnelles, si important pour aider les États parties à les rédiger, est disponible. Ce guide a été préparé par les Organisations consultatives et le Secrétariat est désormais disponible en français, en anglais, en espagnol, en portugais grâce au généreux soutien du gouvernement de la Suisse qui nous a permis de le traduire dans ces quatre langues. Ce document sera mis en ligne sur le site du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO et il est distribué actuellement en version papier à l'extérieur de cette salle ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Next item on the agenda is regarding Item 11, protection of the Palestinian Cultural and Natural Heritage and I am going to leave my place to a new vice-chair.”

ITEM 11: PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Document WHC-10/34.COM/11

Decision: 34 COM 11

The Vice chair (hereafter referred as The Chairperson):

“Good afternoon everybody to whom I did not see. We proceed with Item 11, the report on the Protection of the Palestinian Cultural and Natural Heritage. Please refer to document WHC10/34/COM/11, and I am inviting Madame Veronique Dauge from the World Heritage Centre to introduce the report.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci madame. Depuis la 26^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, le Comité accorde un soutien aux institutions palestiniennes en charge du patrimoine culturel et naturel grâce à une allocation financière du Fonds du patrimoine mondial. Le document 11 qui vous est présenté résume les activités menées depuis la dernière session du Comité, conjointement par le département des Antiquités palestinien et le bureau de l'UNESCO à Ramallah qui les associent au projet financé par des fonds extra budgétaires généreusement alloués à ce bureau notamment par les gouvernements de l'Italie, de la Norvège, des Pays-Bas, de l'Espagne dans le cadre des fonds pour les objectifs du millénaire, ainsi que la Commission européenne.

Je citerai simplement quelques projets, la proposition d'un projet pour une inscription éventuelle de Bethléem, le plan de conservation et de gestion de la région de Bethléem qui a commencé en 2007 et arrive à son terme. ^[diapo] Les études sur les paysages culturels et en particulier l'élaboration d'un dossier d'inscription éventuel pour le site de Battir, la poursuite du projet de présentation de la grande salle des thermes de Jéricho et la protection des mosaïques que vous voyez ici. Dans le cadre de ce projet de Jéricho, l'architecte Peter Zumthor est en train de construire un abri pour les mosaïques. Enfin, la reconstruction et la restauration d'un ancien caravansérail dans la vieille ville de Naplouse pour finir avec des fouilles archéologiques et un projet de conservation et de mise en valeur du site Tell Balata à Naplouse. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to inform you that negotiations took place between the concerned Parties and they agreed on a consensus Decision. So, I propose not to open the debate, if you agree and I do not see anyone against. The floor is to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 11;Rev has been distributed to you in the room on a blue paper and I have not received any written amendment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Do you have any comments? No, so this **Draft Decision 34 COM 11.Rev** is approved. Thank you very much.”

ITEM 13: REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents WHC-10/34.COM/13 and WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev
Decision: 34 COM 13

The original Chair (hereafter referred as The Chairperson):

“Moving to Item 13 regarding the Revision of the Operational Guidelines. As you know we formed a Working Group to examine this item chaired by the permanent delegate of Switzerland to UNESCO, Ambassador Rodolphe Imhoof. The floor is yours.”

Switzerland:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. Ainsi que vous venez de le rappeler, le Comité du patrimoine mondial a décidé de créer un groupe de travail en qualité d'organe consultatif lors de sa 34^e session conformément à l'article 20 de son Règlement intérieur. Un groupe de travail ouvert à tous les États parties pour étudier le point 13 relatif à la révision des orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial.

Ce groupe de travail s'est réuni six fois pendant la 34^e session et a revu la partie 1 du document WHC10/34.COM/13 qui correspond au texte qui avait déjà été présenté à Séville et qui comprenait en plus les commentaires que les États parties avaient soumis pendant le premier semestre 2010. Ce matin, au cours de la sixième réunion, il a entamé l'étude de la partie 2 du document relative aux amendements présentés dans le cadre de réunions d'experts dont les conclusions n'avaient pas encore été débattues par le Comité.

À la lumière de ce qui précède, je propose, en ma qualité de Président, que le groupe de travail termine l'examen des amendements suggérés et présente le résultat global de ces travaux et un document consolidé pour approbation par le Comité à sa 35^e session en 2011. Cette proposition est reflétée dans le projet de Décision 34 COM 13.Rev, vous avez reçu, je crois, le texte et je demanderais au rapporteur de lire la proposition d'amendement du dernier paragraphe. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to our rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. Draft Decision 34 COM 13.Rev has been distributed to you in both languages on a blue sheet of paper and I have since the distribution received two amendments on this Draft Decision, one from The Chairperson of the working group which concerns a small modification at the end of the paragraph. Can I confirm that the amendment is from The Chairperson or from the Swiss Delegation?”

Switzerland:

“It is from the Swiss and Swedish Delegations.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I also have an amendment from Jordan concerning the introduction of a new paragraph 5. The revised paragraph 4 at the end would delete the phrase *on serial nominations* and then the last part of the sentence and I start at the beginning of the line, would read as follows:

and the recommendations of the international expert meeting presented in section II of Document WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev.

The amendment of Jordan introduces a new paragraph 5 which would read as follows:

5. Recalling 31 COM 8A.3 and 32 COM 8A concerning tentative lists, requests the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies to propose a revision of Part II.C (Tentative Lists) of the Operational Guidelines in order to clarify the procedures of technical analysis by the World Heritage Centre and to ensure that properties proposed on the tentative lists are consistent with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Perhaps I repeat this a second time, since it is a bit lengthy. New paragraph 5 at the proposal of Jordan reads as follow:

5. Recalling Decisions 31 COM 8A.3 and 32 COM 8A concerning tentative lists, requests the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies to propose a revision of Part II.C (Tentative Lists) of the Operational Guidelines in order to clarify the procedures of technical analysis by the World Heritage Centre and to ensure that properties proposed on the tentative lists are consistent with properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like to invite members of the Committee to express their comments on the report read by the Ambassador and the Draft Decision.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président, juste une toute petite précision dans notre amendement du paragraphe 4. On devrait dire *faites par les réunions d'experts* donc *expert meetings* parce qu'il s'agit de plusieurs réunions auxquelles on a fait référence. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Switzerland. Rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“I will then repeat the last part of paragraph 4 with the Swiss amendment:

and the recommendations of the international expert meetings presented in section II of Document WHC-10/34.COM/13.Rev.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“I would like to express the disappointment of the Delegation of Brazil in that we are unable to discuss this matter here in this meeting and the reasons expressed by the Working group: I would suggest that in the Draft agenda at the next meeting we have a guarantee that we will have enough time for discussion, given the importance of the proposed amendment to the Operational Guidelines. Thank you very much Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The Secretariat takes note and now I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to warmly congratulate The Chairpersonman of the consultative group for its extensive effort in progressing this matter. We have certainly progressed beyond, with this complicated matter, where the subject was left last year. If we could just ask, through you, the World Heritage Centre for details of the working group, whether any details are known and perhaps flag Australia’s interest in further involvement in this issue.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Australia. Secretariat?”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Si j’ai bien compris votre question Australie, c’était quand se tiendrait ce groupe de travail sur la révision des Orientations. La proposition du Secrétariat, en accord avec notre Président du groupe de travail, serait à l’automne éventuellement au mois de novembre 2010 à Paris au siège de l’UNESCO ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Secretariat, no further comments from Australia. Let’s move to the adoption of this Decision.

Are there any objections to the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM13.Rev** as amended by Jordan and Switzerland? No. It is adopted. Thank you.

ITEM 16: PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2008-2009, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2010-11 BUDGET COVERING 01 JANUARY TO 31 MAY 2010.

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/16

Decision: **34 COM 16**

We are moving to Item 16 and during the examination of this item I hope Item 12 will be ready. Item 16 is on the report on the Presentation of the final accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2008-2009, the interim financial statement and the state of implementation of the 2010-11 budget covering 01 January to 31 May 2010. The documents under our consideration are WHC-10/34.COM/16 et ADD. I would also like to draw your attention to the Draft Decision referring to this item; both documents are being distributed in the room. I would like to give the floor to The Chairperson of the working group, the representative of Barbados.”

Barbados:

“Thank you Chair. I think the point that somebody made earlier that if you offer suggestions you have to be prepared to take the work, because this is a reluctant Chairperson and we look forward to see someone else in The Chairperson next year.

We had a very small group, but a collegial and hard working one. We completed our work in three sessions. We examined items before us and we were able to express our pleasure by the progress having been made by the Centre in their presentation of the budget and the articulation of the execution of that budget. We were not concentrated at all, as we were last year on how the information was presented, but in fact were able to point to one or two refinements in those areas that we would see more work on. But we were able to congratulate the Centre in respect to this.

With respect to item 5J on the audit of the World Heritage Centre: Again the State Parties were quite pleased with the attention being paid to the implementation of the recommendation by the Centre with respect to the external auditors’ report, but asked that particular attention be paid to furthering the work along these lines with respect to a number of items (monitoring extra budget funds, centralising more calls of funds). This is captured in paragraph 3.

To reiterate its concern with respect to the rapid appointment of the Deputy Director of Management for the World Heritage Centre and to pick up on its concerns with the recruitment concerns thereon.

Finally, we wanted to underscore the necessity for making sure that any partnerships that were entered into by the World Heritage Centre, did take knowledge of the *Convention*

provisions and were developed and executed in respect of balance between the interests of the different parties involved and ensuring that these were taken up in the future work of the centre in this respect.

There was also a concern expressed to ensure that future budgetary documents were set out in relation to certain areas of activities. This is the one part that we have not been able to finalise to the satisfaction of all, so it requires further work, but I believe detailed discussions took place between the state Party concerned and the Centre in order to reach a better understanding of what was required. This was captured in paragraph 7 of that Draft Decision.

I want to thank the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and indeed the States involved and I believe that we came to a satisfactory and rapid conclusion on our work. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any comments? The Secretariat would like to add further information.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to thank The Chairperson of the working group in managing the business of the working group in a very efficient and effective manner. I am available for any questions that the Committee might have on the Draft Decision or in fact any other issue raised in these two working documents.

With your permission Mr. Chair, I would also like to draw attention to another document, which is 34 COM.16.Add, which was not considered by the working group, because it is in a very early stage of development. This is just to show you work in progress and I would like to refer to the Decision which was taken at the 33rd session when the Centre was asked to explore options for equitable additional voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund. We have some preliminary exploration of these options which is presented in this document 34 COM16.Add, this is only for your information, and we are going to continue that exploration and come back at the next session with some draft proposals.

The second item I would like to draw your attention to is again a Decision from Seville, the 33rd Session of the Committee, when we were asked to indicate the budgetary implications of the World Heritage Committee’s decisions. What we have done is look at all the decisions that you have adopted from items 2 to 8 and we looked at what the financial implications might be of those decisions and we have come out with a figure of about US\$2,312,000 for the present. There are still more items to be discussed and adopted and we will give you a final indication of the figure at the end of the session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. With your permission, I would like to give the floor to our rapporteur for the examination of both Draft Decision 34 COM 5G.Rev and 34 COM 16.Rev.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Both Draft Decisions have been distributed in the room on a blue paper and I have not received any amendments to either of them. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Do you have any comments regarding these Draft Decisions? No, so **Draft Decisions 34 COM 5G Rev** and **34 COM 16.Rev** are adopted.

I am asking if Item 12 is ready yet. France, you have the floor.”

France :

« Juste un mot pour remercier, au nom des États qui ont participé au groupe de travail sur le budget et la question du rapport de l'auditeur externe, la présidente de notre groupe de travail. Ce n'était pas un travail facile, elle a montré une fois de plus sa mæstria pour diriger nos travaux ».

ITEM 15: EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Document WHC-10/34.COM/15 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.15

Decision: 34 COM 15.1 and 15.2

The Chairperson:

“*Merci à vous.* So we will move to Item 15 regarding the examination of international assistance request and I invite Mr Guy Debonnet from the World Heritage Centre to introduce this item.”

The Secretariat:

“As an introduction, I would like to remind the Committee that the provisions for the granting of international assistance of the World Heritage Fund are laid out in the Operational Guidelines, paragraphs 223 to 227. I would like to briefly recall some important points for discussion.

State Parties, with arrears payments of their contributions to the World Heritage Centre are not eligible for international assistance. This provision does not apply for emergency assistance. According to the Operational Guidelines, emergency assistance may be granted to properties that have suffered severe damage or are in imminent danger of collapse due to sudden phenomena.

I also want to recall that, as mentioned in your working document, funds available for emergency assistance for approval by the Committee are US\$350,700. The total amount for request for approval by the committee is US\$848,353. The total amount recommended for approval by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies are US\$240,688 and the funds available on the preparatory assistance and conservation and management are US\$561,740, of which US\$381,326 is reserved for cultural heritage and US\$180,504 for natural heritage.

With your permission I would go for the first request. The first request we want to propose for emergency assistance is Madagascar for the property of the Rainforests of Atsinanana; the requested amount is US\$324,307. In February 2010, an international assistance request was submitted by Madagascar National Parks through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry to meet the various threats to the Rainforest of Atsinanana. The Committee will remember that the property was inscribed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger earlier in this session.

The first version of this request has been subjected to various comments from the Secretariat and IUCN as laid out in your document. It was also noted that the request did not meet the criteria for emergency assistance, as defined in the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, it had to be resubmitted under the window conservation and management which requires payment of arrears to the World Heritage Funds.

During the 9th extraordinary Session of the Committee on June 14, 2010, the Committee decided to postpone the consideration of the request pending the submission and review of a revised version. A revised request was received by the Secretariat on June 26, 2010. Like the previous application it was again submitted under the emergency assistance window. The Secretariat and IUCN still have a certain number of comments on this reformulated application which are laid out in your working document. The Secretariat and IUCN also conclude that a large scale action programme is necessary to meet the current threats to the property and that the financing of such a programme is not within the purview of international assistance.

However, given the current situation, urgent response is needed. Therefore the Secretariat's recommendation would be to approve funding for this request for emergency assistance to a maximum of US\$100,000 under the conservation and management window, subject to the payment of arrears by the State Party and in accordance with the following:

- An amount of US\$35,000 could be allocated to immediately assess the present situation of the two Parks that are threatened, before the organisation of the World Heritage centre-IUCN monitoring mission, which was requested previously during this session and an emergency plan could be defined jointly with the State Party and the stakeholders during this mission to establish corrective measures.
- A contribution of US\$65,000 could then be provided to the implementation of the Action Plan as seed money. The mission should also discuss modality for the implementation of activities and modalities for potential co-financing of this emergency plan by other institutions.

This recommendation is reflected on page 18 of your working document on the English version and page 19 of the French version. I also want to note that so far the arrears have not been paid by the State Party. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I open the floor for comments. Sweden you have the floor."

Sweden:

"Thank you Mr. Chair. Sweden supports the proposed decision, but we would like to stress that there is a need to assess how to channel this support, taking into account that the UN, as well as the African Union, have decided not to have any contact with the political authorities in Madagascar. We are of the opinion that the decision needs a short amendment to ensure that the support is efficient and will lead to desired results. We have proposed an amendment to this as sub-paragraph 3c. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Sweden. No further requests, so we move to the examination and adoption of the Draft Decision and the floor is to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. Draft Decision 15.1 is on page 8 of your document 15 and decision 15.2 can be found on page 19 of the two-language version. I have indeed received an amendment to Decision 15.2 by the Delegation of Sweden.

The proposal is to insert a sub-paragraph into paragraph 3 which would be placed between the current paragraphs c and d and would become a new c, and c, accordingly, would become a new d, and d a new e. The new paragraph c would read:

c) The support should be channelled through reliable and recognized organizations selected by the World Heritage Centre in communication with relevant authorities.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 15.1 as amended**? No. It is adopted. Thank you. Now the floor is to the Secretariat for the second request.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you Chair. The emergency assistance request was submitted to the World heritage Centre on April 26, 2010 for Valparaiso after the deadline of February 1, as set in paragraph 241 of the Operational Guidelines. This meant that normally this request should have been examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in Bahrain in 2011. However, as the need for emergency assistance is by definition unpredictable, it was felt that the deadline of February 1, for emergency assistance was somehow inappropriate. Accordingly the Draft Decision 15.1 proposed to amend paragraph 241 of the Operational Guidelines by removing the specified deadline for submission of emergency request. After an official request from the State Party and due to the emergency situation of Chile due to the earthquake, the World Heritage Centre decided to accept this request for examination by the World Heritage Committee, during this session.

The project consists of taking emergency actions oriented towards averting further building collapses and crumbling in favour of addressing the recovery of the most outstanding buildings of the property. Upon the request from the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, the State Party sent, on June 14, complimentary information including the CV's of the staff in charge of the emergency work, the technical chart with information of damage to each building, the level of damage, the actions to be undertaken, the description of each building as well as a detailed budget. The State Party has indicated that its technical staff will implement the diagnosis faced and monitor the structure consolidation and urgent intervention works.

The Secretariat considers that the State Party has clearly stated the priorities for intervention in the documentation and the action could be clearly focused on the buildings of the Matriz Church, the Cathedral of Valparaiso, the Guillermo Rivera Building, the Meyer Building and the Building in Bustamante Street. The total amount requested for these interventions is US\$140,000. The State Party has also expressed its agreement to elaborate a risk preparedness plan for Valparaiso. The request for a priority intervention of the Matriz Cathedral and the main buildings of the property is recommended for approval. The Draft Decision is on page 8 of the English version and 7 of the French version. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Mexico would like the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. First of all I would like to express our gratitude that has been submitted to our attention and obviously to express our moral support to the people of Chile for the horrible earthquake that struck them at the beginning of the year. Also, if it is possible, we would like to hear what the State Party has to say on this particular subject and especially regarding the work on the Cathedral of Valparaiso. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is the representative of the State Party in the room? You have the floor Sir.”

Chile :

“Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to thank the Committee for the consent shown to my country. The earthquake reach 8 on the Richter scale, the damage brought was immense and we are seeking assistance for this region, which is the heart of the City of Valparaiso.

We had a fantastic dialogue with the people from the World Heritage Centre and this will help us in tackling the most urgent things which we need to do immediately without any further delay, so if you have any other questions, I would be happy to answer them, but this is an icon to us, this is part of our history and, as you can see from the photograph in the technical report it is a fractured building. It is our first priority together with the other buildings mentioned. We need to start work on this as quickly as possible. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Sir. Are there any further requests for intervention or objections regarding the adoption of Draft Decision 34 COM 15.1? I seen none, the **Draft Decision 34 COM 15.1** is adopted.

**ITEM 12: REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*
(Continuation)**

We still have Items 12 and 14. The Secretariat just informed that the report on Item 12 is ready and has been printed. So, I give the floor to the representative of Australia regarding the Working Group on the Future of the *Convention*.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. Can I just clarify first with the Secretariat? There are two decisions that came out of the working group, one in relation to Item 12A.1 and one related to Item 5. Would you like one or both of those presentations. If I may start in that case with Item 5F.1.

This relates to tourism, but before I go into the details of that, can I just explain the reasons why there are two decisions coming out of the working group? The reason is that the working group was actually tasked to look at several items: To look at the tourism issues contained in agenda Item 5F which was the report on the World Heritage Centre thematic programmes, but also to look at Item 12A on the agenda and Item 14.

In the work of the group we considered Item 5F on tourism separately and that is what I briefly outline now. By way of background, the working group met seven times formally. It was a consultative group open to all State Parties, Advisory Bodies and other Observers. There were around one hundred attendees and perhaps more, given that at one point we met in this room, so it was hard to keep track. Some 40-50 different State Parties were represented at various points as well as the Advisory Bodies and Category 2 Centres.

Can I record enormous gratitude for the several informal consultations that took place? Ms. Lu Chong from China and Mr. Inger Liliequist from Sweden undertook particular consultations on items in relation with the tourism set of issues. The Draft Decision on tourism recognizes that the tourism sector is large, diverse and is growing fast and poses some challenges in relation to World Heritage in a two-way relationship. Tourism clearly offers enormous benefits, but if not managed well it can pose serious challenges for sites. By way of background, the World Heritage Centre has had a tourism programme since 2001. One of the documents before us was an evaluation of that programme, a very good evaluation carried out by the United Nations Foundation.

As the Convention approaches its 40th anniversary, one of the initiatives from last year established for the first time a baseline on tourism. The Chinese government was the generous host of a meeting on sustainable tourism held last year in Mogao. The outcomes of that meeting have established basic policy orientations that define the relationship between heritage and tourism. These orientations are important and are attached to the Draft Decision unchanged, as the outcome of the Mogao workshop, and are put forward by the working group to the Committee for its consideration and agreement.

The second element of the Draft Decision relates to the work of the World Heritage Centre. As I mentioned, there has been a Tourism Programme in the Centre since 2001. It has now been evaluated and the consulting group proposes before the World Heritage Committee that a new World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme be established. The Draft Decision also proposes modalities on how this Programme should operate. It should be broadly exclusive and it should have a steering group established to guide its orientation. The Draft Decision records the very generous offer of the government of Switzerland to sponsor concrete activities that may take place in relation to this programme.

The Draft Decision also recalls follow-up, as well as monitoring by the World Heritage Centre and it does record the very generous offer of Nordic governments to hold a meeting on tourism issues. Finally, the Draft Decision on World Heritage and Tourism calls upon the director general of UNESCO to consider committing work on the draft recommendation in relation to heritage and tourism, in light of the considerable experience gained on the relationship between World Heritage and tourism under the World Heritage *Convention*. A suggestion is put forward by the consulting group for possible agreement by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, would you like to go on with the Draft Decision under Item 12 or should I pause at this point?"

The Chairperson:

"I am not sure if the document has been made available to the member States. Did the Secretariat distribute the document? Not yet, but it is being done. Most probably to save time, I would suggest you start with point 12."

Australia:

“Thank you chair. This is a report on the second outcome of the consulting group. As I said previously there were two items examined by the consulting group, one on World Heritage and Tourism, the other on the reflection of the Future of the *Convention*. My first remarks would be to note the comments made today in relation to the Future of the *Convention* and some of the concerns that have been expressed on the floor. Clearly the work of this group that was set up, is, at some level, an attempt to develop procedural, technical, methodological and other responses that can actually help to improve the Future of the *Convention* given the challenges, of which I think in this meeting, we are all being made very much aware.

In relation to the work of the working group on the Future and its work in producing a document, can I record particular gratitude to both Ambassador Yamamoto of Japan and also to Professor Christina Cameron, a well-known independent expert currently not associated with a particular State Party, but very well-known to all of us. Both of them carried out informal consultations that enabled us to complete the large amount of work in front of us.

I can also record that in this work on the Decision 12.1 and the Decision on Tourism, both exercises have been conducted in an open spirit, which have become the custom for the work on the Future of the *Convention*. It was open to all State Parties, all Observers and this is for the very fundamental reason that the Future of the *Convention* affects all involved. The process of reflection on the Future of the *Convention* has been going for two years. I will not recap that history, except to say that it is an interactive process of development and refinement of some of the challenges in front of us.

The consulting group, as well as having a special mandate from this Committee, also had a general direction from the General Assembly held last year and the last Committee to consider for issues: 1) it was asked to consider the development of a Strategic Action Plan, 2) development of the draft vision; 3) to consider planning for the 40th anniversary of the *Convention*; 4) to consider results of the meeting of expert working groups. I can tell you, it was a full agenda.

The Draft Decision, which has been distributed now, Decision 12.1REV, falls into five basic areas. The first section, paragraphs 1 to 6, provides background on the reflection for the future and in particular do note that in continuation of its spirit of transparency that there is a website established on the World Heritage Centre website for documents related to this exercise.

The second section, from paragraphs 7 to 12 inclusive, establishes several important elements:

- 1) the group had before it a document that talked about the 40th anniversary celebration, document 12B. In this document, there was a proposed theme for the 40th anniversary and in this document it is proposed that submission be sought from State Parties and Observers in relation to this theme.
- 2) It also talks about regional activities, rather carrying out regional activities to prepare for the 40th anniversary.
- 3) It notes the very generous offer of the government of Japan to host the final event of the anniversary year in Japan itself. Finally, within this item related to the celebration of the 40th anniversary, the working group had a number of discussions about how to recognise and promote best practices in the implementation of the

Convention. The result in paragraph 10 is a process to both enable progression on that but also further considerations by this Committee of any work on that.

The third section of the Decision, paragraphs 13 to 17, relates to continuous discussions of a Strategic Action Plan and vision. This discussion continues from the Committee last year. It will continue at the Committee next year, subject to the World Heritage Committee agreeing to that. The key elements of progress that were made this time were to draft a basic conceptual approach for considering a Strategic Action Plan. I think this is an area where key progress was made. The consulting group affirmed the five Cs, although it did note that they may be better considered in relation to the vision than the organisation of work in the Action Plan. This is something else that is subject for State Parties to make submissions by November 1, as is carried in paragraph 16.

The last section relates to paragraphs 18 to 21, which pick up the recommendation of workshops held earlier this year in Thailand, related to what colloquially have been called upstream processes, which are the processes relating to considering and developing nominations. This workshop identified a number of very creative options for improving assistance to State Parties in the development of nominations. Paragraph 19, in particular, identifies further work that may be taken forward in this issue. This I think is probably a signal area of innovation that is taking place in recent times in relation to trying to improve some of these systemic challenges that we face in the processes under the *Convention* in front of us.

Finally, paragraphs 22 and 23 look forward. The General Assembly last year requested that there be a meeting on works and methods of the statutory processes of the *Convention*. An initial meeting was held in Bahrain in December last year. It developed a very good agenda, as a draft for input and consideration by the group. The consulting group passes it on for the World Heritage Committee for adoption and changes. Whatever is adopted by this Committee will set the agenda for the meeting that will take place in Bahrain in October on this matter.

To conclude Mr. Chairman, can I again record gratitude to the four informal facilitators that took up elements for these decisions and all the participants for a very constructive and detailed discussion, that I think, have produced a very productive and full set of papers. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think that the Committee has been distributing the Decision, so I would like to open the floor to members of the Committee for their thoughts. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I think, during this meeting, we have reflected a lot for the need for upstream processes, and I think a number of our discussions have illustrated the importance of that dynamic and in that spirit I would just suggest in point 19 of the Draft Decision in the last line that perhaps the Committee would consider, it currently says: *augment the provision of advice and feedback to States Parties throughout the nomination process* and I would suggest *throughout and prior to the nomination process*. It might prove there the need that we need for upstream processes more clearly. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You. Are there any objections regarding this suggestion? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“In reading through this, I realise actually that there are issues discussed by the consulting group where I must apologise to members of the working group, but these issues were not incorporated. If you will allow me, I will point out two small areas, Mr. Chairman.

One is in paragraph 18. It was actually discussed this morning and I do apologise. In the second last line, the word *adopts* is included. I think that the consulting group agreed that this should be changed to *following the approaches and recommendations of the experts working group*. I can provide the precise wording to the rapporteur later, but I think the concept was *following* rather than adopt.

Secondly, in relation to paragraph 19, in the fifth line where *voluntary pilot projects related to identifying options and preparing dossiers for nomination* I think that the working group agreed that this would continue *with particular reference to Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of Attachment C*. Again I can provide the precise language later to the rapporteur, but I think this was clearly agreed this morning. I apologise for these two points that were not picked up earlier.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You. I do not see any further requests for the floor? Yes, Mexico, please you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Mr. Chair, obviously we are aware that we are nearing the end of our work which I think we all are looking forward to. However, I think we need some time, Sir, to acquaint ourselves with the document that has just been distributed to us, if you will allow us, Sir. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank You Mexico. I think you are right, so may be we can postpone the adoption of this Draft Decision until tomorrow. Would you like to postpone for tomorrow, or 15 minutes would be ok? We still have one hour of work in front of us. Mexico, please.”

Mexico:

“Mr. Chairperson, for the time being, we believe we just need a few extra minutes, that should be sufficient. However, we are open to any proposal from any of the members of the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Oui, je crois que si vous nous accordez cinq à sept minutes, on arrivera malgré la fatigue à examiner ce texte. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Then, I would suggest we postpone our session for ten minutes, before that I would like to thank the participants of the three working groups and The Chairpersons of those groups. China you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. First of all, I would like to express our thanks to the last presentation and I would like to bring information on the workshop held at Mogao Caves, China. Actually, the three Advisory Bodies and our colleagues from Australia paid more attention on the Sustainable Tourism Programme last year during the session and the working group. I just would like to say we will pay more close attention to the issue of the Future of the *Convention* and the Working Group on the Statutory Organs of the *Convention*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now, postpone for ten minutes our session.

[*session resumes*] After discussing with some of the members States, we will postpone the adoption of the Draft Decision until tomorrow, so that member States and Observers will have more time to examine it. Now let's move to the item regarding the provisional agenda of the next session of the Committee, the 35th session in 2011. Secretariat, you have the floor.”

ITEM 19 : PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 35TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2011)

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/19

Decision: 34 COM 19

The Secretariat:

“Merci Monsieur le Président. Le Secrétariat a donc le plaisir de vous présenter une proposition d'agenda pour la 35^e session en 2011. Cet agenda sera projeté à l'écran de manière à ce que vous puissiez le lire tranquillement, point par point. Je sais que nous avons déjà reçu des amendements sur certains points que nous intégrerons tranquillement au fur et à mesure. Puis-je avoir l'agenda projeté sur l'écran, merci ?

En attendant que cette proposition d'ordre du jour soit mise à l'écran dans les deux langues, je souhaite attirer votre attention sur le fait que la structure de l'agenda de l'année prochaine est très classique et s'organise absolument de la même manière que cette année. Vous aurez donc des points de repères habituels avec la séance d'ouverture, avec la mission des observateurs, l'adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier, le point 3A et 3B.

Puis, nous passerons ensuite à la section des rapports. Commençant par le rapport du rapporteur de la 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, le point 4. Puis, sous le point 5, nous avons une suite de rapports : rapport du patrimoine mondial et des Organisations consultatives ; d'abord en 5A, le rapport du Centre sur ses activités et sur les décisions du Centre du patrimoine mondial ; puis en 5B, le rapport des Organisations consultatives ; en 5C, le suivi de l'audit du Centre du patrimoine mondial par l'auditeur externe de l'UNESCO, puisque vous l'avez demandé dans le cadre de vos décisions ; le 5D, est un point de clarification demandé cette année sur le rôle du Centre et des Organisations consultatives ; enfin, le 5E, le rapport sur le programme thématique du patrimoine mondial qui nous permettra de couvrir les différents programmes du patrimoine mondial.

Ensuite, comme d'habitude, le point 6, le rapport d'avancement sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Africain, je consulte la salle parce que nous mettons toujours en document d'information le rapport sur la Fondation Nordique du patrimoine mondial, peut-être que cette fois-ci vous souhaiteriez l'ajouter, mais je ne pousse pas pour la création de nouveaux points, je ne vous le cache pas, c'est juste pour plus de transparence.

Je passe ensuite au Point 7, l'examen de l'état de conservation qui est structuré exactement comme cette année, c'est-à-dire le 7A avec lequel vous êtes désormais très familiers, les Biens du patrimoine mondial en péril ; puis le 7B sur l'Etat de conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial. Ensuite, la réflexion sur l'Évolution de l'état de conservation.

Le point 8, l'Établissement de la liste du patrimoine mondial : 8A les Listes indicatives ; 8B les Propositions d'inscriptions sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; 8C le document de clarification sur la Liste en péril ; 8D qui vous a été présenté, notamment aujourd'hui, c'est la clarification des Limites du patrimoine mondial ; 8E l'examen et l'adoption des déclarations rétrospectives des Valeurs universelles exceptionnelles. Ces deux points sont devenus des points habituels, je dirais.

Nous passons ensuite à la Stratégie globale : Pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée et crédible et ce sera l'occasion de vous présenter le rapport d'évaluation qui a été demandé par l'Assemblée générale. Vous en aurez donc l'avant-première avant l'Assemblée générale sur la Stratégie globale et sur le PACTE. Le 9b serait un rapport d'avancement sur la révision de la stratégie globale de formation qui vous a été présentée cet après-midi et Monsieur King de l'ICCROM nous a bien expliqué comment ils étaient en train de réviser cette Stratégie globale de formation avec un point d'information sur les Centres de catégorie 2.

Puis, le point traditionnel des rapports périodiques, avec la présentation du rapport final du rapport périodique pour l'Afrique qui, comme vous l'avez entendu cet après-midi, est en bonne route. Également, le lancement du second cycle de rapport périodique pour l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes, et un point 10C qui serait un rapport d'avancement sur l'ensemble des rapports périodiques des autres régions.

Ensuite les rapports spéciaux, et dans ce cadre nous avons comme d'habitude le rapport sur la Protection du patrimoine palestinien sous le point 11. Nous passerions ensuite aux Méthodes et instruments de travail et nous aurions deux points d'intérêts largement débattus cette année : la Réflexion sur l'avenir de la *Convention* qui continuerait l'année prochaine suivie de la Révision des orientations, car nous avons un groupe de travail qui va travailler sur ce thème cet automne.

Les questions financières et administratives seront couvertes par les points 14 et 15. Point 14 avec l'examen des Demandes d'assistance internationale qui est un point classique et 15 pour la Préparation du budget 2011 et 2012 et le Rapport sur l'exécution du budget 2010-2011. Nous aurions en 16, les questions diverses, le cas échéant, puis nous passerions à la clôture avec l'élection du président, des vice-présidents, du rapporteur, de la

36^e session du patrimoine mondial, son ordre du jour, l'adoption des décisions et la cérémonie de clôture. Je vous remercie de votre attention. J'ai sous les yeux deux amendements, mais c'est Madame le rapporteur qui va nous les présenter ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci, la parole est au rapporteur, puis je laisserai la parole à la salle pour vos réactions ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. I have received an amendment from the Delegation of Barbados, which suggests including two additional agenda items on our next meeting’s agenda. It does not suggest where exactly to include them, but I think they look like 5F and 5G. The Secretariat may advise on placing them somewhere else. The first one: World Heritage and SIDS, including the outcome of the Bahrain meeting and the second item would be Application of the Recommendations of the Science and Technology Working Group in the Context of World Heritage Nominations. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Anyone who would like to have the floor? Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. On aimerait faire une précision par rapport au point 9B sur la Stratégie globale de formation. Il s'agit ici de la présentation et de l'adoption de la Stratégie globale sur le renforcement des capacités et j'aimerais donner la parole à mon collègue qui a un autre amendement ».

Switzerland (new speaker):

« J'aimerais effectivement présenter un amendement sur un point additionnel qui peut être 9C, un rapport concernant l'avancement des zones tampons. Je m'explique rapidement. En 2008, on avait présenté le rapport sur les recommandations sur les zones tampons, il y avait eu discussion et on avait décidé à l'époque de faire une consultation parmi les États parties. Cette consultation n'a pas encore eu lieu, nous avons pris un peu de retard, mais nous partons du principe que le Centre organisera celle-ci l'année prochaine et du coup en 2011, on pourra présenter l'évaluation de cette consultation et la suite des travaux. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Secrétariat, souhaitez-vous la parole ? »

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Nous aurions effectivement une proposition à faire à la Barbade dans laquelle le point sur le programme SIDS pourrait s'insérer, comme le rapporteur l'a dit, dans les points 5, en E cela serait tout à fait logique.

En ce qui concerne le point sur les recommandations de la réunion d'experts sur la science et la technologie, cela pourrait rentrer dans la stratégie globale, car c'est une réflexion, une nouvelle typologie. Donc, cela pourrait être le point 9C.

Pour ce qui est de la proposition, de la suite sur les zones tampons concernant la conservation des biens, cela pourrait constituer le 7A de cette catégorie de points sur l'état de conservation, si vous en êtes d'accord bien entendu. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Secrétariat. D'autres réflexions ou commentaires sur l'agenda provisoire de la prochaine réunion ? Merci beaucoup, je pense que nous avons été très efficaces aujourd'hui, on a fini vraiment à l'heure, les points de l'agenda. Demain, la réunion reprend à 15 h et il restera l'adoption des projets de Décision des points 5F2REV, 12 et 14. Je souhaiterais vous rappeler l'élection du président, des vice-présidents et du rapporteur pour la prochaine session 35 en 2011. Nous reprenons à 15 h comme déjà dit et je laisse la parole au Secrétariat pour toute annonce ».

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. C'est une invitation officielle du gouvernement de la Culture du Brésil, de l'IPHAN, le gouvernement du District fédéral et l'UNESCO ont l'honneur d'inviter les participants à la 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial à prendre part à la cérémonie de clôture de l'événement qui se tiendra au complexe culturel de la République, ce soir à 20 h 30. Les bus vous attendront à la sortie de l'hôtel à partir de 20 h et les organisateurs brésiliens souhaitent attirer votre attention sur le fait que la clôture aura lieu à l'air libre et que de ce fait la température variera entre 15 et 18 degrés, emmenez donc une petite laine comme l'on dit en français. Je vous souhaite une très bonne soirée et à demain après-midi 15 h ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci beaucoup, à demain 15 h, on m'a prévenu qu'il y avait un petit problème de traduction, c'est bien à 15 h demain, 3pm. Bonne soirée à tous, et merci beaucoup, la séance est close ».

Conclusion of proceedings for the afternoon session of 2 August, 2010

Tuesday, 3 August 2010

TWENTIETH

Afternoon session

Chairperson: H. E. Mr João Luiz Silva Ferreira

ITEM 5: REPORTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

5F. Report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes (*Continuation*)

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon, we are going to start with the Adoption of Draft Decision 5F.2.Rev. I think that the French and English versions of the Decision are available. The rapporteur confirmed that she did not receive any amendments.

The Draft Decision includes 8 paragraphs. Are there any objections regarding the adoption of **Draft Decision 34 COM 5F.2.Rev**? No. It is adopted. Thank you.

ITEM 12: REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*
(Continuation)

AND

ITEM 14: FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMITTEE – POSSIBILITY OF HOLDING TWO ANNUAL SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Let's start with agenda 12.. Please refer to the Draft Decision 34 COM 12, distributed in both working languages, English and French. Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I have received two amendments from the Delegations of Bahrain and Barbados. The amendment of the Delegation of Bahrain concerns paragraph 4 of the current Draft Decision. The suggestion is to specify that the Category 2 Centres mentioned in paragraph 4 should be called, *World Heritage Category 2 Centres*. It would read:

4. Recognizes the ongoing open-ended and inclusive participation of States Parties, Advisory Bodies, UNESCO Category 2 Centres specializing in cultural and natural heritage and so on.

The same amendment has been proposed by Bahrain on paragraph 16 where the suggestion is to insert after Advisory Bodies, *World Heritage Category 2 Centres*. The paragraph would then read:

16. *Invites States Parties, Advisory Bodies, UNESCO Category 2 Centres specializing in cultural and natural heritage, and non-governmental organizations to make written submissions on the overall framework and so on.*

Then the Delegation of Barbados suggests the insertion of a new paragraph, 16bis, between current paragraphs 16 and 17. It would read:

Takes note of the UNESCO Category 2 Centres recognizing their relevance in promoting and implementing the World Heritage Convention; and encourages coordinated cooperation among the Centres, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The second amendment from Barbados suggests introducing a new paragraph 24 at the end of the Decision, and it would read:

Requests the organizers of the expert meeting in Bahrain to also include the examination of the Rules of Procedure on the conduct of and participation in World Heritage Committee meetings, and in particular, on adoption of decisions particularly in respect of:

Then follows sub paragraphs:

a) The application of the procedure for secret ballots during the course of the adoption of decisions,

b) An analysis of the frequency and context of the application of the secret ballot while in the course of the adoption of decisions,

c) Possible implications for the interpretation of Rules 25, 26, 40, 41 and 42 and their amendments,

d) The participation of persons qualified in the field of cultural and natural heritage (as set out in Rule 5.2) and the transmission of their qualification (as set out in Rule 5.3),

e) The application of Rule 45.”

The Chairperson:

« Merci rapporteur. Je souhaiterais donner la parole au Secrétariat et à Monsieur Bandarin pour commenter l'amendement proposé par la Barbade ».

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to make a comment and ask also for the indulgence of the delegate of Barbados. Category 2 centres are complex products of the activity of UNESCO. The ones that we call and refer as Category 2 centres, not all of them, do actually have this name in their title. For instance, the one in Brazil does not and it is the same with the one in China specialized on remote sensing and satellite imaginary interpretation for cultural and natural heritage.

So, I do not think that there is something that we can call Category 2 Centres. On the contrary there is something that we can call the UNESCO Category 2 Centres specializing on Cultural and Natural heritage. Thereby, I think it would be better just to keep the generic terms. I know it may be a problem by using the term Category 2 Centres, we are using a name that may not apply to some of them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Bahrain, would you like to retain your amendment after the explanation given by Mr. Bandarin?”

Bahrain:

“We will follow the explanation that has been given by Mr. Bandarin.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain. Now I open the floor to members of the Committee for comments. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry Mr. Chair. Last night as former Chair of the group I proposed two small amendments. I just give them now in writing to the rapporteur and my apologies to her for not having given them earlier. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. It seems the Delegation of Australia proposes an insertion to current paragraph 18 in the last part of the paragraph. It would be modified from *throughout the nomination process* and the end should read: *and encourages the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the approaches*.

So the last part of paragraph 18 which currently reads: *adopts the approaches and recommendations after the Phuket meeting* would be replaced by *and encourages the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the approaches*.

There is a second amendment suggested to paragraph 19. I understand this is an addition to the end of the paragraph which currently ends in *refine and augment the provision of support, advice and feedback to States Parties throughout the nomination process*. Then the addition reads *with particular reference to paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of attachment c*. I repeat: *with particular reference to paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of attachment c*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“The words the rapporteur read out were correct, but it is our error for not provided a clearer text. I wonder if I can clarify the insertion which where exactly the same as we mentioned last night. On paragraph 18, the word *adopts* would be deleted and replaced by

the words *encourages the World Heritage Centre to follow up on* and the last part of the sentence would before read *throughout the nomination process and encourages the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the approaches and recommendations of the Phuket expert meeting (Attachment C)*.

Then in paragraph 19, the insertion would come midway through the paragraph and after the word nomination and the two underlined words *also request*. It would then read:

voluntary pilot projects related to identifying options and preparing dossiers for nomination and then the insertion would read *with particular reference to Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of Attachment C*. The rest of the paragraph would then continue.

Mr. Chairman, I introduce these, less from an Australian point of view, but more that these were made in discussion in the consulting group and I think that the insertions are true to the discussions held. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Australia. I give the floor again to our amendments for re-reading the amendments from Australia and Barbados, but first I would like to give the floor to the Delegation of Barbados to clarify the amendment it submitted."

Barbados:

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. Barbados is interested solely in understanding and clarifying because the procedure used is not written out, so we would like to clarify in what context it is used and how, and solely for that purpose. And then as we had quite a bit of discussion on how we proceed in the course of our deliberations, how we apply certain of these rules and when. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Barbados. Switzerland you have the floor."

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je regrette de prendre la parole. J'ai cru comprendre hier qu'il y avait une certaine confusion dans les amendements proposés. C'est la raison pour laquelle l'honorable représentant de l'Australie avait demandé que nous ayons un texte nouveau aujourd'hui. Or, malgré mes recherches, je n'ai pas pu le trouver, je viens de voir maintenant qu'il y a des amendements qui ne sont pas très clairs à mon sens, on ne sait pas très bien où les placer.

Par ailleurs, je n'ai pas de texte français. Est-ce qu'il serait possible de demander au Secrétariat de rédiger et de distribuer les deux nouveaux paragraphes 18 et 19 tels qu'ils ont été proposés maintenant par le délégué de l'Australie dans les deux langues afin que nous puissions rendre compte.

Quant au contenu, ces amendements sont tout à fait excellents, mais j'aimerais être certain de prendre une décision sur ce qui est effectivement proposé au Comité. Merci Monsieur le Président de votre compréhension ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à la Suisse. Le Secrétariat vient juste de m'informer que le texte est prêt à être distribué et en attendant je vais donner la parole au rapporteur pour une deuxième lecture des amendements ».

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Given that paragraphs 18 and 19 will be distributed in the room, I will now restrict myself to read the amendment that was presented by Barbados. We have just been told that we could put the Australian amendment on the screen if you would wish so. But we could also distribute it in paper, as was requested by the Swiss Delegation. Would the screen be acceptable for you?”

It seems we have not translated the amendments to paragraph 19 into the French version yet. Actually, here it is and also in French. So, on the screen we have both languages now. Paragraph 18, the Australian amendment towards the end of the paragraph. I read again the full paragraph 18 as you see it on the screen now:

Welcomes furthermore the report of the expert meeting on ‘Upstream processes to nominations: creative approaches in the nomination process’ (Phuket, Thailand, 27-29 April 2010) which identifies options to refine and augment the provision of support, advice and feedback to States Parties throughout the nomination process and encourages the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the approaches and recommendations of the Phuket expert meeting (Attachment C).

And then if we move to paragraph 19. The insertion is in the centre and it reads in the English version and I will start at *Each of the UNESCO regional groups*:

Each of the UNESCO regional groups to undertake, on an experimental basis, voluntary pilot projects related to identifying options and preparing dossiers for nomination with particular reference to Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of Attachment C; requests furthermore the World Heritage Centre to ensure that the pilot projects be representative of current challenges in the nomination process... and so on.

Now, paragraph 24, as suggested by Barbados; I read it out a second time:

Requests the organizers of the expert meeting in Bahrain to also include the examination of the Rules of Procedure on the conduct of and participation in World Heritage Committee meetings, and in particular, on adoption of decisions particularly in respect of:

a) The application of the procedure for secret ballots during the course of the adoption of decisions,

b) An analysis of the frequency and context of the application of the secret ballot while in the course of the adoption of decisions,

c) Possible implications for the interpretation of Rules 25, 26, 40, 41 and 42 and their amendments,

d) The participation of persons qualified in the field of cultural and natural heritage (as set out in Rule 5.2) and the transmission of their qualification (as set out in Rule 5.3),

e) The application of Rule 45.

I also understood that the Bahrain amendment has been withdrawn, but I believe it was amended by the Secretariat to read *Category 2 Centres specializing in cultural and natural heritage*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I open the floor for comments. Nobody would like to take the floor? Then, are there any objections to **Draft Decision 34 COM 12.1** as amended by Australia, Bahrain and Barbados? I see none. It is adopted. Thank you.

I would like to remind you that **Item 14** was included in the Decision we have just adopted. Let’s move to Item 17 on our agenda which is devoted to *Any other business*. I see an observer, India, asking for the floor. Please.”

ITEM 17 OTHER BUSINESS

India:

“Chairperson,
World Committee Members and representative of the State Parties,

We are grateful to you for providing this opportunity. India would like to recall the offer made at the 33rd session of the Committee in Seville to host the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012, taking into account, that the 36th Session of the World heritage Committee will coincide with the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage *Convention* and the 150th anniversary of the Archaeological Survey of India *and* the 150th birth anniversary of Rabindranath Tagore, Nobel laureate and one of the greatest creative minds of modern times.

India would like to reiterate its offer to host the 36th Session of the World Heritage Committee in India in 2012. We hope that the World Heritage Committee accepts our warm invitation. Thank you, Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you and thank you for your offer. Thailand you have the floor.”

Thailand:

“Thank you Sir. The Delegation of Thailand would like to inform the Committee that the Royal Thai government has the honour to propose to stage the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012. With this announcement, we have submitted an official letter signalling our good intention to UNESCO.

As a newly elected member, Thailand has also been entrusted by the State Party to be a vice-Chair of the Committee this year. We have been closely following the work of the Committee and of UNESCO on safeguarding and protecting cultural and natural heritage and are committed to the 1972 *Convention*. Also, Thailand has had experience in hosting various international meetings and conferences under the UN framework. In this regard the Thai Cabinet has agreed to render its full support for this event.

I would appreciate very much if the Committee would accept our proposed hospitality, to host the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 which will mark the 25th

anniversary of Thailand's ratification of the *Convention*. We sincerely hope to see you in Thailand in two years from now. Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Thailand and thank you for your offer. Cambodia, you have the floor.”

Cambodge:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je rappelle que l'ordre du jour de notre Comité doit se prononcer sur la composition du bureau de la 35^e session du Bureau à Bahreïn qui est le point 18, n'est-ce pas ? S'il s'avère que l'on doit se prononcer également sur la 36^e session, ce qui semble-t-il n'est pas encore à l'ordre du jour, permettez-moi alors de faire remarquer plusieurs points.

Premièrement, le Royaume du Cambodge, membre du Comité, a déposé le 29 octobre 2009 une lettre officielle d'invitation à organiser la 36^e session à Siem Reap Angkor en juillet 2012. Une lettre a été adressée à Madame Irina Bokova directrice de l'UNESCO et une autre dans le même sens à Monsieur Francesco Bandarin en sa qualité de directeur du patrimoine mondial.

Point 2 : Comme vous le savez, le Cambodge n'a jamais eu l'honneur jusqu'ici de recevoir une session du Comité.

Point 3 : Permettez-moi enfin, Monsieur le Président, d'attirer le fait que 2012 est l'année du 40^e anniversaire de la *Convention* et c'est aussi l'année du 20^e anniversaire de l'inscription d'Angkor, fleuron de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Cette heureuse coïncidence fera de la 36^e session du Comité en 2012 une grande fête du patrimoine mondial, de notre Comité, de l'UNESCO ainsi que de ses organes et du Cambodge en particulier ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Cambodge et merci de votre générosité. La Barbade, vous avez la parole. »

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. After such offers and generosity I regret to tell you that Barbados is not offering to host the 36th session, so I look forward to the wonderful offers we have just heard. However, if I may, briefly, introduce a subject for which I wear a different hat as president of ICOM.

Just to report, we had an event here just a few days ago, and we had a small but well represented group from the five regions and I was pleasantly surprised at the way members were showing their enthusiasm in continuing the dialogue and working towards a complete understanding of the relationships and activities of Museums in World Heritage sites or related to World Heritage sites. We have recognised moreover, that museums in this context play multifarious roles as owners, managers, interpreters, coordinators, conservators and facilitators, and these are just of the few areas. We believe that it will be important to start working towards achieving greater synthesis of knowledge with regard to this role. And with your indulgence, Chair, I would like to ask if the Director General of ICOM Mr. Julien Anfruns, can address the Committee further on this topic, with your indulgence, Sir.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Is the Director General in the room?”

Barbados:

“Yes Sir, he is.”

The Chairperson:

“Then you have the floor.”

ICOM:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président. Très brièvement, je voulais vous remercier, effectivement pour l'organisation de cette session qui a permis des échanges fructueux sur le rôle des musées et des thématiques débattues dans le cadre de ce Comité. Plus spécifiquement, nous avons pu voir le rôle qui va au-delà du rôle d'interprétation vis-à-vis des problématiques du patrimoine. Ce que l'ICOM peut proposer comme première base de travail qui a été proposée ici au Brésil et pourra se poursuivre avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial en vue de la préparation, notamment de la réunion du Bahreïn, c'est de poursuivre ces études, notamment à travers une typologie des musées en lien avec le patrimoine mondial.

Nous parlons de plus de 8 000 musées qui sont en lien avec ce patrimoine et qui permettent sa valorisation. Travailler en lien avec vous sur une base de données qui permettra un travail plus précis sur ses développements. Et aussi travailler sur les points d'expertises, y compris sur les sujets qui concernent le patrimoine naturel en lien avec l'ensemble des musées de science, d'histoire naturelle et d'écomusée à travers le monde. Je vous remercie de permettre cette intervention et l'ICOM se rend disponible pour pouvoir poursuivre cette riche réflexion dans le cadre des prochaines sessions. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci à l'ICOM. Une autre demande du Mali, vous avez la parole ».

Mali :

« Merci Monsieur le Président. J'ai bien écouté le directeur général de l'ICOM et ce projet est non seulement global mais aussi transversal car c'est un projet qui englobe plusieurs thématiques et je pense qu'il vient aussi en appoint pour compléter ce que le Centre du patrimoine mondial est en train de faire. Le Mali approuve donc vivement ce projet. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Merci au Mali. Encore une fois, je souhaiterais remercier l'Inde, la Thaïlande et le Cambodge. Je voudrais juste rappeler au Comité que le choix pour le pays hôte de la 36^e session se fera l'année prochaine à Bahreïn, ce qui donne le temps au Secrétariat de recevoir d'autres propositions. Merci, et avec votre permission nous passons au point

suisant, le 18, concernant l'élection du Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour la 35^e session, l'année prochaine, ainsi que des vice-présidents et du rapporteur.

ITEM 18. ELECTION OF THE BUREAU OF THE 35TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE 2011)

Decision: **34 COM 18**

I will give 10 to 15 minutes for consultation among member states before taking back the floor and resuming our agenda.

[session resumes] I understood that the Delegation of Jordan wishes to propose a candidate for the next meeting of the 35th session of the World heritage Committee. Jordan, you have the floor."

Jordan:

"Thank you, Chair. Jordan would like to propose Her Excellency Madame Mai Al Khalifa, Minister of Culture of the Kingdom of Bahrain for the Presidency of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee which will take place in Bahrain in 2011. Thank you Mr. Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Jordan. Are there any other candidates? Iraq you have the floor."

Iraq:

"We will second that. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Iraq. Russian Federation, you have the floor."

Russian Federation:

"I would like to propose Estonia as a member... Oh! Sorry, not yet."

The Chairperson:

"Not yet.

Are there any other candidatures for the position of Chairperson? No, so Madame Mai Al Khalifa will be the President of the next session, the 35th, in Bahrain. Congratulations.

Regarding the election of the vice-chairpersons of the Committee and the rapporteur: I will firstly ask the Delegations from Africa. Mali would like the floor."

Mali:

“Thank you Mr. Chairman. We want to propose South Africa as the vice-chair.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. South Africa would be the vice-Chair for the African region. Any objections to this candidature? No, then congratulations South Africa.

Asia and Pacific region. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you, Chair. According to an agreement reached in a special meeting in Paris. Cambodia is recommended on behalf of the Asia Pacific region for being the vice-chair of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee. Thank You.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Other member States agree? Then congratulations to Cambodia. Next region is Europe and North America. Sweden, you have the floor.”

Sweden:

“Thank you, Chair. As a member of the Bureau and on behalf of the electorate group 1, Sweden would like to nominate Switzerland as the vice-chair of the Committee, as a member of the bureau, under the leadership of its distinguished ambassador, Mr. Imhoof, the Swiss Delegation has, throughout this session, here in Brasilia, demonstrated full commitment and we are fully convinced that Switzerland, a member of the Bureau, will continue to contribute to the implementation of the *Convention*, its objectives and the facilitation of the Committee session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any objections to Switzerland, as being elected vice-chair for Europe and North America? No, then congratulations.

Now, the Russian Federation, you have the floor.”

Russian Federation:

“I would like to propose Estonia on behalf of the second electorate group for the position of vice-chair of the 35th session of the Committee. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Does the Committee agree to Estonia as the vice-chair of Group 2? Yes, congratulations Estonia.

Group 3, Latin America and the Caribbean region. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Chair. Our Group has decided to propose Barbados as vice-chairperson for the meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I see Mexico asking for the floor.”

Mexico :

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We would like to support the proposal made by Brazil that Barbados should be one of the vice-chairs. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Congratulations Barbados. Now regarding the election of the rapporteur of the next session, are there any suggestions from members of the Committee? Nigeria, you have the floor.”

Nigeria:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I wish to propose Mali for the position of rapporteur.”

The Chairperson :

“It is an individual position; you have to name the person you want to choose.”

Nigeria:

“It is Mr. Ali Ould Sidi.”

The Chairperson:

“Cambodia, you have the floor.”

Cambodia:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Le Cambodge soutient la proposition du Nigeria en espérant que le Mali accepte la proposition ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Cambodia. Mali, Mr. Ali Ould Sidi, do you accept?”

Mali :

« Monsieur le Président, nous sommes disponibles à faire ce travail à condition qu'il n'y ait pas de contradiction. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

« Il n'y en a pas. Irak ? »

Iraq:

“We support Mali, Sir, and thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. So our rapporteur will be Mr. Ali Ould Sidi from Mali, congratulations.

I give the floor to our rapporteur for the next item.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chair. The World Heritage Committee decides to elect Her Excellency Mai Al Khalifa of Bahrain as Chairperson for the World heritage Committee. As vice-chairpersons, and I quote by Alphabetical order in the English language: Barbados, Cambodia, Estonia, South Africa and Switzerland, and as rapporteur was elected Mr. Ali Ould Sidi from Mali.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now I have the pleasure to ask the Delegation of Bahrain to take the floor on behalf of the new Chairperson.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, Chair. On behalf of the government and the people of the Kingdom of Bahrain, we thank the Committee for their trust in our Commitment in World Heritage and in the World Heritage *Convention*. The head of our Delegation, Her Excellency Mai Al Khalifa, Minister of Culture, who is not present here today, has recorded a welcoming speech which will be shown now, if we may.”

The Chairperson:

“Yes of course please go ahead.”

Bahrain

«[video recorded speech] Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I would like to thank the members of the World heritage Committee for the trust they have shown in electing me to this honourable position. I will certainly try my best to build upon achievements and examples of previous Chairpersons and I will strive to learn many things during the forthcoming year. I would like to thank the Brazilian government for their warm hospitality and the work achieved during our time at the 34th World Heritage Committee held in Brazil.

Personally, I am very pleased to extend the invitation and warm welcome of the Kingdom of Bahrain, its government and people for the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee which should take place in Bahrain from 19-29 June 2011. We are looking forward to making your visit to Bahrain a unique and memorable experience and we hope that you will enjoy your stay. We have brought a presentation with us which will provide you with some visual impressions of Bahrain, its heritage, culture and people. Mr. Chairperson, allow me to present this short movie to the members of the Committee, Thank you very much *[then salutation in Arabic language followed by a video]* .”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Bahrain, and could you convey our warmest and deepest congratulations to Her Excellency Mai Al Khalifa for her election. I would like also to congratulate Bahrain for this election and for hosting the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee, a new task for a new chairperson. Again, congratulations from the member States and The Chairperson.

We are moving to the next item on the agenda number 20, regarding adoption of decisions.

ITEM 20: ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC-10/34.COM/20 and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.20

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have reached the final part of our session regarding the adoption of the decisions report which has been achieved on time, and I would like to congratulate our rapporteur and the Secretariat for this achievement. I give the floor to the rapporteur, and I would like to remind you that the report is divided into 5 parts. The first section contains the Decisions 34 COM 2 to 34 COM 6, the second section Decisions 34 COM 7.1 to 34 COM 7B.32, the third section 34 COM 8A to 34 COM 8C and the last ones, 34 COM 9A to 34 COM 9D.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr Chairman. We distributed part one and part two of the report before you entered the room. Part three is in the process of being distributed. We hope that part four is available in a few minutes and part five, in which you have just adopted the election of The Chairperson and so on, is now being sent to the printer and hopefully will be available in one hour.

So, we have at least one hour's time to go through the previous four parts of the report and identify all the kinds of issues that you see in the current version. Since we did not have the time that we usually have for compiling the report, please bear with us on the current version and if you identify issues please raise them and we will be very happy to correct them.

I would like to take the opportunity, at this point, to thank the Secretariat for their immense support during this process. The job of rapporteur would not be possible at all without all this team behind me, the Secretariat staff, which have worked most of last night to get the last bits and pieces together; also the days before until late hours. I would also like to thank the translation team and the typist who have been working behind me, including two volunteers who have been receiving your Draft Decisions. So, a big thank to all of them including the interpreters who also helped to shape our Draft Decision by spontaneously shaping them whenever necessary in the right wording. So I would like to express to all of them my thanks before we start here. And I believe it is up to you now, Chairperson to take us through the Decisions and identify anything that I did not see last night."

The Chairperson:

"I do not think I will see anything. I hope you had sufficient time to at least review the first part of our report. The first part contains Decisions from 34 COM 2 up to 34 COM 6. And I would like to check with the members of the Committee if they had time to check this and if the Secretariat has found any mistakes."

Rapporteur:

"Yes we have found one small error, which really is not an error; it's more an omission from the report. Part I of the report says that Decision 5G on page 7 of part I of the report is still indicated as pending. It is not true; we took the Decision last night, but we had compiled Part I just before we took the Decision and as there were no amendments to the Decision that was distributed in print on a blue paper, we thought that this might be acceptable to you, to accept that you all have the Decision with you on a blue paper, as there were no amendments. Should you wish to be given the Decision once more, we have additional copies and would be happy to pass them on to you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I will give you a couple of minutes to review and then we are going to proceed to the adoption Decision by Decision.

I hope you've had sufficient time to review the first part. Are there any comments regarding the first **Decision 34 COM 2A** concerning requests for Observer status? No. On the second **Decision 34 COM 2B**, Request for Observer status? No. On Item 3, Adoption of the Agenda and timetable of the 34th Session of the World Heritage Committee, Brasilia? No.

On **Decision 34 COM 3B**, Provisional Timetable of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010)? I see none. Item 5: Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies **Decision 34 COM 5A**? No. **Decision 34 COM 5B**, Reports of the Advisory Bodies? No. Moving to **Decision 34 COM 5C** Roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies? No, **Decision 34 COM 5D** World Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development?

Decision 34 COM 5E, The World Heritage Convention and the other UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture? **Decision 34 COM 5F**, Report on the World Heritage

Thematic Programmes? **Decision 34 COM 5G**, Audit of the World Heritage Centre by the External Auditors? The Rapporteur confirmed to me that there is no amendment regarding this Decision distributed yesterday. **Decision 34 COM 6**: Progress Report on the African World Heritage Fund; any objections? No? Thank you.

Part II regarding Decisions from **7.1 until 7A**. Were there any mistakes noted by the Secretariat, any comments from the rapporteur? No. Thank you. Reviewing of part II. Item **7.1, 7.2, 7.3, Item 7A**: State of conservation of the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, items **7A.1, 7A.2, 7A.3, 7A.4, 7A.5, 7A.6, 7A.7, 7A.8, 7A.9, 7A.10, 7A.11, 7A.12, 7A.13, 7A.14, 34 COM 7A.15, 7A.16, 34 COM 7A.17**, Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Mr. President. On 7A.17, we did change the second part. In paragraph 4 the word *helps* to *requests* and I can see that it has not been changed.”

The Chairperson:

“Yes, thank you Bahrain. Continuing reviewing: **7A.18, 7A.19, 7A.20, 34 COM 7A.21, 7A.22, 7A.23, 7A.24, 7A.25, 7A.26, 34 COM 7A.27, 7A.28, 7A.29, 7A.30, 7A.31, and Decision 34 COM 7A.32**. Thank you.

Now, moving to part III: Decisions 7.1 to 7.3. I do not think you had time to check the document, so I will award a ten minute break to check the document. Thank you.

[*session resumes*] We are starting our proceedings again. part III: **Decisions 7.1 to 7.3, Item 7B**: State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List **Decision 34 COM 7B.1, 7B.2, 7B.3, reviewing Decision 34 COM 7B.4, 7B.5, 7B.6, 34 COM 7B.7, 7B.8, 7B.9, 7B.10, 34 COM 7B.11, 7B.12, 7B.13, 34 COM 7B.14, 7B.15, 7B.15, 7B.16, 7B.17, 34 COM 7B.18, 7B.19, 7B.20**. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico :

“Mr. Chair, one of the State Parties made an observation to us and just to make sure that everything is consistent, in the last paragraph, we should have the “State Parties” in the plural form. That’s all. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Mexico, it’s correct. Continuing reviewing **Decision 34 COM 7B.21, 7B.22, 7B.23, 7B.24, 7B.25, 7B.26, 7B.27, Decision 34 COM 7B.28, 7B.29, 34 COM 7B.30, 7B.31, 7B.32, 7B.33, 7B.34, 7B.35, 7B.36, 7B.37**. Now regarding mixed properties **34 COM 7B.38, 7B.39, 7B.40, 7B.41, 7B.42**. Now cultural properties, on **34 COM 7B.43**, Barbados, you asked for the floor.”

Barbados:

“Thank you, Chair. In paragraph 4, we had indicated an amendment to the word *appliance* which we replaced by *application*.”

The Chairperson:

“Correct thank you. Reviewing **Decision 34 COM 7B.34, 7B.35, 7B.36, 7B.37, 7B.38, 34 COM 7B.39, 7B.50, 7B.51, 7B.52, 34 COM 7B.53, 7B.54, Decision 34 COM 7B.55, 7B.56.** Jordan, you asked for the floor.”

Jordan:

“We submitted an amendment through the Delegation of Egypt concerning paragraph 8. In this paragraph the amendment was concerning the date which states *by 1 February, 2012* and the second amendment concerns *36th session in 2012*; so, two dates and the number of the meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. Indeed, we did receive the amendment; since the item was not opened for the Committee, I have consulted with the Egyptian Delegation to enquire if they want open it, and at that time the amendment was withdrawn, since it was not previously indicated and it was further advanced than item 7B.”

Jordan:

“It is very difficult to go with 2010 because (...).”

The Chairperson *[interrupting the speaker]*.

“We are just reviewing the Decision, not modifying the Decision. Thank you. Reviewing **Decision 34 COM 7B.57, 7B.58, 7B.59, 7B.60, 7B.61, 7B.62, 34 COM 7B.63, 7B.64, 7B.65, 7B.66** and there is a correction on paragraph 4 on the English version—the French version is correct—*further welcomes the steps taken by the State Party*, and the rest remains unchanged. Reviewing **Decision 34 COM 7B. 67, 7B. 68, 7B.69, 7B.70, 7B.71, 7B.72.** Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“I am sorry; there is confusion in 64 which we need to correct because it does not give any meaning on paragraph 6:

Takes note of interventions undertaken to reduce the impact of the cultural centre on Medhat Pasha street, but reiterates its request that the State Party send further documentation on building project as early as possible Centre for review by that to the World Heritage and the ... so I think it needs to be corrected.”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson, and thank you to Bahrain to pointing this out to us. This State of Conservation report was not opened for discussion, but of course we should clarify the meaning. I assume it is supposed to mean *as early as possible to the World Heritage Centre*, if this is acceptable to the members of the committee. I repeat:

as early as possible to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Just to clarify, I will read the whole paragraph again. It would be:

Takes note of interventions undertaken to reduce the impact of the cultural centre on Medhat Pasha street, but reiterates its request that the State Party send further documentation on the building project as early as possible to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Reviewing now **Decision 34 COM 7B.72, 7B.73, 7B.74, 7B.74, 7B.75, 7B.76, 7B.77, 34 COM 7B.78, 7B.79, 34 COM 7B.80, 7B.81, 7B.82, 7B.83, 7B.84, 7B.84, 34 COM 7B.85, 7B.86, 7B.87, 34 COM 7B.88, 7B.89, 7B.90, 7B.91, 7B92, 7B93, 7B94, 7B.95, 34 COM 7B.96, 7B.97, 7B.98, 7B.99, Decision 34 COM 7B.100.** Mexico, you have the floor, but on which Decision?”

Mexico :

“Thank you, Chair. On Decision 100, we would like to consult the rapporteur regarding the drafting of paragraph 3. We understand that the Committee adopted a motion to *adverse potential impact* rather than *negative*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Switzerland, for the same Draft Decision?”

Switzerland:

« Monsieur le Président, je me souviens du contraire et que l'on a plutôt insisté sur le terme *néгатif*. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“My notes would confirm the Swiss intervention. I wrote down *potential negative impact*; however, in paragraph 5 we speak of a *possible adverse impact* so both formulations are in the Decision, which perhaps causes the confusion.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Switzerland.”

Switzerland:

« Excusez-moi, mais aussi avant dans le paragraphe 4, vous avez dans la version française *impact négatif*. Merci Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“Can we check? France, you have the floor.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je crois que dans un souci d'harmonisation de la version anglaise et de la version française, l'on trouve partout dans la version française le terme négatif, on pourrait peut-être partout indiquer dans la version anglaise le terme *adverse* ».

The Chairperson:

« Je pense que lors de l'adoption de la Décision on s'est plus basé sur la version anglaise, et cela a été le cas pendant l'examen du projet de Décision. Je donne la parole au rapporteur ».

Rapporteur:

“I redid this Draft Decision on the English version since the amendments of Mexico made on this paragraph were submitted in English. However, I seem to remember that the intervention of Switzerland was made in French and then captured and reflected in the English language and I think that the French term can be translated by both ‘adverse’ and ‘negative’ into English. So perhaps the suggestion by the French Delegation could be acceptable. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Reviewing **Decisions 34 COM 7B.101, 7B.102, 7B.103, 7B.104, 7B.105, 34 COM 7B.106, 7B.107, 7B.108, 7B.109, 7B.110, 34 COM 7B.111, 7B.112, 7B.113, 7B.114, 34 COM 7B.115, 34 COM 7B.116**. Thank you.

Now reviewing Item 7C: Reflection on the trends of the state of conservation **Decision 34 COM 7C**. Thank you.

Now part IV, is it available?”

Rapporteur:

"I see something being distributed in the room; maybe it is part IV of the document. Maybe the Delegation in the back could tell us what it is? It is the statement of Outstanding Universal Value that has been distributed, so perhaps the Committee can take the time to review these statements of Outstanding Universal Value, which are the statements submitted by State Parties for the five properties that were recommended for deferral by the Advisory Bodies and have been inscribed at the wish of the Committee, which created a situation for which the Advisory Bodies could not provide statements of Outstanding Universal Values.

The Chairperson asked me to remind you again that we suggested to you to approve these statements of Outstanding Universal Value on a provisional basis this year, to give the Secretariat the opportunity to edit for any form of correctness, the consistency of the information with what was submitted previously in the nomination file. And in case modification should be required the statement of Outstanding Universal Value would again be presented to you during the forthcoming session of the World Heritage Committee for their finalisation. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

« Le Secrétariat vient de m'informer que la Partie IV est en train d'être distribuée et je laisse une pause de dix minutes pour son examen.

[session resumes] Part IV containing Decisions from 8A to 8E. 8A Reviewing Item 8A, Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2010, in conformity with the Operational Guidelines **Decision 34 COM 8A**, Item 8B Nominations to the World Heritage List starting with natural properties Decision 34 COM 8B.1 to...I am sorry, IUCN?"

IUCN:

"Both actually, for 8B.1 I propose we do not open the detail of Outstanding Universal Value, because, it will be adopted later and I think for the record there will be some things to check and it is not in complete coherence between the Decision, and the paragraph of the Decision and what the statement says. There are a couple of points about the status of integrity and the buffer zone which should be harmonised. This one is not in the agreed format for a statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as it has separate sections for protection and management, so we should ask the Secretariat to look at that point. I think it can be done for adoption at the next session. Do you want to take it for later, Chair, then? Yes, ok.

On 8B.2, it is also a question of factual points, and certainly in the English the colleagues at the desk in front of me also mentioned that in the French as well some phrases are not complete. If, again, the Secretariat could take note."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, the Secretariat took note. Decision **34 COM 8B.3, 8B.3, 8B.4, 8B.5, 34 COM 8B.6, 8B.7**. Switzerland, you have the floor."

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Dans cette proposition faite par la Fédération de Russie sur un *defer*, la Suisse a fait un amendement verbal que l'on inclue la possibilité d'associer cette nomination à des objets déjà inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur le même thème. Et on vous propose, car nous avons déjà la version anglaise, une formulation qui pourrait être un paragraphe B:

To consider to associate the nomination of Dinosaur Ichnites of the Iberian Peninsula, Portugal/Spain, to existing World Heritage properties inscribed on the World heritage List by similar values.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN, would you like to comment?”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Chair. Just checking with the rapporteur, on the first part of this, I was asked for the previous Decision which was read out by the rapporteur, but it was not caught fully in the point A. I can read out what the rapporteur read at the time which corresponds to the previous decision and it reads:

A previous through analysis, including justification for a property based on Dinosaur ichnites, to be considered as being of Outstanding Universal Value. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Both comments are reflected in my notes on the matter. I fully confirm that the previous sentence was incomplete in the version that was distributed and reads as the representative of IUCN read it out to us. I also have a note considering serial nomination, as proposed by the Swiss Delegation. I also phrased it quite differently in my notes. My notes consist of one paragraph which combines the two issues and reads:

A through global analysis including justification for a property based on dinosaur ichnites to be considered for Outstanding Universal Value, including consideration for a serial nomination with existing properties.

This is from my notes; however, the Swiss text just read out is probably even more nicely formulated, so if the Committee agrees to that, we can also include it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain :

“Thank you very much Chairperson. Spain would only like to point out that indeed mention must be made of the note of the rapporteur, because, if I understood correctly the Swiss amendment was oral and was not produced in written format. So, we believe it is not the time now to incorporate new comments. In the opinion of Spain we should only abide by the notes of the rapporteur. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I am going to give the floor to our rapporteur for re-reading.

Rapporteur:

“Yes, I think it is the best procedure for the wording, although we may remain with my rather non elegant note. It would read:

thorough global comparative analysis, including justification for a property based on dinosaur ichnites to be considered as being of Outstanding Universal Value including considerations for a serial nomination with existing properties.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Switzerland, you would like the floor again?”

Switzerland:

« Monsieur le Président. On peut suivre cette formulation. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Reviewing **Decision 34 COM 8B.8, 8B.9**. IUCN you would like the floor for Decision 8B.8 or 8B.9?”

IUCN:

“Decision 8B.9 actually, Chair. Firstly, to note that this was a referred property which was inscribed. We developed rather hastily a statement of Outstanding Universal Value according to the normal format, and we would request that this is regarded as provisional to those that have been submitted by the State Parties for the deferred nominations. Secondly, we are a little curious about some of the Decisions that are related to the cultural property part, but we refer to the rapporteur. In paragraph 9, for example:

Considers that any revised nomination with revised boundaries requires an expert mission to the site.

This is something which does not correspond to the inscription decision that we understood because it relates to the deferred elements of this property and may be other points. We have not really followed the cultural content that has been retained, but it may be

that there are sub-paragraphs that maybe should have been referred for deletion. But we refer to the rapporteur to make a note on that. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I then give the floor to the rapporteur.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you. According to my notes, the paragraph has been adopted following the previous paragraph, which was paragraph 8, also adopted unchanged. And I do think that the meaning is not completely out of the context of the Decision. Indeed, the cultural attributes are deferred and could be re-nominated and this re-nomination of the cultural criteria would require a mission to the site. Thereby, I do not see inconsistency.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN would you like to comment?”

IUCN:

“It is fine. We just wanted to ask the question to be sure that there was nothing that has been misinterpreted.”

The Chairperson :

“Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Mr. Chair, in paragraph 2, it said that the site would be inscribed under cultural criteria (vii) and (viii). I wonder if we should get that checked with our procedures, as things like that could be checked in proofreading. Do you not wish to hear from us on this sort of thing, or conversely?”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Chair. I think we would prefer to hear from you for this type of issue. But I cannot identify it: Perhaps the original name of the site, which was the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka, is a cultural and natural heritage; it is confusing in this paragraph. Then in paragraph 3 the name was reduced, because only the natural component was inscribed and it no longer seemed appropriate to call the site cultural and natural heritage, but since the original proposal had this part in its name, the decision to not inscribe the original proposal still referred to the name cultural and natural heritage. I hope the explanation clarifies.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, are you fine with the explanation of the rapporteur? Yes, thank you. Reviewing the next property **34 COM 8B.10**: IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Just to say that the name of the property was changed, but there has been a deletion which does not make sense in the fourth line of the brief synthesis.”

The Chairperson:

“Which Decision are you talking about, 8B.10?”

IUCN:

“Yes, before the fourth line of the brief synthesis, it should still read:

comprises the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, otherwise it does not make sense.

Secondly, under protection and management requirements on the fifth line, but this is probably an IUCN or ICOMOS error, so apologies, but it reads *National Marine Monument* and it should read *Marine National Monument*. Two words just need to be reversed. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Could you repeat the second correction? Which line?”

IUCN:

“The second correction is in the section of Outstanding Universal Value under the section headed *Protection and Management Requirements* on the first paragraph on the fifth line. There is a sentence which reads *The property was declared a National Marine Monument* but it should read *Marine National Monument*. Two words just need to be reversed. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Any further comments on Decision **34 COM 8B.10**? Now moving to cultural properties. Decision **34 COM 8B.11, 8B.12, 34 COM 8B.13, 8B.14, 8B.15, 8B.16**. Australia, you have the floor for 8B.16.”

Australia:

“Thank you Mr. Chair. This is the first time I have seen this. I have noticed several factual errors in there, as well as several oddities of interpretation. I do not know if you want me to go into detail now? Yes? In paragraph 4, on the second page under the heading

Protection and Management Measures, the second sentence says *The inscription of Brickendon and Woolmers Estate is in progress*; that was actually inscribed in 2007. I think that sentence can probably be deleted.

On the next page the first paragraph *Brickendon and Woolmers Estate have entered an exception and rapid action is needed in this case*, I think the language in the evaluation report was *required ongoing assistance*, which is probably more accurate in our view and that derives from the evaluation report.

In the next paragraph, it reads *they are adequately coordinated by the general management plan*. There is actually a strategic management framework and not a *general management plan*. Further down in that paragraph, it talks about *For the sites involving the participation of private stakeholders for visitor reception, improved consultation is necessary*, I wonder if that was for *improved interpretation*."

The Chairperson:

"Which paragraph? The last one?"

Australia:

"This is the second on the section of the final paragraph of paragraph 4. Sorry there is no page numbering to refer to. Further on, *common objectives and a shared charter of good conduct would be necessary*. I am not sure what it means. There is *Strategic Management Framework* and this is may be what it refers to there, and if not, that sort of meaning. In paragraph 5f, that should not refer to Darlington, which does not have perimeter walls; it should refer to the Cascades female factory which does have these walls which are currently being restored. Chair, we can provide these in writing afterwards, if you would like us to."

The Chairperson:

"Yes, thank you. I am turning to the Committee. Should we adopt **Draft Decision 8B.16** with the amendment given by the Australian Delegation? No objections? Then it is adopted. Reviewing **Decisions 34 COM 8B.17, 8B.18, 8B.19, 8B.20**. Australia, you have the floor for that last one."

Australia:

"Mr. Chairman, likewise a number of factual errors. In paragraph 3, the paragraph under brief Synthesis says *67 nuclear tests*; there were actually 23 carried out in that period of time. In the next line that says *including the explosion of the first H Bomb*, it was not the explosion of the first H Bomb; this should be deleted. In the next sentence *The cumulative force of the tests*, it should be added *in all of the Marshall Islands* then the end was *equivalent to 7,000 times that of the Hiroshima bomb*.

A further couple of paragraphs down, where it says: *The violence exerted on the natural, geophysical and living elements by nuclear weapons illustrates paroxysm or relationship*; I am not sure that that word is appropriate in that context and we suggest deleting it.

On the next page, in paragraph 4B, it requests the establishment of the Bikini Divers Group and that's a nicely ambiguous phrase. The reason why Bikini Divers Group does not exist is that it used to exist, but there is not enough tourism to sustain it. So, I think, in fact,

we had a discussion from the floor. It used to exist; if it's not fact then it is not a sensible thing to call on a State Party to do. It refers to the exchange we had on the floor. Then moving to paragraph d and f likewise, they request details of the number of inhabitants in the atoll. I think we recall a discussion about that and *prospects for future development and detailed marine's balance system*. Each of these has been provided previously. The request can be there, but it has been satisfied. I think we can consider them as redundant and delete them Mr. Chairman."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor if you wish."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you Chair, we have been trying to keep up with the pace. We think there is an issue of translation on this one and the previous one that was looked at from Australia and we would like to go through the proposed amendments that have been proposed by Australia in collaboration with the French text, but I do not know how this is possible."

The Chairperson:

"I am going to check with our rapporteur. You have the floor."

Rapporteur:

"I cannot comment on the statement of Outstanding Universal Value, because obviously this is the first time it is in front of us. However, with regard to the recommendation of the end of the Decision, I have to state that these recommendations were in the original Draft Decision and although we amended the umbrella paragraph of this Decision, by requesting the State Party *to fulfil this request within two years*, we did not delete any of the sub-paragraphs that follow. So, I am afraid we may have to sustain them, although they are no longer appropriate. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"We should then keep it as it is for the sub-paragraphs. Reviewing **Decisions 34 COM 8B.21, 8B.22, 8B.23, 34 COM 8B.24, 8B.25**: ICOMOS, you have the floor."

ICOMOS:

"Just a small comment on Decision 25: The name of Sarazm was changed to the proto-urban site of Sarazm, and at the moment there is no consistency in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value. In some instances the name has been changed, in others it has not. For example it was changed in criterion (ii) but not in (iii), and in under Protection and Management."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Reviewing Decisions **34 COM 8B.26, 8B.27, 8B.28, 8B.29, 8B.30, 34 COM 8B.30**. Switzerland you have the floor.”

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Une correction dans le paragraphe de la justification du critère (iv). Selon la lettre concernant les erreurs factuelles, on doit lire au lieu de *flamish*, il faut lire *dutch* et au lieu de *netgable*, il faut lire *its variety façades and gables*. Ce sont les corrections apportées par les Pays-Bas dans leur lettre pour les erreurs factuelles. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“*Merci à la Suisse*. Reviewing Decisions **34 COM 8B.31, 8B.32, 8B.33**. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much Mr. Chairperson. There is a name change as we understand it. The name of this property was changed. This has not been reflected in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Chairperson:

“The rapporteur remembers. She has the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I remember there was a proposal for a name change from ICOMOS and I remember we asked the State Party and it expressed the name that was submitted in the amendment by France. According to the wishes of the State Party we sustained the name that was submitted in the draft amendment by the Delegation of France.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Can we clarify this, because paragraph 2 approves the extension of the property to become the *Mines of Rammelsberg and Historic Town of Goslar*. Is that the finally adopted name?”

Rapporteur:

“To my understanding the name is *Mines of Rammelsberg, Historic Town of Goslar and Upper Harz Water Management System*, Germany.”

ICOMOS:

“Yes, that was our understanding and we thought that this should be reflected in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Chairperson:

“We take note. Any additional comment ICOMOS? No, thank you. Reviewing Decisions **34 COM 8B.34, 8B.35, 8B.36, 8B.37, 34 COM 8B.38, 8B.39, 8B.40, 8B.41, 34 COM 8B.42, 8B.43.** Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil :

“Thank you, Chair. It seems to me that paragraph 4c, contains two slight mistakes. It seems to me that we should say *to establish and implement a monitoring system by the relevant authorities in the long term.*”

The Chairperson:

“Could you repeat please?”

Brazil :

“It is in paragraph 4c, with two slight mistakes. It should say *to establish and implement a monitoring system by the relevant authorities in the long term.*”

The Chairperson:

“Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Chair. The original submission was from France, in the French language and it does seem to vary from what the Brazilian Delegation suggested. It reads in French as it was submitted:

D'établir et de mettre en oeuvre un système de suivi pour la conservation du bien à long terme tout en incluant des indicateurs-clés et un organe de suivi.

This seems rather close to the current English translation, if I understand correctly.”

Brazil :

"I believe so rapporteur, but in English there is the *of* missing or rather the *for the property*."

The Chairperson:

"Reviewing **Decisions 34 COM 8B.44, 8B.45, 8B.46, 8B.47, 8B.48, 8B.49, 8B.50, 8B.51, 8B.52, 8B.53, 8B.54, 8B.55, 8B.56, 8B.57, 8B.58, 8B.59, 8B.60, 8B.61**. Now Item 8C: Establishment of the World Heritage List in Danger. Reviewing **Decisions 34 COM 8C.1, 8C.2, 8C.3**: Item 8D: Clarification of property boundaries and areas by the State Parties in response to the retrospective inventory, **Decision 34 COM 8D**. Item 8E: Regarding the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal value, **Decision 34 COM 8E**. Thank you.

Part V, I think, has been distributed. I am giving you a five minute break to review this part. Thank you.

[*session resumes*] Let's continue with part V with Decision from 9A to 16. Item 9A: Global Strategy, **Decision 34 COM 9A**. Item 9B, Serial Nominations, **Decision 34 COM 9B**. Item 9C: Global Training Strategy and **Decision 34 COM 9C**. Item 10: Periodic Reports, **Decisions 34 COM 10A, 10B.1, 10B.2 and 10B.3**.

Item 10C: Progress Report in the Asia and Pacific Region, **Decision 34 COM 10C**. Item 10D: Implementation of AFRICA 2009 programme, **Decision 34 COM 10D**. Item 11: There was a mistake; please disregard this paper as a new corrected decision is being distributed, **Decision 34 COM 11**. Item 12: Reflection on the Future of the World Heritage *Convention*, which we just adopted this afternoon, **34 COM.12**. Item 13: Revision of Operational Guidelines, **Decision 34 COM.13**. Switzerland, you have the floor."

Switzerland:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Deux petites coquilles dans le texte français au point 3, il manque le mot *document* sur la deuxième ligne dans la phrase : *présenté sur le document WHC...* Et au point 4 à la antépénultième ligne et cela correspond au texte anglais: *par les réunions* avec un s, ce sont les réunions, d'après notre discussion. Le texte anglais, lui, est bon. Merci Monsieur le Président."

The Chairperson:

"The English text is correct, so **Decision 34 COM 13**. **Item 14 was included with decision 12**. Item 15: International Assistance, **Decision 34 COM 15.1, 15.2**. Item 16: Financial Statement of the Budget 2008-2009 and 2010-2011, **Decision 34 COM 16**. Item 18: Election of the Bureau of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee in Bahrain. Item 19: Provisional Agenda of the forthcoming Session.

All Decisions are approved. Thank you very much. I give the floor to the rapporteur."

Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. I just take this opportunity to thank the great team of the Secretariat and I actually would like to name them because some of them were really

involved in putting this report together throughout the night. Special thanks to Anne, Richard, Alessandro, Veronique, Mark, Lynn, Barbara, and to the translators and typist behind me, Celine, Alisha, Anne and Marianne. To the two volunteers Chris and Anna, in particular also to the Swiss and the Australian Delegations who helped us with proofreading last night, to the legal advisors for their valuable advice and of course, last but not least, to the podium up here, that is the two Chairpersons and sometimes even the three Chairpersons I had the honour to work with at some times, and to the Director and the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre.

Thanks for your support and my best wishes to my successor and I would be very happy to help him with the preparation. Also, thanks to all the Delegations, you have been really helpful with your amendments and clear handwriting (most of the time), and many of you have expressed your appreciation for the work that has been done. This is very encouraging and I would like to thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Rapporteur. We have one more item for the closing session and I leave my chair to *Monsieur le Ministre*.

Switzerland, you asked for the floor. It is yours for your statement.”

Switzerland:

« Merci beaucoup Monsieur le Président pour votre indulgence à cette heure tardive, je vous en suis très reconnaissant. Je voudrais faire une remarque et vous adresser une communication.

Ma remarque porte sur l'ordre du jour et le calendrier du Comité. Nous n'avons malheureusement pas pu profiter de tout le programme culturel exceptionnel offert avec tant de générosité et de chaleur par le Brésil dans le cadre de cette session. La raison, nous avons dû trop travailler. Les presque 300 pages de décisions que nous venons d'entériner en témoignent. Cette constatation, que je regrette, me porte à me demander si à l'avenir il ne faudrait pas profiter de la possibilité de prolonger nos sessions quelque peu afin de pouvoir mener de front le travail qui nous incombe et pouvoir jouir en même temps des beautés du pays hôte.

Quant à ma communication, Monsieur le Président, elle porte sur la 37^e session du Comité, j'ai le plaisir de vous faire part de l'intention de mes autorités d'accueillir la session du Comité en 2013 en Suisse. Nous veillerons à officialiser cette offre dans un proche avenir si cette invitation recueille l'assentiment du Comité. Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président ».

The Chairperson:

“I now give the floor to the representative of France.”

France:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais, au nom de beaucoup d'États membres sinon tous les États membres du Comité j'en suis certain, adresser nos vives félicitations à notre rapporteur. Elle a fait un travail extraordinaire, nous avons admiré sa concentration, son efficacité, sa gentillesse et je voulais la remercier ».

The Chairperson:

“I now give the floor to Mr. Mohamed el Zahaby.”

Egypt:

« Monsieur le Ministre,
Monsieur le Président du Comité du Patrimoine mondial,
Excellences,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

Nous arrivons au terme de ces dix jours qui ont parfois été très longs lors de cette 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Nos Décisions ont été officiellement adoptées et feront l'objet d'une très large diffusion sur le plan local et international.

Ce fut un très grand plaisir pour moi d'intervenir à Brasília, ville qui a célébré le 21 avril dernier son 150^e anniversaire. Monsieur le Ministre, permettez-moi de vous témoigner ma profonde reconnaissance d'avoir présidé avec vous cette session au cours de laquelle j'ai pu apprécier votre efficacité et simplicité. Je remercie aussi chaleureusement notre rapporteur qui mérite encore une fois qu'on l'applaudisse très fortement et a démontré tout au long de cette session un professionnalisme sans faille.

Je tiens à remercier également nos hôtes brésiliens pour leur accueil chaleureux. Nous avons pu apprécier, lors des intermèdes musicaux, la multitude des identités brésiliennes qui sont la source d'une grande créativité et vitalité foisonnante indienne, africaine, portugaise, italienne ou d'immigration récente. Me retrouver parmi vous me donne le sentiment de me retrouver en famille. Ces grandes familles dont l'ambition sont le souci de l'autre, une cause commune qui tend à protéger et conserver le patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel qui a une valeur exceptionnelle pour les générations futures.

Au-delà de l'indépendance attachée à l'exercice de nos fonctions, s'impose le respect des valeurs intangibles qui font que nous sommes des serviteurs de la *Convention* de 1972. Notre indépendance de jugement, d'expression, notre esprit critique, notre liberté de jugement et de parole nous aideront à faire face aux défis, aux enjeux du 21^e siècle. À trouver des solutions pour éradiquer les atteintes révoltantes de la déforestation, des dégradations liées au changement climatique et au tourisme de masse.

De répondre aux besoins souvent légitimes des populations locales, ainsi que l'évolution de la *Convention*. Nous fêterons en 2012 son 40^e anniversaire et force est de constater que son application, son interprétation ont fortement évolué dans les dernières décennies. Cette session du Comité a permis de mettre en exergue la nécessité de redéfinir le rôle de chacun des acteurs de la *Convention* du patrimoine et leur interaction à savoir les États parties, le Comité, les groupes consultatifs et le Secrétariat dans un souci de transparence et de simplicité dans le cadre d'une interprétation positive de l'esprit de la *Convention* du patrimoine.

Cette redéfinition pourra se faire dans le cadre de la révision des orientations et de la réflexion sur le futur de la *Convention*. Ces évolutions sont porteuses d'enjeux pour tous, surtout pour les pays du Sud. Notre session a mis en évidence leur réel besoin d'assistance technique et financière pour reconnaissance nationale et internationale et la sauvegarde de leur patrimoine exceptionnel. Je sais pouvoir compter sur vous dans la poursuite de cette coopération internationale.

Je vous remercie Monsieur le Ministre, *bye, bye Brazil* terre d'amitié et d'avenir et bienvenue au Bahreïn 2011. Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson :

« Maintenant j'ai l'honneur de passer la parole au Sous-Directeur général pour la culture et Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, Monsieur Francesco Bandarin pour son allocution de clôture ».

Mr. Francesco Bandarin:

“Mr. Chairperson,

Dear members of the World Heritage Committee and representatives of the State parties,
Dear colleagues of the Advisory Bodies and of the World Heritage Centre,

With your permission, I would like to take a few minutes of your time to give my farewell to the Committee, as its secretary and director of the World Heritage centre, *et oui le temps des adieux est arrivé*. As you know, two months ago I was appointed as a new ADG for culture at UNESCO, and while I am still in this moment the interim Director of the World Heritage Centre, my task as Secretary of the Committee is about to end. This is the last meeting I will attend in this position.

I took my full position in 2000. I had the privilege of serving the Committee and the *Convention* for ten years. I think I was fortunate to be appointed at a time when a series of reforms of the activity of the Committee had been discussed and prepared. I was able to accompany, therefore, a process of important changes of your internal procedures and working methods, such as the creation of a system of decisions that is now in use or the agreement of the shortening of the participation of the State Party as well as many reflections on the way to improve the effectiveness of our work and to face the challenges of the future.

In these ten years the Committee has remarkably improved and modernised its mechanisms, its Operational Guidelines and has achieved an effective decision making system and important results worldwide. Today the *Convention* is without doubt the most authoritative and complete system of heritage conservation and monitoring in the world. The Periodic Reporting system of the World heritage Centre that has taken so much of our time to adapt and reform over this decade is certainly today, at the global scale, the most exhaustive and credible information system for sites.

We know that nothing is perfect and a full and balanced representation of regions and cultures of the world is still to be achieved. We have made tremendous progresses towards that objective, with many new States joining the *Convention* and the World Heritage List. When I arrived the centre was only eight years old, but already under the leaderships of my predecessors an important and visible part of UNESCO. Since my arrival I spared no energy to improve the centre, to strengthen it, to increase its capacity to respond to the needs of the Committee of the State Parties to the *Convention* and of the World Heritage sites, especially in Africa and the regions that need more technical and financial support.

During the past ten years, the operational system that we have in use today, based on a good and clear articulation of tasks and collaboration with the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the Committee has been put in place. While this system can still be improved, I believe that today it serves very well the World heritage *Convention*.

The Centre is today significantly larger and stronger than it was ten years ago. It has become an internationally managed organisation, respected for its role and for the quality of its work. I think this result is largely due to the support we have received from you, from the Committee, from the State Parties and from UNESCO itself. I also think that in the past ten

years, the Centre has been able to extend the reach of the world Heritage *Convention*, offering to the World heritage Committee an important backing and an essential tool to implement its decisions.

Also, we have tried to support the common efforts of analysis and technical discussions around World Heritage conservation, exploring new areas that needed to be expended and supporting the work of the Advisory Bodies. We have also tried to use the international success of the World Heritage *Convention* to attract additional financial resources and to launch partnerships with public and private institutions. We have been able to increase, directly and indirectly, the financial contributions of State Parties and of private organisations to the World Heritage. And we have been able to expand our administrative and technical implementation capacity. Today, the Centre alone implements over half of the budgetary activity of the cultural sector of UNESCO.

I cannot list, now, all the projects that we have carried on within the mission of the World Heritage Centre. But a few stick out as examples of international cooperation. For instance, I would like to mention our ten years of involvement for the conservation of the Parks in the Congo, the Central African Forest Conservation Programme, the reinstallation of the Aksum obelisk, the restoration of the fortress of San Sebastian in Mozambique, the newly launched project for the conservation of Cairo and New Gourná village in Egypt, and the restoration of the Jam Minaret and Banyan Buddha niches in Afghanistan. We have also been able to support new and innovative projects, such as the one for the inscription of Qhapaq Ñan, the Andean route and the Silk Road.

We have tried to improve our communication activities, especially on the web and in publications. We have developed what is certainly the best website of UNESCO, with over 35 percent of the total of visitors to UNESCO. Our publication activities are exemplified by our World Heritage Reviews and a series of World Heritage papers, all of great quality.

All along these years, my main preoccupation has been the same one expressed by the Committee in the past ten years: How to strengthen technical capacity for conservation, for what has become a very large global system, the world Heritage List. This is why, with the support of many State Parties and of the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre has supported the creation of Centres in different regions of the World, the Category 2 Centres. There are six of them today, in Norway, China, South Africa, Bahrain, Mexico and here in Brazil. Others are under preparation and will be added to the network in the coming years. Together they form an important new system in support of the *Convention*.

Finally, the Centre tries to support the Committee in dealing with special issues through initiatives and programmes such as the one on Climate Change and Tourism, Disaster Prevention, Small Islands, Modern Heritage, Earthen Architecture, Forest and Marine Preservation and Prehistory. In one field in particular, Urban Historical Conservation, an important reflection for the future has been launched on the initiative of the World Heritage Committee, and is now taking the form of a new UNESCO recommendation on the Historical Landscape.

During these ten years, by far the most important of my professional career, I have met experts and public officials in all regions of the world and I have been privileged to benefit from their friendship and support. I have been able to work together with and to learn from a network of experts and representatives of public institutions, that care about heritage and I am honoured to have been able to be associated with their work.

In 2002 the 30th anniversary of the *Convention* was celebrated in Budapest, where the Strategic Objectives were established, and in Venice, where the system of World Heritage partnership was launched. In my new position as ADG of culture of UNESCO, I will be happy to accompany the process that is leading towards the celebration of the 40th anniversary in 2012. Please, rest assured that in my new position I will continue to strongly

support the World Heritage *Convention* as the main UNESCO tool for heritage conservation and I will strengthen its role in the sustainable development processes supported by the United Nations.

As I leave my position as Secretary of the World Heritage Committee, I would like to thank all of you, as representatives of the State Parties, for the support I have received all along the past ten years. I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies, for their collaboration, for their openness and everything that I have been able to learn from them. I would like to thank specifically my colleagues from the World Heritage Centre, truly a great group of experts and international civil servants that have supported me in my task, all along the past ten years, with enthusiasm and a spirit of service, whom I consider without exception as my friends.

Thanks to all of you. I will miss the passion and the intensity that is unique to the World Heritage family. Thank you Mr. Chairperson, thank you Mohammed, thank you Britta, thank you all of you. May I finish my speech with a personal thank you? I am not the only person who is leaving the Secretariat. Anne Lemaistre, the chief of the pole unit that is coordinating the Committee is also leaving Paris to become the UNESCO Office director of Phnom Penh in Cambodia. I would like to thank her on behalf of all our colleagues for the work she has done in managing a complex task with great professionalism and great team spirit. I am sure we will all miss you Anne.”

The Secretariat:

« Merci Monsieur le Président. Après dix années passées à la tête du Centre du patrimoine mondial, il nous semble à nous, les collègues du Centre du patrimoine mondial, que vous devez savoir des choses au sujet de Monsieur Bandarin. Depuis le 20 septembre 2000, monsieur Francesco Bandarin a participé à :

- ^[diapo] 11 sessions ordinaires du patrimoine mondial, 5 sessions extraordinaires du Comité du patrimoine mondial, 7 sessions du bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial, 8 exercices de rapport périodique complétés ou initiés, 18 réunions d'information pour les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, 150 réunions techniques.

- ^[diapo] 284 biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, malheureusement 2 biens retirés de cette même Liste, 57 États parties élus au Comité du patrimoine mondial pour la première fois, 28 nouveaux États parties à la *Convention* du patrimoine mondial, 666 documents de travail et d'informations préparés par le Secrétariat, ^[diapo] 1 382 rapports sur l'état de conservation examinés, 2 392 décisions adoptées, ^[diapo] 3 574 jours passés en tant que directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, ^[diapo] 100 pays visités, 1 000 jours de mission, ^[diapo] 1 million de kilomètres, mais toujours un seul homme.

Francesco, nous vous remercions beaucoup pour tout ce que vous avez fait ».

The Chairperson :

“Before telling you what I was expecting to tell you, on behalf of everyone here, I should like in particular to thank Francesco Bandarin for everything he has done for the *Convention*, for UNESCO; congratulations to you Sir.

Representative of the director general of UNESCO, Mr. Bandarin, Chairperson of the UNESCO board, Madame Mitrofanova, heads of Delegations, representatives of the State Parties to the Committee, members of the Advisory Bodies, delegates, observers, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are nearing the end of our work; we have spent nine days of intense negotiations, deliberations and evaluations. If I had to say which was the most special contribution of this 34th session to the track record of the World Heritage Committee, I believe such contribution

would definitively be everyone's willingness to take part in an open, frank and constructive dialogue.

The most sensitive items on our agenda were addressed with no haste and due diligence and all the main requests from the state Parties to the *Convention* were heard and carefully considered. Brasilia has thus left on this Committee its imprint, a combination of harmony, cooperative and constructive work which is also the trademark of Brazilian action abroad.

You heard the summary submitted by the rapporteur and the remarks made by the representative of the director general. The large number of nominations examined bear witness to the vitality of the *Convention*. State Parties continue to identify the World Heritage as a paradigm of excellence to preserve humanity, to celebrate the diversity of people and civilisation and the uniqueness of the most significant sites among the natural landscapes of our planet.

After nine days of work, we can point to many achievements: 21 new sites were included on the World Heritage List, the conservation zones of Ngorongoro were recognised as both natural and cultural sites. Moreover, seven extensions of listed properties were adopted. More importantly, the new sites listed extended the geographical coverage of the World Heritage List, with the addition of three new countries that previously had not been included: Kiribati, the Marshall Islands and Tajikistan, thereby embracing all the regions of the world and doubling the surface area of properties protected by the *Convention*.

All the State Parties emerge stronger from this event. The Committee acknowledges the value of nominations from Arabic countries, the African continent, Asian and Latin America countries, demonstrating thereby their understanding of the historical, social and cultural specificities of these countries. The Committee also showed keen sensitivity in presenting the opinions presented with full respect for cultural diversity. That is the spirit of this Committee: To be the voice of the state parties to the 1972 *Convention*.

One lesson to be gleaned from the decisions made by the Committee is that there is a need to improve the preparation of nomination dossiers in full compliance with the Operational Guidelines and the spirit of the *Convention*. I appeal to the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Centre and to the State Parties to provide greater support to developing countries, helping them prepare new and coherent nominations that fully demonstrate the World Heritage significance and the Outstanding Universal Value we seek to protect.

I am sure the new category 2 Centres set up by six countries under the aegis of UNESCO will be a key instrument in enhancing cooperation and ever-expanding need. For its part, Brazil will start forthwith the work of the training Centre in Rio de Janeiro, whose remit is to improve the management skills of other South American and Portuguese-speaking African countries. Furthermore, the agreement signed with Benin, on the occasion of this event, is a clear example of our commitment to extending our cooperation in this area to other African countries and the rest of the developing world.

I would like to conclude this short address to congratulate all of those that have contributed to the success of this meeting: To our vice-chairperson, Mohamed El Zahaby and to Ambassador Mitrofanova, under whose able stewardships the proceedings continued smoothly in my absence. To both of them a special word of thanks. Madame Britta Rudolff, our rapporteur, deserves my personal gratitude. Through it all she has been sitting by my side, always watchful and ready to lend me a hand in the proper conduct of our work.

My heartfelt thanks go to my dear Francesco Bandarin, representative of the director general, assistant director general for Culture and Director of the World Heritage centre. And to Anne Lemaistre and the whole UNESCO team. To you, I say, without your unflinching support none of this would have been possible. And to you my fellow Committee members

goes my sincere gratitude for your constant support and hallowedness which helps us to deal with the longest agenda ever in the history of this Body. For all the Advisory Bodies, and the IUCN, my thanks also for your tremendous work, and thanks so much to our interpreters who helped us so much despite our obdurate determinations to work evenings and all day Sunday.

Let me mention, to conclude, the competence and devotion of all the Brazilian team in charge of organising this 34th session of the World Heritage Committee. I now wish you all a safe return home, with the hope you will be back in Brazil to better know our culture, our people and of course our beautiful sites on the World Heritage List. This session is hereby adjourned. Thank you very much.”

Conclusion of the proceedings of the World Heritage Committee 34th Session