



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



The Protection of the
Underwater Cultural Heritage

4 MSP

UCH/13/4.MSP/220/INF.2 REV

15 April 2013

Original: English

Distribution limited

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

CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE UNDERWATER CULTURAL HERITAGE

MEETING OF STATES PARTIES

**Fourth Session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV
28 -29 May 2013**

Information Document INF.2

Report of the Advisory Body

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body met on 15 April 2011 and on 19 April 2012 in Paris. It also worked electronically. The reports of the two meetings are enclosed below:

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY BODY

Second Meeting, Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, 15 April 2011

Final Report & Recommendations and Resolutions

The second meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body (hereinafter 'the Advisory Body') for the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (hereinafter 'the Convention') took place at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, on 15 April 2011. It was attended by 10 of its 12 members, namely: Ms Dolores Elkin (Argentina), Ms Annalisa Zarattini (Italy), Mr Vladas Zulkus (Lithuania), Ms Pilar Luna Erreguerena (Mexico), Augustus Babajide Ajibola (Nigeria), Mr Hugo Eliecer Bonilla Mendoza (Panama), Mr Constantin Chera (Romania), Mr Andrej Gaspari (Slovenia), Ms Carmen García Rivera (Spain), and Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane (Tunisia). H.E. Mr Jasen Mesic (Croatia) and Mr Ovidio Juan Ortega Pereyra (Cuba) were not able to attend. Nevertheless, observers participated from Croatia. Also present were observers from four States Parties to the Convention but not members of the Advisory Body, 11 States not party to the Convention, and four NGOs. UNESCO representatives served as the Secretariat. Simultaneous interpretation was provided in English and French. Simultaneous interpretation in Spanish was also available as the result of a generous contribution from Spain. As no Rules of Procedure have been adopted for the Advisory Body, the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting of States Parties were applied *mutatis mutandis*.

I. Opening, Election of the Bureau and Adoption of the Agenda

Item 1 (UCH/11/2.STAB/220/1) and Item 2 (UCH/11/2.STAB/220/2)

The session was opened on 15 April 2011 at 10 am with an introduction by Ms Ulrike Guérin of the Secretariat. She provided information on the composition of the newly elected Advisory Body, elected by the Meeting of States Parties on 14 April 2011 and recalled that the Chair of the prior Advisory Body was Ms Carmen García Rivera (Spain) and the Vice-Chair was Ms Pilar Luna Erreguerena (Mexico).

Via **Resolution 1/STAB 2**, the Advisory Body elected Mr **Constantin Chera (Romania)** as Chairperson and Ms **Ouafa Ben Slimane (Tunisia)** as Vice-Chairperson. The newly elected Chairperson reminded the Advisory Body of its tasks and confirmed the presence of a quorum. He also informed the Advisory Body that the meeting was open to admitted observers, such as those observers from States Parties and UNESCO Member States. The Chair also informed the Advisory Body that a representative of the International Council on Monuments and Sites - International Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage ((ICOMOS - ICUCH) was present and had a special status as an NGO already accredited for cooperation with the Advisory Body under Article 1(e) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body¹. The International Congress for Underwater Archaeology (IKUWA), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Unterwasserarchäologie (German Society for Underwater Archaeology - DEGUWA), the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) and the Joint Nautical Archaeology

¹ Article 1 (e) The Advisory Body shall consult and collaborate with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) having activities related to the scope of the Convention, namely ICUCH, as well as other competent NGOs accredited by the Meeting of States Parties.

Policy Committee (JNAPC), UK, had also applied for observer admission to the Advisory Body meeting. Because the formal accreditation of NGOs was not on the agenda, the Chair proposed to admit these observers under Article 4(b) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body.² This was unanimously accepted.

The Chair then asked the Secretariat to present the agenda, which had been made available in document *UCH/11/2.STAB/220/2*.

The Secretariat informed that according to Article 4(a) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body, the Director-General of UNESCO had established the agenda for the sessions after consultation with both the Chairperson of the Meeting of States Parties and the Chairperson of the Advisory Body. The Meeting of States Parties requested the addition of two new items to the agenda: a Report by the Secretariat on the Results of the Meeting of States Parties; and a discussion of the Manual on the Annex. The agenda was amended and adopted with these additions (**Resolution 2/ STAB 2**).

II. Report of the Secretariat and Discussion of the Manual on the Annex

New Item 3 and 4 of the Agenda

The Secretariat reported on the Third Session of the Meeting of States Parties (13-14 April 2011), where nearly all recommendations of the first meeting of the Advisory Body had been adopted under Resolution 6 / MSP 3. The Secretariat also conveyed the Meeting of States Parties' wish that the Advisory Body review the Manual on the Annex of the Convention before its publication. Furthermore, the Secretariat reported that Resolution 9/ MSP 3 decided that the Secretariat should evaluate applications by NGOs for temporary accreditation for cooperation with the Advisory Body, as an interim measure prior to the adoption of Operational Guidelines. The Secretariat should make to the Bureau of the Meeting of the States Parties recommendations and the Meeting asked the Bureau to decide on temporary accreditations.

The Advisory Body then turned to the issue of the Manual on the Annex, which had been recently elaborated by the Secretariat. Its text had been made available to the Body in early spring 2011. Mr Andrej Gaspari, Slovenia, stressed his strong appreciation of the text; this sentiment was echoed by other members. He proposed the addition of further scientific references. Other members also indicated their interest in cooperating. The Advisory Body agreed on a text revision deadline of 15 May 2011 in order to allow for printing and publication in time for the 10th anniversary of the Convention on 2 November 2011. This was reflected in **Resolution 6/ STAB 2**.

III. Discussion of the most significant factors negatively affecting the conservation of underwater cultural heritage and identification of remedial measures

Item 5 (UCH/11/2.STAB/220/3)

The Advisory Body proceeded to the discussion of the most significant factors negatively affecting the conservation of underwater cultural heritage and the identification of possible remedial measures. At their first meeting, the Advisory Body recognized the importance of examining these factors (*Recommendation 5 / MAB 1*). Several Advisory Body members thus launched the topical discussions with short addresses: Ms Pilar Luna on the issue of the commercial exploitation and looting, Mr Augustus Babajide Ajibola on resource extraction, Ms Carmen Garcia Rivera on the issue of infrastructure and construction projects and Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane on tourism and the public enjoyment of underwater cultural heritage.

²Article 4 (b): In addition to members, experts or representatives of organizations, whose duties and qualifications make them suitable for assisting the Advisory Body, may be invited by it to address a meeting of the Advisory Body.

a. Commercial exploitation

Ms Pilar Luna Erreguerena reported on the issue of commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage, which she identified as one of the main problems threatening submerged archaeological sites in South America. She called for clear resolutions and increased public awareness-raising. She also informed the Advisory Body of the recommendations taken at a recent UNESCO Regional Meeting in Cozumel, Mexico.

b. Resource Extraction

Mr Augustus Babajide Ajibola took the floor to report on resource extraction projects threatening underwater cultural heritage sites, highlighting Nigeria as an example. While noting the economic importance of oil-based revenue, he drew attention to issues coincident to such activities in Nigeria as the third largest supplier of crude oil in the world. He informed the Advisory Body that the effects of oil extraction, including frequent oil spillage in the Niger Delta, have been and are a threat to the aquaculture, fish, crop, communities, and the health of the population. Moreover, due to the transatlantic slave trade, it is a significant amount of submerged archaeological heritage that is threatened. The hazards incident to oil spillages and pollution will limit research and protection, despite the historic importance of finds, such as a recent discovery of an ancient canoe.

It was stressed that a main issue regarding resource extraction projects was legislation accounting for cultural and environmental issues in addition to economic benefit. Mr Ajibola underscored the importance of a cultural impact assessment request by the government prior to authorization of any industrial action (*e.g.*, drilling). He suggested also that there is a need to create protected zones and an improved balancing of policy, where activities are not solely dictated by economic interest.

A lively discussion ensued. Mr Constantin Chera raised the question of how to convince petroleum and other resource extraction companies to comply with cultural protection policies. The Secretariat informed the Advisory Body that the problem of quantifying the damage of the recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico had been brought to its attention and warranted further research. It also, however, drew attention to the recent pipeline laying in the Baltic, where the firm Nordstream paid for archaeological research; thus not every enterprise of this kind does harm underwater cultural heritage. Special attention was drawn to a proposal of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), which offered to help obtain data useful for the identification of sites prior to industrial intervention.

Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane called for the preparation of a charter concerning dredging, port development, and oil drilling projects and informed the Advisory Body that models of such charters concerning the environment already exist in Tunisia. It was suggested that issues related to underwater cultural heritage should be included as part of the application file for resource extraction companies, and that they should be obliged to fund site assessment and research.

Some members informed the Advisory Body about the legal situation in their countries. In some countries every intervention on the seabed must be approved by the Ministry of Culture. Ms Dolores Elkin suggested that proposals be submitted with a view to mitigate adverse consequences of interventions. This would be preferable to a practice where compensation is collected after the damage is done. She also suggested that a levy be imposed to establish a sustainable fund, which would fund research and preservation measures. Ms Carmen Garcia agreed that promoters should pay for environmental analyses and mitigation, as well as for valorization of the heritage affected by their activities. Mr Andrej Gaspari referred to the example of France, where a 2% tax on infrastructure development projects is used for site assessment and analysis before the intervention or development project.

c. Infrastructure Projects

Ms Carmen Garcia Rivera then presented issues relating to infrastructural projects that affect the seabed, coastal areas and associated underwater cultural heritage. She drew attention to the challenges of cable laying, port constructions, the creation of artificial islands, and aerosol power stations. While noting the economic importance of these projects, she stressed the need to balance economic interests with the interest in heritage protection. Developing knowledge and inventorying heritage in affected areas are steps to defining a solution to this task. She identified a need for mapping connected to legal measures, such as mandatory consultation and funding earmarked for the mitigation of projects enforced by sanctions. She drew attention to the need for appropriate administrative measures, such as ensuring that administrative services in charge of managing construction projects appropriately take into account underwater cultural heritage protection. Attention was also drawn to the issue where activities can change a current and indirectly erode or discover a site physically far removed from the activity itself.

There was also some discussion on how far trawling and deep sea fishing affected sites, and if physical protection measures would be able to protect affected areas.

Mr Hugo Bonilla inquired about the follow-up to decisions and recommendations of the Advisory Body. The Secretariat assured him of the best possible promotion for the recommendations, upon the Meeting of States Parties' endorsement; for instance, the new Code of Ethics for diving on submerged archaeological sites would now be disseminated widely with the help of partners, and an initiative would now be set up to make inventories interchangeable, as recommended by the Advisory Body in its last session.

d. Tourism and public enjoyment

Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane spoke on the importance of public enjoyment of underwater cultural heritage. Many initiatives had already been taken, such as the creation of dive trails and protected areas. There is, however, still a challenge to appropriately and adequately involve dive-clubs and leisure divers. She remarked that they could be made guardians of the heritage – in many cases the dive clubs had been guarding their discovered sites, albeit jealously, and for economically-motivated reasons.

Ms Carmen Garcia remarked that sites might not be as affected by professional dive clubs as by the divers to which the sites were shown, who might later return to pillage such a site. This question, and the idea of reimbursement for chance finds as a solution was discussed; it was contended that while restitution for chance finds provided an incentive to disclose, it might also incentivize treasure-hunting for official restitution by authorities.

At the end of these discussions on the factors negatively affecting underwater cultural heritage, **Recommendation 3/STAB 2**, giving indications for remedial measures suggested to States Parties, was unanimously adopted.

IV. Discussion of the status of underwater archaeology

Item 6 (UCH/11/2.STAB/220/4)

Mr Constantin Chera opened the afternoon discussion with a presentation on the status of underwater archaeology projects. Romania was used as an example where investigation and awareness-raising projects were organized with minimal resourcing. Authorities organized meetings with stakeholders to inform them and he told also that there was an intention to appoint different NGO to be responsible for specific sites. A major issue was raised concerning the mapping of underwater cultural heritage. In the ensuing discussion the Secretariat inquired about the current needs of underwater archaeology and drew attention to the above-mentioned offer to facilitate data transmission by the IOC. It also informed the Advisory Body about a Bulgarian initiative to elaborate prediction models for areas and their content of underwater cultural heritage.

Ms Dolores Elkin then gave a concise overview of the status of funding of underwater archaeology projects in Argentina. She indicated that Argentina's experience might be useful

for others establishing investigation programmes. She informed the Advisory Body that her team of four persons was responsible for nearly 3,000 km of coastline; they currently are focused on the *HMS Swift* project with a budget of approximately 60,000 USD per year, including the cost of staff.

Mr Vladas Zulkus then informed the Advisory Body on the status of the legal and operational aspects of protection. He stressed the urgent need to solidify legal aspects first, before approaching operational aspects.

The Advisory Body discussed the problems currently faced in investigation projects. Focal points of the discussion were the harmonization of databases and mapping, qualification and teaching and scientific diver licensing. **Recommendation 4/STAB 2**, adopted by the Advisory Body, encompasses these issues.

Resolution 5/ STAB 2, also adopted by the Advisory Body, decided to collect best-practice examples to identify paradigms for application worldwide. Ms Annalisa Zarattini presented the Archaeomar project of the Italian Government and proposed its consideration as a best-practice example. The Advisory Body expressed its appreciation and requested the Secretariat establish a specialized “Best Practice Collection” page on the UNESCO website. There was then a brief discussion on the advisability of the creation of an **Award for the Best Underwater Archaeology Project** should be created. There was, however, the concern that this prize might consistently be awarded to large heritage services and that geographical equality would not be achieved. The project was therefore not endorsed. Ms Pilar Luna Erreguerena stressed another issue: the need to do more work in **child and youth education**. She expressed her warm appreciation for the new UNESCO underwater cultural heritage children’s programme and requested more work in this area. The Secretariat informed the Advisory Body that it intended to elaborate, in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the ICO, a Teachers Kit for the education of the youth to be introduced, ideally, in school schedules.

At the end of the discussion, the Advisory Body adopted **Resolution 7/ STAB 2**, deciding that it would meet again in April 2012 in Paris; work is to continue in the interim via electronic means.

Resolutions and Recommendations:

RESOLUTION 1/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage,

1. *Elects* Mr Constantin Chera (Romania) Chairperson of its second meeting;
2. *Elects* Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane (Tunisia) Vice-Chairperson of its second meeting.

RESOLUTION 2/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. *Having examined* document *UCH/11/2.STAB/220/2*;
2. *Adopts* the Agenda of its second meeting included in the above-mentioned document, as amended.

RECOMMENDATION 3/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. *Having examined* document *UCH/11/2.MAB/220/3*;

2. Recognizes the severe threats posed to the preservation of underwater cultural heritage by pillaging, commercial exploitation and activities indirectly affecting the underwater cultural heritage;
3. Acknowledges the need to balance the economic interest of development projects, resource extraction projects, and tourism with the need to preserve the underwater cultural heritage;
4. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage to raise awareness among promoters of development and resource extraction projects, fishers, divers and other stakeholders;
5. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties, with respect to **development and resource extraction projects**, to ensure that:
 - a) development and resource extraction projects take into account the existence of underwater cultural heritage;
 - b) the project document submitted for the authorization of development and resource extraction projects includes mandatory assessment of the area and identification of underwater cultural heritage contained therein;
 - c) the competent national authorities for underwater cultural heritage are mandatorily consulted in the authorization of all development and resource extraction projects that concern coastal areas or the seabed; or, if such consultation is not possible, that the authorizing national authorities include special experts on underwater cultural heritage;
 - d) the evaluation criteria applied in the authorization of development and resource extraction projects include the project's impact on underwater cultural heritage;
 - e) the public and private developers of such projects should provide the funds and be responsible for:
 - i. the assessment of the project area and the identification of underwater cultural heritage therein;
 - ii. the prevention, to the extent possible, of impact to underwater cultural heritage caused by the project in the project area and its surrounding environment;
 - iii. the mitigation of negative effects caused by the project in the project area and its surrounding environment;
 - iv. the conservation of the affected underwater cultural heritage; and
 - v. the promotion of affected underwater cultural heritage and the dissemination of knowledge about it;
 - f) alternatively, a levy on all relevant infrastructure and resource extraction projects is imposed that feeds a fund dedicated to:
 - i. the preliminary assessment of all development areas;
 - ii. the identification or prediction of underwater cultural heritage sites in these areas; and
 - iii. the taking of the measures cited under paragraph e);

- g) sanctions are imposed on developers of infrastructure and resource extraction projects that do not respect the provisions put in place for the protection of underwater cultural heritage;
 - h) the mapping and establishment of inventories of coastal areas and territorial waters is reinforced to allow for the elaboration of predictive models in order to recognize risk areas, identify underwater cultural heritage and establish impact prevention and mitigation policies; and
 - i) a Charter on development projects, infrastructure projects and their relation to the protection of underwater cultural heritage is elaborated.
6. *Recommends* to the Meeting of States Parties, with respect to **fishing and trawling activities**, to encourage:
- a) the creation of physical protection measures for underwater cultural heritage sites or related protection areas; and
 - b) the introduction of the issue of underwater cultural heritage protection in fishing policies and the establishment of specific protection areas where fishing is prohibited;
7. *Recommends* to the Meeting of States Parties, with respect to **leisure diving activities**, to encourage:
- a) the collaboration with and the sensitization of diving operators toward the protection of underwater cultural heritage, in undertaking activities such as promotion of the *UNESCO Code of Ethics for Diving on Submerged Archaeological Sites*; and
 - b) the possible introduction of incentives for the consignment of chance finds to the national competent authorities.

RECOMMENDATION 4/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. *Having examined* document *UCH/11/2.STAB/220/4*;
2. *Recommends* to the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, with respect to **national authorities**, to encourage:
 - a) the establishment of competent national authorities for underwater cultural heritage, in recalling Article 22.1 of the Convention; and
 - b) to provide such competent national authorities with the funds, personnel, technical means and facilities necessary to ensure the proper management, research and conservation of such heritage.
3. *Recommends* to the Meeting of States Parties, with respect to **research and capacity-building**, to encourage:
 - a) an increase of national science funding to provide financing for research activities directed at underwater cultural heritage;
 - b) international and regional capacity-building initiatives and specialist training;

- c) the harmonization of academic qualification standards for underwater archaeologists; and
 - d) the harmonization of licensing for scientific divers including the related legal, health and safety requirements, to facilitate international collaboration on research projects;
4. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties, with respect to **interventions**, to ensure decisions on whether a site is excavated or preserved *in situ* are based on analyses comparing their significance with that of other existing sites.

RESOLUTION 5/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Decides to collect best practices, including those concerning: scientific diving licenses; national, regional and international research and cooperation projects; and cooperation projects between professional and recreational divers; and
2. Requests the Secretariat to provide on its webpage information on these best practices, as identified by the Advisory Body.

RESOLUTION 6/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Having taken note of *Resolution 5 /MSP.3* of the Meeting of States Parties;
2. Decides to review the Manual on the Annex of the Convention, as elaborated by the Secretariat, and provide, at the latest, comments and suggestions for revision by 15 May 2011.

RESOLUTION 7/ STAB 2

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Having examined document *UCH/11/2.STAB/220/6*;
2. Invites the Director-General to convene the third meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body in April 2012 in Paris.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY BODY

Third Meeting, 19 April 2012, Paris, UNESCO HQ Report, Recommendations and Resolutions

The third meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body (hereinafter '**the Advisory Body**') for the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (hereinafter '**the Convention**') took place at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, on **19 April 2012**. It was

attended by 10 of its 12 members, namely: Ms Dolores Elkin (Argentina), Mr Jasen Mesic (Croatia), Ms Annalisa Zarattini (Italy), Mr Vladas Zulkus (Lithuania), Ms Pilar Luna Erreguerena (Mexico) *by teleconference*, Augustus Babajide Ajibola (Nigeria), Mr Constantin Chera (Romania), Mr Andrej Gaspari (Slovenia), Ms Carmen García Rivera (Spain) and Ms Ouafa Ben Slimane (Tunisia). Mr Hugo Eliecer Bonilla Mendoza (Panama) and Mr Ovidio Juan Ortega Pereyra (Cuba) were not able to attend. Three observers participated from Panama. Also present were observers from 18 States and representatives from ten accredited NGOs, namely ACUA, ADRAMAR, AIMA, ARKAEOS, CIE, DEGUWA, JNAPC, NAS, SHA and ICUCH. Only INA, A US based non-governmental organization, was not able to send a delegate. UNESCO representatives served as the Secretariat of the meeting. Simultaneous interpretation was provided in English and French. Simultaneous interpretation in Spanish was also available as the result of a generous contribution from Spain. As no Rules of Procedure have been adopted for the Advisory Body, the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting of States Parties were applied *mutatis mutandis*.

V. Opening, Election of the Bureau and Adoption of the Agenda

Item 1 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/1)

The session was opened on 19 April 2012 at 10 am with a welcome speech by Mr Alain Godonou, Director of the Division for Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage. He stressed the rising importance of the Advisory Body and the need to ensure its visibility, recognition and the dissemination of its recommendations in the long term. He also pointed out that the NGOs present and temporarily accredited to collaborate with the Body were a precious asset in making the 2001 Convention work. He then extended his wishes for the success and productivity of the debates.

Ms Ulrike Guérin of the Secretariat then provided information on the presence of the Advisory Body members and recalled the prior bureaux of the Advisory Body. On the proposal of Constantin Chera, former chairperson, the Advisory Body then elected Doris Elkin from Argentina as its new Chairperson by **Resolution 1/STAB 3** and Augustus Babajide Ajibola from Nigeria as its new Vice-Chairperson. It also adopted the agenda, after introducing two new items: a report by the Secretariat on the results of the work of the Advisory Body and a discussion of the financing of activities directed at submerged archaeological sites by the de-accession of artefacts from that site.

VI. Functioning of Advisory Body and Collaboration with accredited NGOs

Item 2 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/2)

The newly elected Chairperson, Dolores Elkin, took the floor and thanked the Advisory Body for its confidence and trust, reminding it of its tasks. She asked the Secretariat to give a short report of the decisions of the Meeting of States Parties concerning the Advisory Body, the actions of the Secretariat in implementation of these decisions, and the temporary accreditation of NGOs.

Following this report, which was made available in writing as *UCH/12/3.STAB/220/Inf.1*, Mrs Elkin opened discussions on Item 2 of the Agenda: the functioning of the Advisory Body. To be discussed were here the questions:

- how to increase the recognition and visibility of the Advisory Body and of the implementation of the recommendations made, and
- the discussion of the cooperation with accredited NGO.

Prior to this meeting, all the recommendations the Advisory Body made and the related resolutions of the Meeting of States Parties had been circulated to all Member States of UNESCO through their Permanent Delegations to UNESCO. They had also been made available on the Website of the 2001 Convention. However, it appeared advisable to discuss how the Body's work could have more impact and achieve more visibility. The Advisory Body decided therefore, to work more frequently and using electronic means like emails or teleconferencing and to submit and discuss agenda items for discussion earlier in advance of its meetings. It also decided to increase its visibility through the UNESCO Website by making more information available on its work and its members. For example, it could publish the CVs and pictures of the members. A closer cooperation with media services and educational TV stations was also to be sought with the help of the Secretariat. The Advisory Body decided to become also more visible through its support to conferences and presentations on its behalf. Singled out were here especially the World Archaeology Congress and similar congresses. In regard to the educational tasks of the Advisory Body, it was decided to verify, endorse and contribute to educational or child-related material on underwater cultural heritage. The Advisory Body then adopted **Resolution 2 / STAB 3** unanimously.

Following that, the meeting discussed how to regulate the cooperation with the accredited NGOs. The Advisory Body members stressed the importance of the NGO accreditations. It was felt important to work with them as closely as possible, as these NGOs are working directly in the field and with national authorities worldwide. They may therefore be some of the Body's best vectors to make its recommendations heard and to make the ethical principles and guidelines of the Convention known. NGOs were also recognized as having a very useful insight in the practice of underwater archaeology in the field, especially concerning issues that need to be considered in what constitutes best practice and the fostering of the development of underwater archaeology on a national, regional and international level.

The Advisory Body members invited the accredited NGOs to submit proposals on the contributions they may wish to provide to its work by **Resolution 3 / STAB 3**. They also invited the NGOs to raise awareness of the 2001 Convention, to contribute information concerning specific discussed agenda items, monitor practical and emerging issues and to propose topics related to them for consideration by the Advisory Body and to identify best practices in underwater archaeology for consideration of the Advisory Body.

The Advisory Body also asked the Secretariat to facilitate the communication between NGOs and the Advisory Body and to provide information on minimum standards for the accreditation of NGOs to the Advisory Body so that a greater number of NGOs can be identified for cooperation.

VII. Identifying Common and Emerging Issues of Underwater Archaeology

Item 3 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/3)

The Chairperson recalled that the Advisory Body should propose to the Meeting of States Parties, standards for and means to promote best practices in underwater cultural heritage sites protection and materials conservation by identifying and monitoring practical common and emerging issues. In the December 2011 UNESCO Scientific Colloquium in Brussels, several emerging issues of underwater archaeological research were outlined. Among them were for example sea routes and their research potential, prehistoric site research, and the upcoming 100th anniversary of World War I in 2014.

After extensive discussions on these issues the Advisory Body recommended to the Meeting of States Parties to encourage work and cooperation on inland water related underwater archaeological research, sea routes and submerged prehistoric landscapes and sites.

- The research on *inland water sites* was singled out as being of specific importance for the understanding of the history of landlocked States and should not be underestimated in its scientific importance.
- *Sea routes* were felt in particular to be valued for their connecting factor that allowed researching the intercultural exchange between regions and civilisations. Sites like that of the Maritime Silk Road contributed significantly to the research on land based travel and exchange routes. They included immensely important sites, as was shown in the on-going excavation of the Maritime Silk Road wreck Nanhai No. 1 in a new museum on Hailing Island, China.
- In regards to *submerged prehistoric landscapes* and sites it was stressed that it was necessary to promote their protection in conjunction with the implementation and promotion of instruments protecting the environment. Their extension and the difficulty to address their research and safeguarding in a comprehensive way were underlined.

Special attention was paid to the upcoming *100th anniversary of World War I*. This conflict has resulted in immense human losses and the naval part of it has left a great number of submerged historic sites.

- It was shortly discussed if it would be possible to provide the States before the year 2014 with comprehensive information on this heritage. However, it appeared that there were too many sites and a comprehensive research would need much more time, even when it was already on-going in many States.
- The Advisory Body agreed unanimously that the 100th anniversary of WW I, from which on the various wrecks of ships and aircraft resulting from this war would begin to fall under the protection of the 2001 Convention (with the 100th anniversary of their respective submersion), should be appropriately commemorated. Special attention was drawn to the importance and global, international and humanitarian aspects of the naval war of WWI. Thousands lost their lives with the sinking and destruction of the concerned ships or vehicles. They need to be remembered appropriately.
- Attention was also called to the endangered situation of the related sites created by natural and human causes. Indeed the mostly metallic wrecks were affected by corrosion, the build-up of 'rusticles' (rust like formations caused by bacteria and resembling icicles) and the interaction with marine life. The Advisory Body was also

concerned by extensive pillage and in the focus of commercial exploitation enterprises.

- The Advisory Body did in consequence recommend to the Meeting of States Parties to organize an international commemorative event in the year 2014 and to identify appropriate funds for this. The Body did also recommend involving States not yet Parties to the 2001 Convention and other international organizations concerned. It was furthermore recommended to gather information and material related to the submerged heritage from World War I for the education of the public and for interested media.
- It was decided to continue the discussion of this issue by electronic means and by circulating proposals, especially what regarded the creation of a Steering Committee. The Advisory Body adopted then **Recommendation 4 / STAB 3** on the above issues.

VIII. Education and awareness-raising

Item 4 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/4)

In its second meeting in April 2011, the Advisory Body had expressed a strong interest in the issues of youth education and awareness-raising. Therefore the Secretariat took the floor to briefly inform the meeting about an upcoming cooperation with the producers of the Geronimo Stilton books and about an Education Kit on underwater cultural heritage created in Portugal. It also declared that the short cartoons on the UNESCO underwater cultural heritage website had already been seen by more than 25.000 users since their publication the preceding year. The dissemination of the full TV episodes created by the partner enterprise Moonscoop was much higher and even more successful.

The Advisory Body discussed how to work further in the education of youth and recommended to the Meeting of States Parties to introduce topics on underwater cultural heritage in educative material and curricula of primary, secondary and higher level schools and educational institutions. It also opined that it would be advisable to create more short films and cartoons for children for publication on the underwater cultural heritage Kids Page of UNESCO. The Advisory Body called on all States Parties to contribute more appropriate material to this page to make it more interesting and attractive and to disseminate and use this page for educational purposes. It recommended also to develop and facilitate cooperation with appropriate children's publication producers and to circulate and exchange appropriate exhibitions on underwater cultural heritage, addressed to the public at large or children in specific. The Advisory Body then adopted **Recommendation 6 / STAB 3**.

IX. Virtual Access Initiatives concerning Underwater Cultural Heritage

Item 5 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/5)

Many current initiatives try to ensure virtual access to the ocean or/and underwater cultural heritage sites. Several are also undertaking to virtually map accessible shipwreck sites or other submerged heritage. The Advisory Body had already drawn attention to the importance

of these initiatives and the Meeting of States Parties had in consequence asked the Secretariat to collect information on them. The Advisory Body discussed how to proceed with the creation of a full-fledged project and debated about whether cooperation with Google should be considered.

First of all, the Advisory Body recommended to the Meeting of States Parties to facilitate the provision of information on virtual access initiatives to the Secretariat in order to ensure the completeness of the collection. It also asked the Secretariat to make such initiatives available in one common web space or project on the UNESCO underwater cultural heritage website, which would allow finding synergies. It encouraged the accredited NGOs, which are in many cases working on such virtual access initiatives, to contribute to this project or website and to assist in the quality and ethical control of the participating initiatives. Finally, it recommended to the Meeting of States Parties to encourage States Parties to create special websites on underwater cultural heritage and connect them to the UNESCO website. It then adopted **Recommendation 8 / STAB 3**.

X. Licensing for scientific divers

Item 6 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/6)

In its prior session, the Advisory Body had expressed interest in seeking ways to harmonize the licensing for scientific divers including legal, health and safety requirements. Currently, these requirements vary from country to country and the resulting differences hinder international cooperation, training exchanges and research cooperation. This issue was discussed more profoundly at this session. It appeared that this issue of licensing constitutes a problem even at a national level. The observer for France informed that 65 per cent of all those that had worked in the domain of underwater archaeology in France until 2011 had no license to do so anymore. The Advisory Body member from Italy, Annalisa Zarattini, did similarly inform the meeting that it was currently almost impossible to obtain a license for professional archaeological diving in Italy.

The discussions showed however that it was very difficult to find a solution. This resulted in part from the differences of the archaeological reality in the various regions and because of the varying security requirements, which depended on the roughness of the waters, depth of the sites etc. The debate considered the possibilities of a mutual recognition of licenses, the harmonization of licenses and the drawing up of a UNESCO model license.

The Advisory Body then recommended to the Meeting of the States Parties by **Resolution 9 / STAB 3**, to encourage States Parties to identify common minimum basic standards for archaeological divers, to harmonize the training of diving for archaeological purposes and to encourage the States to mutually recognize national diving qualifications for archaeological purposes.

XI. Guidelines for the inventory of underwater cultural heritage

Item 7 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/7)

A number of countries and organizations are engaged in inventorying their underwater cultural heritage. In its first meeting, the Advisory Body adopted Recommendation 5 / MAB 1 paragraph 3.g encouraging the creation of guidelines for the establishment of national

inventories in order to ensure the inter-changeability of national databases in the long term and to call on ICUCH to assist in this exercise. In response to this recommendation, the Meeting of States Parties requested the Advisory Body by Resolution 6 / MSP 3 to present to it for consideration at its upcoming fourth session, Draft Guidelines for the Establishment of National Inventories in order to ensure the inter-changeability of national databases on the long term. A first draft of a model inventory sheet was hence elaborated by the Secretariat.

The Advisory Body members considered this proposal. They remarked that it was necessary to further define the terms used, as for instance such terms as 'close' or 'far' from the coast could be understood very differently, etc. The Advisory Body decided to undertake an electronic exchange of comments on the draft inventory form proposed by the Secretariat and to send those comments to the Secretariat for the composition of the revised draft version. A special effort is to be made to define the terms used in the draft model.

While the draft inventory model proposed by the Secretariat was a sheet, which could be transformed into an electronic form, it was then also felt necessary to go beyond that. The Body did therefore decide to also add to the model more extensive guidelines for national inventories, in particular concerning the electronic storage of data. The Advisory Body adopted **Resolution 10 / STAB 3** on this issue.

XII. Financing of Archaeological Excavations by the De-accession of Artefacts

An item that was only introduced into the agenda on the morning of the meeting was that if activities directed at underwater archaeological sites financed through the de-accessioning of artefacts from the concerned site would be in harmony with the Rules annexed to the 2001 Convention.

a. Scope of the mandate of the Advisory Body

On request of the United States, present as observer of the meeting, it was first clarified if the response to this question would fall within the tasks of the Advisory Body. It was also clarified if such an item could be brought to the attention of the Body by one of the accredited NGOs, as was the case here.

The Secretariat then referred to Article 1 (e) of its Statutes:

'the Advisory Body shall consult and collaborate with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) having activities related to the scope of the Convention'.

Consultation and collaboration could be understood to not only include questions posed by the Advisory Body to the accredited NGOs, but also an active contribution of the NGOs to the Advisory Body's work in drawing its attention to emerging issues in the field of underwater archaeology.

The Secretariat informed furthermore that according to Article 1 (a) (ii),

'The Advisory Body shall propose to the Meeting of States Parties standards of and means to promote best practice in underwater cultural heritage sites protection and materials conservation by [...] identifying and monitoring practical common and emerging issues in underwater cultural heritage sites protection and materials conservation [...].'

This could be interpreted in a way that the Advisory Body could and should address emerging issues, like for example the financing of activities directed at such sites, and recommend what the best practice in the light of the Rules annexed to the Convention should be. It was then accepted that the Advisory Body had the right and the duty to address the question that was put up for discussion, i.e. the financing of activities directed at an archaeological site through the de-accession of the artefacts recovered from it.

b. On the issue of pre-planned de-accession

In its following discussions as well as in additional electronic discussions in line with Article 7 (b) of its Statutes, the Advisory Body drew from its experiences as well as from that of the accredited NGOs. It gave the following clarifications:

De-accessioning is the formal process of the removal of an object from a collection register, catalogue or database. Disposal is the physical removal of the object from the collection. De-accession and disposal are practices used in museums and other institutions which host natural or cultural materials. One of the reasons why materials can be de-accessioned and disposed of is that they are duplicates. De-accession and disposal normally take place after a thorough analysis and consultation process.

In regard to the question, if a pre-planned de-accession of some of the recovered artefacts could be used to finance the archaeological excavation of a site, the members concluded that the practice of de-accessioning could be abused to justify a pre-planned over-recovery and trade of archaeological materials for the payment of professional recovery services employed on that same site. This could typically result in a commercial exploitation scheme on the ground that certain materials would be identified as duplicates, which is for instance often the case for coins and ceramics. In the end result sites would be excavated for their monetary value, not for their scientific interest. From the outset, items could be recovered that were not otherwise intended to be used other than for sale and they would be commercialized for the payment of the salvager. This would be against the spirit of the 2001 Convention.

While the Advisory Body recognized that the de-accessioning of material from a museum or other entity might in some cases not be against the Convention, and without issuing any view on that issue, it was of the opinion that an unconformity with the Convention's regulations would be given, when the recovery of material from an archaeological site

- was made without the goal of contributing considerably to the protection, knowledge about, or enhancement of underwater cultural heritage; and /or
- resulted in the unnecessary disturbance of the concerned archaeological remains and their context; and /or
- would effectively result in the commercialization of underwater cultural heritage; and /or
- would be undertaken without that the necessary sound funding base.

In detail the Advisory Body considered that:

On Rule 1 of the Annex: A pre-planned de-accessioning of ‘surplus’ material from a submerged archaeological site would mean that Rule 1 of the Annex, which regulates that protection *in situ* should be considered as first option, is not respected. A recovery would be made while there was no intention to contribute through it considerably to knowledge, enhancement or protection. Even if there was a threat to the site by other causes, like trawling or looting, it was not justifiable to foresee from the outset to recover material for the financing of an activity.

On Rule 2 of the Annex: The Advisory Body members also opined that as soon as the artefacts from the excavated site were in whichever way exchanged against money this was equal to a sale, so that the activity becomes a commercial one and violates Rule 2. This was not to be understood as a correct deposition of underwater cultural heritage, recovered in conformity with the Convention, as it did prejudice the scientific or cultural interest and integrity of the recovered material and would usually result in its irretrievable dispersal.

On Rule 3 and 4 of the Annex: A pre-planned de-accessioning would also mean the disturbance of an archaeological site with the goal of recovery of items beyond any scientific need in order to finance the activity. This would typically result in a situation that would violate Rule 3, according to which activities directed at underwater cultural heritage are not to adversely affect the heritage more than is necessary for the objectives of the project. According to Rule 4, activities directed at underwater cultural heritage must also use non-destructive techniques and survey methods in preference to the recovery of objects. If excavation or recovery is necessary for the purpose of scientific studies or for the ultimate protection of the underwater cultural heritage, the methods and techniques used must be as non-destructive as possible and contribute to the preservation of the remains. This does not cover their pre-planned recovery and de-accessioning to serve as payment.

On Rule 17 of the Annex: Moreover, according to Rule 17 an adequate funding base shall be assured in advance of any activity. This should however not include any sale of artefacts which is not in conformity with Rule 2. So if there is no such funding assured, then the activity should not be undertaken.

The Advisory Body then unanimously adopted **Recommendation 5 / STAB 3** on the financing of archaeological excavations by the de-accessioning of the artefacts recommending to the Meeting of States Parties to consider that the de-accessioning of the artefacts from such a concerned site was not consistent with the Rules annexed to the 2001 Convention.

XIII. Replacement of Advisory Body Members

The Advisory Body then discussed the issue of the absence of some of its members and problems related to their ability to fulfil their work. In each of the Advisory Body meetings one or more members of the Advisory Body were unable to attend. This was either due to professional obstacles (on-going archaeological excavations etc.) or the fact that the concerned person had changed their professional position and was therefore not fully representing their State any more. The Advisory Body thus recommended to the Meeting of

States Parties to take measures allowing the replacement of one of its members with an equally qualified person without new elections in specific situations by **Recommendation 11 / STAB 3**.

XIV. Fourth Meeting of the Advisory Body

Item 8 (UCH/12/3.STAB/220/8)

According to Article 4 (a) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body, the Meeting of the Advisory Body takes place at least once every year. It was therefore the last agenda item of the meeting to recommend when the next meeting should take place. The Advisory Body saw it fit to recommend a date close to the Meeting of States Parties in order to facilitate the coverage of the travel of the Advisory Body members, who are often also members of the delegations of their countries to the Meeting of States Parties. Additional attention was drawn to the issue that the term of office of several members will end on 14 April 2013 so new elections have to take place. Additionally, from 14 April onwards it might happen that some of the members of the Body would be out of their current office and elections would only take place in the next Meeting of States Parties. It was therefore felt advisable to hold the meeting after the fourth Meeting of States Parties. Therefore, the Advisory Body asked the Director-General by **Resolution 12 / STAB 3** to convene the fourth meeting of the Advisory Body in April 2013 in Paris following immediately the fourth Meeting of the State Parties.

Resolutions and Recommendations:

RESOLUTION 1 / STAB 3 – Bureau and Agenda

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage,

3. Elects Ms Dolores Elkin (Argentina) Chairperson of its third meeting;
4. Elects Mr Augustus Babajide Ajibola (Nigeria) Vice-Chairperson of its third meeting;
5. Having considered document UCH/12/3.STAB/220/1;
6. Adopts the Agenda included in the above-mentioned document, as amended.

RESOLUTION 2 / STAB 3 – Functioning and Visibility of the work of the Advisory Body

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

3. Having considered document UCH/12/3.STAB/220/2;
4. Decides
 - a. to work in a more frequent manner and using electronic means; and
 - b. to submit agenda items for discussion well in advance of any meeting.

5. Considers it important to increase its visibility; and
6. Decides therefore
 - a. to increase its visibility through the UNESCO Website by making more information available on the Advisory Body and its work;
 - b. to seek closer cooperation with media services and educational TV stations;
 - c. to provide support to conferences and to make presentations on behalf of the Advisory Body at different scientific meetings and organizations;
 - d. to seek to endorse and contribute to educational or child-related material on underwater cultural heritage.

RESOLUTION 3 / STAB 3 – Cooperation with and Consultation of NGOs

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

2. Invites the accredited NGOs to submit proposals on the contributions they may wish to provide to its work;
3. Considers that the work of the accredited NGOs should promote and provide visibility to the 2001 Convention and the Advisory Body and help in the implementation of the Convention;
4. Invites the NGOs
 - a. to raise awareness of the 2001 Convention, its directions and ethical principles as well as of the recommendations of the Advisory Body;
 - b. to contribute information concerning specific discussed agenda items;
 - c. to monitor practical and emerging issues and to propose topics related to them for consideration by the Advisory Body;
 - d. to identify best practices in underwater archaeology for consideration of the Advisory Body;
5. Invites the Secretariat
 - a. to facilitate the fluent communication between NGOs and the Advisory Body; and
 - b. to provide information on minimum standards for the accreditation of NGOs to the Advisory Body so that a greater number of NGOs can be identified for cooperation.

RECOMMENDATION 4 / STAB 3 - Common and Emerging Issues of Underwater Archaeology

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

5. Having considered document UCH/12/3.STAB/220/3;
6. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to encourage work and cooperation on
 - a. Inland water related underwater archaeological research;

- b. Sea routes;
 - c. Submerged prehistoric landscapes and sites, in particular in conjunction with the implementation and promotion of instruments protecting the environment;
7. Does in relation to the upcoming 100th anniversary of World War I,
- a. draw special attention to its importance and global, international and humanitarian aspects;
 - b. call for attention to the endangered situation of the related sites created by natural and human causes;
 - c. recommend to the Meeting of States Parties to organize in an international effort a commemorative event in the year 2014;
 - d. recommend to identify appropriate funds for this and to gather related information and material;
 - e. recommend to also involve States not yet Parties to the 2001 Convention and other international organizations concerned.
8. Decides to continue the discussion of this issue by electronic means and to circulate proposals.

RECOMMENDATION 5 / STAB 3 - Financing of Excavations by De-accession of the Artefacts

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Identifies as one of the emerging issues concerning the protection of underwater cultural heritage the current discussion on a possible financing of archaeological services by means of de-accessioning of artefacts; and
2. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to consider that the financing of excavations by the process of the de-accessioning of the artefacts from the concerned site is not consistent with the Rules annexed to the 2001 Convention.

RECOMMENDATION 6 / STAB 3 - Education

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Having considered document UCH/12/3.STAB/220/4;
2. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties
 - a. to introduce topics on underwater cultural heritage in educative material and curricula of primary, secondary and higher level schools and educational institutions;
 - b. to develop short films and cartoons for children for publication on the underwater cultural heritage Kids page of UNESCO;

- c. to contribute any other appropriate material to this Kids page; and
 - d. to develop and facilitate cooperation with appropriate children publication producers.
3. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to circulate and exchange appropriate exhibitions on underwater cultural heritage.

RECOMMENDATION 7 / STAB 3 – Benefits of Protection

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

Recommends to the Meeting of the States Parties

- a. to take measures to demonstrate the public interest and utility of the protection of the underwater cultural heritage;
- b. to collect information on recommendable models and statistical information through the States Parties and the Secretariat;
- c. to propose models for managing underwater cultural heritage in a way that brings benefits for the sustainable economic development of regions; and
- d. to increase the positive image of underwater archaeology and the involvement of the public in the awareness, the protection and enjoyment of the underwater cultural heritage.

RECOMMENDATION 8 / STAB 3 - Virtual Access

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body

1. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to facilitate the provision of information on virtual access initiatives to the Secretariat;
2. Asks the Secretariat to make such initiatives available in one common web space or project on the UNESCO underwater cultural heritage website in line with Resolution 6 / MSP 3 issued by the Meeting of States Parties;
3. Encourages accredited NGOs to contribute to this project or website and to assist in the quality and ethical control of the proposed initiatives; and
4. Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to encourage States Parties to create special websites on underwater cultural heritage and connect them to UNESCO underwater cultural heritage website.

RECOMMENDATION 9 / STAB 3 - Standards for Archaeological Divers

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

Recommends to the Meeting of the States Parties

- a. to encourage States Parties to identify common minimum basic standards for archaeological divers;
- b. to harmonize the training of diving for archaeological purposes; and
- c. to encourage States Parties to mutually recognize national diving qualifications for archaeological purposes.

RESOLUTION 10 / STAB 3 – Inventory of Underwater Cultural Heritage

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Decides to undertake an electronic exchange of comments of its members on the draft inventory form proposed by the Secretariat and to send those comments to the Secretariat for the preparation of the final version;
2. Decides to make efforts to define the terms used in the draft form; and
3. Decides to add to the form guidelines for national inventories, in particular concerning the electronic storage of data.

RECOMMENDATION 11 / STAB 3 – Replacement of Advisory Body Members

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

Recommends to the Meeting of States Parties to take measures allowing the replacement of one of its members with an equally qualified person without new elections in specific situations.

RESOLUTION 12 / STAB 3 - Fourth Meeting of the Advisory Body

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Having considered document UCH/12/3.STAB/220/8;
2. Asks the Director-General to convene the fourth meeting of the Advisory Body in April 2013 in Paris following immediately after the fourth Meeting of the State Parties.



RECOMMENDATION 13 / STAB 3

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Body,

1. Was requested by the third session of the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001) by RESOLUTION 6/MSP 3 paragraph 5 “to present to it for consideration, at its fourth session Draft Guidelines for the Establishment of National Inventories in order to ensure the interchangeability of national databases on the long term”;

2. Submits the annexed Draft UNESCO Model Inventory Sheet for Underwater Cultural Heritage, elaborated in electronic exchange, for consideration and possible adoption to the Meeting of States Parties.

ANNEX to RECOMMENDATION 13 / STAB 3:

| DRAFT | | | | | UNESCO MODEL INVENTORY SHEET FOR UNDERWATER CULTURAL HERITAGE | |   <small>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</small> <small>The Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage</small> | |
|---|--|------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| COUNTRY | | | | | | | | |
| REGION, PROVINCE | | | | | | | | |
| COMPETENT AUTHORITY | | | | | | | | |
| REGISTERED BY (name, position) | | Date | | Email / Tel nº | | | | |
| SITE NAME (provide also 'nicknames') | | | | SITE REGISTRATION NUMBER | | | | |

| GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| TYPE | Shipwreck | Identification certain | Yes / no |
| | Aircraft wreck | Period/Year of creation/building | |
| | Other vehicle | Time of submersion (period/year) | |
| | Isolated artefacts | CONSERVATION STATUS | |
| | Prehistoric site | Excellent | |
| Pre-Columbian site | Good | | |
| Ruin | Damaged | | |
| Structure | Destroyed | | |
| Cave/Cenote | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Free Description of Remains | | | |
| | | | |

| LOCATION | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---------|----------|---------------------------|
| COORDINATES UTM | | | | GEOGRAPHICAL COORDINATES | | | |
| DATUM | | | | DATUM | | | |
| X | | | | Latitude | | | |
| Y | | | | Longitude | | | |
| Z | | | | Depth | | | |
| Have these coordinates been verified? | | | | | | | |
| MAX. EXTENT OF SITE <i>(exact/estimate in meters)</i> | | Width | | Length | | Height | |
| DESCRIPTION | AREA (pls underline) | | | MARITIME ZONE (pls underline) | | | |
| | Wetland, swamp Water hole, source Flooded cave, cavity River Lake/Lagoon/Spring Coast of ocean Port Bay Close to coast Far from coast (give approx. distance) Open sea | | | Terrestrial Inland waters Internal waters Territorial Sea, Archipelagic waters Contiguous Zone Exclusive Economic Zone Continental shelf Area (High Seas) Contiguous Zone of other State [<i>specify</i>] Exclusive Economic Zone of other State [<i>specify</i>] Continental shelf of other State [<i>specify</i>] | | | |
| WATER | WATER FEATURES | | | DEPTH IN METERS | | | |
| | Calm | | | Maximum | | | |
| | Moved | | | Minimum | | | |
| Rough | | | UNDERWATER VISIBILITY (in meters) | | | | |
| SITE IMMERSION | | Periodical | Continuous | Partial | | Complete | |
| SEA-BOTTOM COMPOSITION | | | | | | | |
| Sea grass | | | Gravel | | Pebbles | | Rock |
| Sand | | | Mud | | Blocks | | Others |
| VISIBILITY | | Parts of site visible No visible parts Site observable as mount Indication of site through echo | | | ACCESS | | From the shore By boat |
| <i>(Add sketch of site to this form if desired)</i> | | | | | | | |

| ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARTEFACTS | | | |
|---|--------|-----------|----------------|
| ARTEFACTS FOUND | | | |
| CURRENT LOCATION | STORED | DISPLAYED | <i>IN SITU</i> |
| | | | |
| CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION (references of reports etc.) | | | |
| | | | |

| HISTORIC BACKGROUND, CULTURAL ORIGINS | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| ORIGIN | African | SIGNIFICANCE | Historical |
| | Asian | | Cultural |
| | European | | Artistic |
| | Arab | | Archaeological |
| | American | Historic documentation | |
| | Australian | Other References | |
| | Other (specify) | | |
| <i>(Add free description of historic background to this form if desired)</i> | | | |

| THREATS | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------|
| DAMAGING ACTIVITIES DIRECTED AT THE SITE | Pillaging Cargo recovery Displacement Intended destruction Exposure Other | HUMAN ACTIVITIES INCIDENTALLY AFFECTING SITE | Mineral extraction |
| | | | Pollution |
| NATURAL FACTORS CAUSING DAMAGE | Erosion Exposure Oxygen influence Seismic activity Waves Other | STATUS | Trawling |
| | | | Fishing |
| | | | Dredging |
| | | | Construction works |
| | | | Change of currents |
| | | | Dam construction |
| | | | Other |
| | | | Threat on-going |
| | | | Immediate danger |
| | | | Threat expected |
| <i>Evidence of threats:</i> | | | |
| | | | |
| FINDING, DISCOVERY | | | |
| DISCOVERY | Date of discovery | | |
| | Discovered by | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | Contact details | |
| REPORTS | SENT BY (pls underline) | SENT TO (pls underline) |
| | Finder Vessel, state national Local responsible authority [scroll down list] Responsible archaeologist, site manager Competent National Authority | Competent National Authority Ministry [scroll down list] Other State [scroll down list] States Parties 2001 Convention Other |
| NOTIFICATION of UNESCO <i>(for sites outside of territorial waters and if applicable)</i> | SENT BY | SENT TO |
| | Competent National Authority Other | UNESCO International Seabed Authority |
| DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST | RECEIVED FROM, DATE | FOLLOW UP |
| | 1. | |
| | 2. | |

| ACTIVITIES DIRECTED AT THE SITE | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| ACTIVITY TYPE (Preliminary research, research, documentation, recovery of artefacts, excavation...) | START-DATE | RESULTS | PERSON / ENTITY RESPONSIBLE | CONTACT |
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | Add further |
| UPLOAD | REPORTS ; PHOTOS ; PERMISSIONS | | | |
| INTENDED ACTIVITIES AND AUTHORIZATION REQUESTS | | | | |
| TYPE OF INTENDED ACTIVITY | START-DATE | ACTIVITY PLANNED | PERSON / ENTITY RESPONSIBLE | CONTACT |
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | Add further |
| STATUS OF AUTHORIZATION | NAME AND QUALIFICATION OF TEAM LEADER | REPORTING BY | REPORTING TO | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Local responsible authority Archaeologist Site manager Person or entity requesting permission | Competent National Authority Responsible Ministry Other State All State Parties to 2001 Convention International Seabed Authority UNESCO |
| NOTIFICATION of UNESCO (<i>for sites outside of territorial waters and if applicable</i>) | SENT BY | SENT TO | |
| | Competent National Authority Other | UNESCO International Seabed Authority | |

| INVENTORY AND DESIGNATION | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Site noted in a national inventory? | |
| Special designation? | |
| Part of a protected zone? | |

| RELEVANT PUBLICATIONS & REPORTS | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Author</i> | <i>Year, Place</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Link</i> | <i>Edition, Pages</i> |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Add further |