



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

33 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-09/33.COM
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-third Session**

**Sevilla, Spain
22– 30 June 2009**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

Monday, 22 June 2009

OPENING CEREMONY

6.00 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM/INF.1*

The 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee was opened on Monday, 22 June 2009 at the Seville Conference and Exhibition Centre (FIBES) in Seville, Spain, by H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo, the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Spain to UNESCO.

The 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee were present: Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United States of America.

The following 97 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo (the Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See (Vatican City State), Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of), Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tanzania (United Republic of), Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

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

H.Exc. Ms. Ángeles González-Sinde Reig, Spain's Minister of Culture, welcomed the participants, and stressed the importance of uniting efforts to preserve humanity's shared heritage, as neglect and vandalism remained a threat.

Mr. Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, took stock of developments in UNESCO's World Heritage work, from the beginning of his chairmanship of the World Heritage Committee in 1998 (Kyoto, Japan) and over the course of his subsequent 10 years as head of UNESCO. Mr. Matsuura highlighted some of the challenges currently facing the World Heritage Convention, such as the need to ensure that all States Parties (soon to number 187) be represented on the List, the need to improve imbalances in both geographical diversity and between the number of cultural and natural sites, as the former greatly exceeds the latter. Mr. Matsuura emphasized regional capacity-building and alternative financing mechanisms as ways to support the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The UNESCO Category 2 Centres dedicated to World Heritage and the African World Heritage Fund, as well as the nascent Pacific World Heritage Fund, were cited as good examples. Private companies and foundations have also played an increasingly important role, and Mr. Matsuura paid warm tribute to the United Nations Foundation for its support of UNESCO's work in the Democratic Republic of Congo and other highly biodiverse sites around the world, as well as its more recent role as a key partner of the World Heritage sustainable tourism programme.

UNESCO had established a comprehensive set of legal tools for protecting all aspects of humanity's cultural diversity, building on the mutually reinforcing and/or complementary Conventions of 1972, 2003 and 2005 on World Heritage, Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The challenge now was to establish harmonious working relationships between all these components. He thanked Spain for its support of World Heritage through the Spanish Funds in Trust, which aim to enhance the implementation of the Convention in Latin America and the Caribbean Region, Africa, the Arab States and in the Pacific Region.

Mr. Antonio Griñán, President of the Autonomous Government of Andalusia, emphasized Andalusia's cultural richness. He mentioned progress made in the region towards achieving objectives related to the preservation of heritage. He noted that protective measures, such as the approval of the Historic Heritage Law, which includes the protection of intangible, landscape and sub-aquatic heritage (as well as the protection of 56 sub-aquatic archaeological settings), were now being implemented. He noted the importance of the catalytic relationship between culture and economy, which creates job opportunities, but also pointed to the importance of sustainable measures in order to avoid the negative impacts of excessive tourism or urban development.

Mr. Sánchez Montesión, Mayor of Seville, highlighted the beauty of the city whose residents have been able to create and consolidate a city with a unique heritage. He mentioned several projects that had been implemented by the municipality, most of which were oriented towards the recuperation of urban spaces and the introduction of non-polluting transportation systems. Finally, he mentioned the *mestizo* racial tradition of the city, and how this was reflected in its culture, architecture and heritage.

Mr. George N. Anastassopoulos, President of UNESCO's General Conference, highlighted one of the major governance questions that the Committee should, in his view, be addressing in the next couple of years: the development of a truly equitable and

representative List of World Heritage sites that could be efficiently monitored and preserved.

Mr. Olabiyi Babalola Joseph Yaï, Chairman of the Organization's Executive Board, also stressed the importance of the Global Strategy, and recalled the important role that communities play in the preservation and management of World Heritage Sites.

The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Spain to UNESCO, outlined the achievements of the 1972 World Heritage Convention on the eve of its 40th anniversary and its quasi-universal ratification. She mentioned the importance of the 60th anniversary of the Human Rights Declaration and the 1972 Convention. The Chairperson highlighted the significant decisions that the World Heritage Committee would be taking during this session. She recognized the work of the people responsible for heritage preservation and mentioned climate change, tourism and urban expansion as some of its challenges. Finally, she mentioned that 2009 was an important year for science, with the celebration of the International Year of Astronomy, the 200th anniversary of Darwin's birth, and the 150th anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*.

The 39 participants of the **First Ibero-American World Heritage Youth Forum**, held from 15-21 June in Seville, presented their work and conclusions, in particular the communications campaign they had carried out. A video prepared by the young people during the Forum was projected, featuring their visits to several Spanish World Heritage Sites and the workshops they had conducted on the subject of World Heritage. The presentation ended with the première of the animated film "*Patrimonito in Spain: Old City of Avila*", the 8th episode of the "Patrimonito's World Heritage Adventures" cartoon series.

FIRST DAY – TUESDAY, 23 JUNE 2009

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. –2 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Document: WHC-09/33.COM.2

Decision: **33 COM 2**

The **Chairperson** welcomed the Committee to Seville and thanked the Ministry of Culture of Spain, the Regional Government of Andalusia and the Mayor of Seville for their warm welcome. Discussion on Item 2 (Observer requests) was opened.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that the document included Draft Decision 33 COM 2.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that interpretation was in English, French, Spanish and Arabic. Those Committee Members speaking in Spanish or Arabic needed to indicate their preference for having their records in English or French.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that, upon taking the floor for the first time, Members should indicate whether their interventions were to be recorded in English or French.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that Committee Members had three minutes maximum, and Observers two minutes, for their interventions. Item 2 was then opened for discussion.

The Delegation of **Kenya** informed the meeting that its choice would be English. It thanked the **Chairperson**, the Spanish Government and the Government of Andalusia for their hospitality. It supported the Draft Decision to amend Rule 8.3.

The **Secretariat** explained why the present system, which accepted requests up to the last minute, was not ideal since it kept the document open. He asked for proposals to change this situation. Canada had sent a letter detailing needs in this respect. The Draft Decision set a deadline of six weeks before the beginning of the Committee session in order to be able to send the document to the Committee members. Was it appropriate to create a formal working group during the year to analyze the proposal and produce a good proposal next year, or did the Committee prefer a full proposal incorporating other points?

The **Chairperson** asked for Committee Members' reactions.

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked the **Chairperson** and the Government of Spain for their excellent hospitality. It would prefer to change the Rules of Procedure during this meeting because there were other issues involved.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it would use English. It thanked the Government of Spain for its hospitality. Israel was concerned about the issue of Observers and therefore supported Australia's proposal to set up a working group straightaway.

The Delegation of **Spain** said it would use English. It suggested that a study be made of how other Conventions proceeded in this regard, for examination at the next session in Brazil.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked Spain for its hospitality. It informed the Committee that it had sent a letter to the Secretariat on the subject of Decision 32 COM 2 The text proposed by Canada concerned ways of ensuring efficiency among host countries when organizing sessions, how to limit costs, and how to deal with attendance at sessions.

The Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Spanish Government for its hospitality and said it wished to be recorded in English. It supported amending the Rules of Procedure during the current session in Seville.

The **Chairperson** said that it would be possible to change the rules and to establish a working group. Although two working groups were proposed, the Committee agreed that informal consultations were preferable, as it did not wish to set up a further working group. This was agreed upon.

The **Secretariat** referred to the List of Observers and said that whereas informal consultation could be organized in the coming days, paragraphs 1 to 3 could be adopted immediately.

The **Chairperson** referred the question to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that a Draft Decision could not be partially adopted and that, should there be an additional Decision, it would need to have a separate number.

The **Chairperson** asked if Committee Members agreed to adopt paragraphs 1 to 3 and to remove paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the Decision and asked who would lead the consultations. It asked whether the Committee was in agreement that Canada would consult the Secretariat on this matter.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed and was thanked by the **Chairperson**.

The Draft Decision **33COM.2** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/3A.Rev2

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/3B.Rev2

Decisions: **33 COM 3A**

33 COM 3B

The **Secretariat** explained that there were two documents: 3A Rev (Agenda) and 3B Rev 2 (timetable), entailing two Decisions.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were comments on the agenda and timetable and suggested adding a new item after 14B to consider the possibility of a change in the Rules of Procedure. The Observer status item would be added for possible consideration when examining Document 14C (changes to the Rules of Procedure).

The Draft Decisions **33 COM 3A and 33 COM 3B** were adopted.

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

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 32nd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (QUEBEC CITY, 2008)

The **Chairperson** pointed out that there were several former Chairpersons present at the session. On behalf of the Committee, she thanked Ms. Alissandra Cummins, Rapporteur for the 32nd session of the Committee, for her excellent work.

The Rapporteur of the 32nd session thanked the **Chairperson** and then reported on the outcomes of the 32nd session of the Committee.

Among the innovations had been the introduction of a highly beneficial orientation session for new Committee Members. 30 young people from around the world, part of the World Heritage and Youth Forum, had visited Canadian World Heritage Sites and had been integrated into State Party Delegations or the Secretariat for the duration of the Committee session.

She referred to the representativeness of the Convention: although there were 185 States Parties to the 1972 World Heritage Convention, nine Member States of UNESCO were still not States Parties. 30 sites remained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Sites in four States Parties had achieved World Heritage designation for the first time: Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Saudi Arabia and Vanuatu. The World Heritage List had thus increased to 878 sites.

The Centre had been commended on its progress during the year, but questions had arisen about the Centre's efforts to execute the Global Strategy. A policy for the accreditation of delegations to future sessions of the Committee appeared to be necessary, as was the establishment of fixed quotas for countries, guidelines for the

registration of participants, evaluation of requests for registration, and processing of Observer applications.

Various activities had been carried out, including an Expert Meeting on Buffer Zones and meetings on Historic Urban Landscapes, Reinforced Monitoring Mechanisms, Serial Transnational Nominations, the next cycle of Periodic Reporting, the election of Committee Members and the Report on the Sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. Other meetings had been held to examine criteria to evaluate the impact of urban development on the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, standards for assessing the effectiveness of management plans and check-lists for assessment. There had been meetings on Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, management and integrity issues in the listing of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the status and management of Outstanding Universal Value, particularly for serial/transnational sites, and the report on the outcomes of two expert meetings on Historic Urban Landscapes.

The Committee called for criteria to be established to evaluate the impact of urban development on Outstanding Universal Value and State of Conservation. The Committee reflected on the List of World Heritage in Danger, noting especially the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and it contemplated the removal of Dresden from the World Heritage List.

Regarding the World Heritage List, 290 decisions had been taken during the course of the session, 30 relating to the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, 157 relating to the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and 27 relating to the Tentative List. The nomination of new properties for inscription on the World Heritage List and changes to sites already on the List had also been decided upon. 40 decisions had been adopted without debate, and a further 250 had been debated before a decision was made. The preparation of texts and recommendations for the revision of amendments to Draft Decisions had also been undertaken.

The **Chairperson**, on behalf of the Committee Members, thanked the Rapporteur of the 32nd session for her thorough report and suggestions for the future and also thanked her personally for her outstanding contribution. Interventions from the Committee were asked for.

The Delegate of **Brazil** thanked the **Chairperson** for Spain's hospitality and Ms. Cummins for her excellent work.

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

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

Documents: *WHC-09/33.COM/5A*
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.1
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.2
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.3

Decision: **33 COM 5A**

The **Secretariat** presented Document 5A and three information documents, 5A.1, 5A.2 and 5A.3.

In drafting the Summary Records, it had been found that the long document had taken almost a year to complete, leading to many complications. A proposal had been made to experiment with a new system of recording the entire session in audio format, complemented by a 50-page summary guide. This implied a need to change working practices.

The Report focused on the results of a great deal of activity, as mentioned by the Rapporteur. There were now 186 Member States, with the accession of the Bahamas underway. Activities summarized in the Report included:

- The meeting on the Future of the Convention, held in February 2009, the results of which would be communicated to the 17th General Assembly of States Parties;
- Two working groups on budgetary issues and on the emblem;
- Improvement of the online Web information system;
- The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism;
- The development of a number of partnerships with the private sector and international bodies;
- The relationship between this Convention and other Conventions;
- The recently signed agreement with the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The list of activities reflected the complexity of the Convention. One activity had been the creation of a set of new Category 2 Centres (associated training and research centres), in order to strengthen the Convention and decentralize activities. ICCROM had had a special role to play here, and China, Bahrain and Brazil had already created such Centres and Mexico was to follow. The Nordic World Heritage Foundation had been the first to be established, and the African World Heritage Fund would become a Category 2 Centre at the next General Conference. Countries were interested in creating thematic centres – Spain had proposed a Category 2 Centre for pre-history, and Egypt was interested in one for archaeology. The new energy that the Convention was generating had been much appreciated.

Regarding activities carried out by the Advisory Bodies, Document 8 was a joint report produced in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies in order to identify their respective roles and responsibilities. Other activities included drafting State of Conservation

Reports, missions, programmes and projects, thematic studies, and assistance with the preparation of nominations – all in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

The World Heritage System was an interactive system and it required clearly defined roles for best performance.

Referring to Document 5.3, the Centre's workload had been examined as part of a study carried out by the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) of UNESCO, this showing how the Centre spent its time. The Report was a valuable tool in planning the best use of the Centre's resources. The Director of the World Heritage Centre expressed his thanks to the IOS and to the Deputy-Director of the Centre. The Report had found that the Centre employed a large number of temporary staff (57%). The Director gave details on units that were developing extra-budgetary projects: while all units contributed to the main task of supporting the Convention, a significant part of this work involved extra-budgetary funds. Staff members were overworked – the IOS report has remarked on this – and this situation became more acute during Committee sessions. This was a relevant element for consideration in the context of discussions on the future of the Convention.

The results-based Report on the activities of the World Heritage Centre specifically mentioned three activities. Five preparatory meetings had been organized on pre-history (with support from the Government of Spain), including an important activity relating to themes such as sites where human evolution had taken place, rock-art sites and prehistoric sites associated with nature.

These meetings were part of a programme designed to implement the Action Plan on Prehistory in the Medium Term Strategy 2009-2013, the results of which were to include, in terms of conservation, the setting up of twinning programmes between World Heritage properties in order to share information on conservation issues and best practices, and, in terms of capacity-building, the fostering of close cooperation between experts, universities, research institutions, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Other planned results would include revision of national and regional Tentative Lists, the launch of a page on pre-history on the Centre's Website, and the establishment of a resource database.

The programme on World Heritage Earthen Architecture had been executed with support from the Government of Italy. A seminar called "Terra 2008" had been held in Bamako, Mali, focusing on Africa. Agreements had been drawn up with major international centres. The restoration of New Gurna, Egypt, designed by architect Hassan Fathy, could act as an important form of training.

The tourism programme had also been developed. This was an important sector, as it held out both threats and opportunities for World Heritage Sites. Partnerships with States Parties and better management principles had been developed, and these needed to be reflected in the Operational Guidelines. The training of people working in this area was being undertaken, and the Centre was also investigating further partnerships and pledges. Four workshops had been held, and a further one, supported by the Australian Government, was to be held in China.

The **Chairperson** thanked Secretariat for his presentation and asked the Committee if there were any questions.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the host country for its hospitality. It also thanked the Director and staff of the World Heritage Centre for their work and noted with appreciation the cooperation between intergovernmental bodies and the secretariats of other Conventions. It referred to a speech delivered by the President of UNESCO's General Conference, which had stressed the importance of close cooperation between UNESCO's Conventions in the field of culture. It asked that this be reflected in Decision 33 COM 5A. Referring to paragraph 18, and in particular the phrase "also involving women," it asked that gender issues, and the involvement of women and communities, be taken into account. Concerning the staffing of the World Heritage Centre, and citing paragraph 39 of the Document, it expressed concern about overtime. It asked for clarification on this and recommended that it be reflected in the Decision. Under the list of activities, it asked that information on the meeting to be held in Bahrain be added and that the resulting Action Plan be included.

The Delegation of **Kenya** also asked if the agreement between the World Heritage Centre and INRAP only concerned certain sites, or if it concerned all regions. It concluded by reiterating its view that the Decision should take into account the following points:

- The issue of staffing, which could not be dealt with by the Director of the Centre alone, who was already "looking for extra-budgetary funds";
- Cooperation between the various Conventions;
- Enhancing the role of women and communities;
- Promoting the Pre-history Programme, which was believed to be an excellent one, as well as the Earthen Architecture and Tourism Programmes.

In relation to pre-history, it asked the Committee to take note of the recent act of vandalism that had occurred at the World Heritage Rock-Art Site of Acacus in Libya and to support Libya in protecting this site. This support did not necessarily have to take the form of a Decision, since it could also take the form of a field mission.

The **Chairperson** thanked Kenya for its contribution and invited other speakers to take the floor. The Chairperson asked speakers not to exceed the three minutes allocated to them and to wait for the electronic clock to start. She would give the floor to three speakers at a time, she said, and invited the Delegation of **China** to take the floor.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the host country for its hospitality, and the Secretariat for his Report. It noted that the work undertaken by the Centre was results-oriented and that it impacted on critical areas. It agreed with Kenya in commending the work undertaken and in particular in commending the building of national capacities in management and conservation that had been undertaken in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. It noted, however, that Asian countries were still under-represented as beneficiaries of these activities. It stressed the importance of high-visibility projects, mentioning in particular the Aksum Obelisk Reinstallation Project, and it expressed its appreciation to Italy for its support for that project. The Delegation considered that this project was a success for UNESCO and an expression of a new commitment on the part of the World Heritage Committee with regard to the return of cultural objects to their country of origin. It added that this example showed that different mechanisms at UNESCO could work together to enlarge the impact and increase the efficiency of the World Heritage Convention, as most States Parties to this Convention had also ratified other Conventions. It asked for greater cooperation between the World Heritage

Convention and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Delegation also welcomed the Tourism Programme and cooperation with other agencies involved in tourism, since the lack of sound tourism management could threaten sites. It concluded by saying that China was in favour of improving the workings of the Convention and some aspects of the World Heritage Centre. It asked for clarification on certain provisions in the Operational Guidelines, in order to avoid ambiguities that could lead to different interpretations. It expressed sympathy for the heavy work load undertaken by the Centre's staff, and asked that staff morale be taken into account and measured in the evaluation process.

The **Chairperson** said that the points raised by China were important, but asked for interventions to focus on the items under discussion, since some of the points raised were scheduled to be discussed later.

The Delegation of **Spain** referred to article 26 of the Secretariat's Report and expressed its satisfaction with the very good coordination and clear distribution of roles between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies during its presidency year and during all jointly organized functions and events. It said that no difficulties had been encountered in terms of the distribution of functions or roles. It provided information on events and announced that the following week it would inform the Committee about others. The Delegation informed the Committee of its intention to continue its support for the Prehistory Programme and announced the allocation of an additional 200,000 USD for this activity. It also confirmed its intention to establish a Category 2 Centre for Prehistory.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its appreciation of the work of the World Heritage Centre. It referred to paragraph 25 in the Document and wondered when the Document would be available. It also referred to paragraphs 26 to 29, which described the respective roles of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and noted that these lacked clarity. It asked for clarification of paragraph 29, firstly with regard to Reactive Monitoring Missions and secondly with regard to State of Conservation Reports. It sought clarification with regard to the heavy involvement of the World Heritage Centre in the State of Conservation Reports. The Delegation of **Canada** also expressed its concern over the high percentage of temporary staff at the Centre (27%) and the effects of excessive overtime on staff.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of **Canada** for its detailed analysis.

The **Secretariat** explained that the Centre had established a relationship with the biodiversity-related Conventions, with other UNESCO Culture Conventions, and in particular with the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. As a result, work had been undertaken in cooperation with these and experiences and results exchanged. He said that although the trend was positive, more cooperation with other Conventions needed to be undertaken. He acknowledged that more attention needed to be given to work on gender equality and apologized for the phrase referring to it in the Report, while also explaining that appropriate attention had been given to gender issues in the detailed Report of the Secretariat. The Secretariat invited the Committee to approve the Prehistory Programme, and he expressed the international community's shock at the recent damage caused by vandalism at the Acacus Site in Libya, one of the most important rock-art sites in the world. He also requested that the Committee ask the State Party to invite a mission to visit the site and report on the unfortunate and very

serious events that had taken place there. Referring to the Centre's work with other organizations, and in particular to the agreement with INRAP, he said that joint cooperation had been launched in the Casbah area of the Algiers World Heritage Site in the light of the on-going construction of the city's metro network.

He explained that activities conducted most recently were not included in the Document. Regarding workload, he acknowledged its volume and intensity, while stressing that the Secretariat had not complained. The issue needed to be addressed by the proper bodies, including the Governing Bodies of UNESCO. He answered the Delegation of **Canada** regarding its request for a document on the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies by explaining that such a document had already been included in the Report under point 2A, which was quite detailed. He nevertheless acknowledged that separate reports should be provided in the future. The drafting of State of Conservation Reports and the conducting of Reactive Monitoring Missions were distinct activities, he said, adding that this year 177 State of Conservation Reports had been written and around 40 Reactive Monitoring Missions conducted. He also said that the State of Conservation Reports made use of reports from States Parties and other sources of information. While reiterating that the Centre and the Advisory Bodies had distinct roles, he acknowledged a certain overlap in their respective tasks due to the mandate of UNESCO. UNESCO was a partner of the respective governments, and it was the main interlocutor of States Parties in terms of their political and diplomatic points of view. The World Heritage Centre was composed of highly capable staff, well-known in the regions for which they had responsibility. Members of the Centre's staff were in themselves a database of information, institutional memory and exchanges with States Parties, allowing the Centre to provide a particularly rich source of expertise, along with the Advisory Bodies complementing the Centre. He said that such synergies made cooperative work all the richer, more effective, credible and thorough. The system of State of Conservation Reports was unique, he concluded. It had proven to be both powerful and effective, and he paid tribute to it.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour les efforts déployés et attire l'attention du Comité sur l'architecture en terre, tant contemporaine et moyenâgeuse qu'antique, en particulier, l'architecture en briques crues ou en pisé. La Délégation suggère que le Centre du patrimoine mondial s'intéresse plus particulièrement aux moyens de préservation de ces matériaux fragiles de l'érosion, notamment grâce aux techniques modernes mais aussi grâce au patrimoine immatériel lié au pisé (chansons, mythologie).

The Delegation of **Israel** complimented the Centre on its work and for its striving to be a centre of excellence. It considered that battle lines needed to be discussed and clarified. It stressed the importance of the educational aspects of the Category 2 Centres and wondered about their link with the UNESCO Forum and universities. It added that the regionalization linked to the Category 2 Centres was part of a strategic approach, and it sought clarification on the hierarchy between different actors. It referred to Document 33.COM/5A1 on the Advisory Bodies, and in particular to the format used, and noted that while the IUCN Report was clear, it was not consistent with the ICOMOS Report. This did not help in understanding the differences between the two Reports, or for giving directions for next year.

The Delegation of **Australia** announced its proposal for a draft amendment to the proposed Decision. It stated that the Secretariat had shown itself to be both strong and

capable, and it welcomed the brief format of the Report, while suggesting various modifications to it. These included clarifying the contribution of the World Heritage Centre when compared to that of the other actors and providing more space for the Centre to present new ideas and strategies. Referring to paragraph 8, the Delegation considered that this item was unclear, and referring to paragraph 29, it asked that this not be agreed upon at this session, but instead be discussed further. It noted that most of the activities reported by the World Heritage Centre were relevant to the Centre's expertise in World Heritage matters. It cited article 28 of the Operational Guidelines and said that the role of the Secretariat described in this article was not reflected in the Report – namely, the Secretariat's tasks of organizing Committee and General Assembly meetings, executing their decisions, and reporting back to the Committee. It noted that, in general, there was little information in the Report about the Centre's function as a Secretariat. It congratulated the Secretariat on providing the documentation on time, but reminded it that last year's Summary Records were still not available. It stated that the Centre's role as a Secretariat should be improved in the area of managing its searchable database of Committee decisions. It illustrated this request by referring to paragraph 27 of the Secretariat's report, which mentioned a report from the Director-General of UNESCO concerning the roles and functions of the World Heritage Centre that was presented to the Bureau and the Committee in 1999. It regretted that it was impossible to find whether the Committee had agreed to the Director-General's proposal in the database.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its support for the proposed audio recording of the Summary Records. It did not adhere to the approach taken for the Prehistory Thematic Study, giving the example of the World Heritage Cultural Landscape of Kakadu, as well as of Uluru, where the human presence was continuous rather than just prehistoric. There was a problem of terminology, it said. It mentioned the joint workshop on sustainable tourism to be organized by China and Australia in Mogao, China, this year and said that more details on this would be provided later. Referring to the Audit Report 32.COM/17, it asked for an update on the D1 managerial post that had been announced by the Director-General and noted that no reference to it had been made in the Report under discussion. Finally, it sought clarifications from the Secretariat about the working group and about the interrelations between the Conventions.

In response to the question regarding the UNESCO Forum and its relation to the Category 2 Centres, the **Secretariat** explained that this had been set up 15 years ago. The UNESCO Forum was co-managed by the Centre and the University of Valencia. He informed the Committee that a meeting had taken place this year in Hanoi and said that meetings (called "conventions") would now take place every three years instead of every year. The Forum would also work virtually via the Web. He explained that the Forum involved 8,000 people and that it concerned heritage as a whole and not only World Heritage, though it was a matter for satisfaction that the number of Masters programmes on World Heritage was growing. Concerning the respective roles of the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, he explained that the main task was the provision of sound results. In answering the Australian Delegation's question regarding the Website, he said that the Centre would try to address issues having to do with the availability of the database, while highlighting that although great progress had been made in this regard, more work needed to be done. Regarding workloads, he called for caution in interpreting percentage figures, and called for the Committee to adopt a results-based approach that would allow the Secretariat to redeploy staff. He reported that the Director-General had not yet taken a decision about the recruitment of the Deputy-Director for Management,

and informed the Committee that the results of this recruitment process had not been entirely satisfactory. Regarding the working groups on the Conventions, the Secretariat said that this item would be presented later, in particular as part of the Biodiversity Liaison Working Group.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Government of Spain for its hospitality. It praised the efforts of the Secretariat and the Chief of the Arab States Unit with regard to the Hassan Fathy Village. The Delegate reported that the Council of Luxor, headed by the Prime Minister of Egypt, in which the Delegate had himself taken part, had inscribed Gournas as a National Heritage Site. The Delegation of Egypt said that Egypt possessed important rock-art sites in the Sinai and near the second cataract of the Nile in the Eastern and Western Desert. It added that no studies were available of these sites and stressed the need to register and safeguard them. It also mentioned that other rock-art sites in Libya were under threat. It concluded by expressing its interest in the Rock-Art Centres being established in Egypt and, as had previously been announced, in Quebec working jointly with the Institute to be established in Spain.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie la Présidente pour son excellent travail, ainsi que la région d'Andalousie et la ville de Séville pour la grande qualité de leur accueil. La Délégation félicite également le Directeur et tous les membres du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le remarquable travail et les rapports fournis. La Délégation souhaite savoir si le Centre du patrimoine mondial a effectué l'évaluation, précédemment demandée, de la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie globale, en place depuis 15 ans, et notamment de son impact sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation souhaite également que le Centre du patrimoine mondial explique pourquoi, dans le paragraphe 18 concernant le renforcement des capacités nationales pour la gestion et la conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial, la région arabe n'est pas citée,. La Délégation demande également de justifier la phrase « y compris les femmes » incluse dans le paragraphe, en se demandant s'il s'agit de création d'emploi. Par ailleurs, concernant le paragraphe 13, la Délégation souhaite connaître les critères sur lesquels le Centre du patrimoine mondial s'est basé pour sélectionner les pays concernés par les activités. Notamment, puisque le site de Taforalt au Maroc figurant sur la Liste indicative est un site préhistorique,.

The Delegation of **Sweden** thanked the Government of Spain, congratulated the World Heritage Centre for its Report, and asked to be recorded in English. It highlighted the Sustainable Tourism Programme approved by the 2001 Committee, endorsed its activities, and raised the importance of developing it further. It asked the Committee to support this Programme and urged that the establishment of criteria for sustainable-tourism development be included in the nomination process and the *Operational Guidelines*, giving details of principles and the implementation process. It underlined the importance to be given to the environment and communities in the process, in line with the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and called for the development of capacity-building not only for site managers, but also for communities and the private sector. It also called for the establishment of a network platform for identifying and implementing best practices and developing long-term strategy. Finally, it asked for the allocation of sufficient resources to support the sustainable tourism initiative and asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to adopt a more strategic approach when working with partners and stakeholders.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Spanish Government and the people of Spain for their warm welcome. It expressed its support for all the programmes presented by the World Heritage Centre, including the Programmes on Prehistory, Sustainable Tourism and Earthen Architecture. It requested information on the training sessions that were to take place and regretted that Jordan had not been informed about the meeting in Bahrain, in which it would have liked to participate.

The **Secretariat** said that the impact of the Global Strategy – raised in the Workshop on the Future of the World Heritage Convention – would continue to be a preoccupation. Nevertheless, positive results had been obtained, with 145 States Parties having World Heritage Sites and new categories such as Modern Architecture having been introduced. Regional distribution was an issue that still remained on the table. He underlined that many activities had taken place in the Arab Region, such as the meeting in Bahrain, and that the Secretariat's focus was on Periodic Reporting, for which several training workshops had been organized and would be organized next year. Concerning the Prehistory Programme and the question of the selection of participating countries, he explained that letters of invitation had been sent to all States Parties which had prehistoric sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, and 17 of them had replied. He confirmed that the list of participating countries was, of course, open-ended, and that the Secretariat would be happy if other countries joined it. He further added that the Programme was comprehensive and that it aimed at developing a strategic approach for the inscription and protection of prehistoric sites through the involvement of States Parties and other institutions and the creation of networks and involvement of private institutions. He said that the Category 2 Centre to be established in Bahrain would deal with training and periodic reporting.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked Saudi Arabia for providing Arabic interpretation at the meeting. It expressed its support for all the initiatives presented in the Report. It thanked the **Chairperson** and the authorities of **Spain** for their warm welcome, and reminded everyone that Bahrain would host a Committee session in 2011. The Delegation explained that it would speak in Arabic when dealing with general policy questions and questions relating to the Arab Region, and in English when dealing with working documents and decisions only available in English and French. It thanked the World Heritage Centre for the documents and Decisions, which had been well prepared and distributed on time, facilitating the work of the Committee. It also thanked the World Heritage Centre for the Report, and stressed that its format was a very comprehensive one and should be followed in the future. It also expressed its support for the important thematic Programme on Prehistory, and recalled that Bahrain had hosted a meeting on this. Finally, it supported the statements of other delegations by requesting more clarity regarding the roles of the Advisory Bodies, and requested that a document be prepared to this end.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to explain the rules designed to lead to a better and more representative working process.

The **Rapporteur** asked Committee Members to formulate proposed amendments to Draft Decisions in digital form in order to facilitate the work of the Committee, although he added that forms would also be available for draft changes in writing. He said that the formulation of amendments in digital form would not preclude the possibility of changing the Decisions during discussion.

The **Chairperson** asked for cooperation from World Heritage Committee Members and explained that this system had been employed for other Conventions and that it had contributed to better processing and improved time management.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked that Committee Members be given the email address to which they should send their proposed amendments. It thanked the Government of Spain for its hospitality and Secretariat for the Report, and said that it agreed with Bahrain that progress had been made to reach the required format. It said that written Summary Records were useful for research, as well as for reviewing and reflecting upon the Convention, and that these could not be replaced by audio recording, although it supported the latter as an additional form of Record. It said that additional experience was required, since speakers' accents or intonation might affect understanding; it also had questions about the quality of the sound. It added that the preparation of the written Summary Records had been delayed, but that these could have been completed in six months had it not been for a delay in the receipt of the audio recordings from the conference centre in Quebec, as well as delays in finalizing certain disputed decisions, which could not be finalized until April this year. There has also been competing claims on the attention and priorities of both the Centre and the Rapporteur that hindered this process.

The Delegation supported China's concern with respect to the demonstrable lack of progress in the representativeness of the World Heritage List, with regard to under-represented regions such as the Caribbean, and it reiterated concerns over the Secretariat's human-resource situation, level of work, and the temporary nature of the majority of the Centre's staff. It called for greater prioritization in allocating staff time, especially with regard to missions undertaken jointly with the Advisory Bodies. It said that the Latin America Director's post had been filled, but that the UNESCO Director-General had also promised to create a post focused on the Caribbean. Had progress been made in this regard, it asked. Concerning the World Heritage Centre's workload, it said that the Report had mentioned that 18 staff members from the Asia-Pacific region were working in field offices and asked for comparative information from other regions, including the Caribbean. Concerning paragraph 18 on actions taken in the field of capacity-building, it said that the Caribbean had benefited from the tourism activities, but that the training modules had only been available in Spanish, a language not understood in all Caribbean countries. It added that it appreciated the Centre's focus on sustainable tourism, as this was a priority for the region, and welcomed the initiative by China and Australia to host a meeting on this theme. It hoped to be involved in the important workshop on tourism and sustainable development to be held in China.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Government of Spain for its hospitality and expressed its support for the sustainable-tourism initiative and looked forward to reading the report at the next Committee session on the subject. It supported experiments with audio recording, but also wanted to keep written records. Regarding temporary staff, it had questions regarding the large amounts of overtime and the division of tasks between the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, underlining the fact that of the vast array of activities conducted by the World Heritage Centre, the World Heritage Committee was only one of them. It asked for clarification on how the Centre prioritized its activities and how far it was directed by the Committee, while also requesting the Committee to take on a more direct managerial role. It added that extra-budgetary projects added to the Centre's workload and imposed priorities on it.

Regarding the adoption of a lexicon for World Heritage Sites and buffer zones, and its use for the terminology used in the Operational Guidelines, it recalled that the World Heritage Committee meeting in Quebec had requested that this lexicon be submitted in December 2008. However, no reference to it was made in the Secretariat's Report.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Secretariat for the Report and for the well-executed work that had been undertaken. It expressed its support for the sustainable-tourism initiative, as well as for the exercise aiming to determine the division of roles and responsibilities between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It welcomed the creation of a Working Group to revise terms and procedures relating to the Convention. Finally, it expressed its full support for the proposed Decision, specifically concerning the Prehistory Initiative. It thanked Spain for supporting the Initiative and stated that it looked forward to the creation of a Category 2 Centre in Brazil.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked the host country, the Regional Government of Andalusia, and the Chairperson for their hospitality. It further thanked the Secretariat for his Report. It expressed its concern over the workload at the Centre and said that it would welcome suggestions from the Centre for solving this problem, suggesting that a review be undertaken in the near future. In support of the statement made by the United States of America, it said that the Republic of Korea was looking forward to the revision of the Guidelines concerning buffer zones for World Heritage properties. It requested that the Secretariat clarify the current number and composition of staff at the World Heritage Centre. Finally, it invited Committee members to respect time limits.

The **Chairperson** said that the issue of time management would be addressed later during the Committee meeting and gave the floor to the Secretariat, followed by ICOMOS and the Delegation of Zimbabwe.

The **Secretariat** agreed that preparation of the Summary Records should have taken less than one year, recalling the unfortunate circumstances linked to delays in shipping the audio recordings. He also referred to the complexity of some of the Decisions that had had to be dealt with. He expressed the readiness of the Secretariat to proceed with or without the audio recordings, or with both the written Summary Records and the audio recordings, as deemed necessary by the Committee. He said that recruitment for the P1/P2 post within the Latin America and Caribbean Unit would be finalized and a suitable candidate identified; he added that the whole Unit worked on the Caribbean region and that the person recruited would reinforce its work. In responding to the United States of America's concern over the large number of activities undertaken by the Centre, he said that these activities were all the result of Committee Decisions, and that they concerned World Heritage Sites, such as the projects developed in the Congo. He underlined the support provided by extra-budgetary funds for the regular work of the Secretariat. He explained that some of these projects were special projects that supported the implementation of the Convention and constituted flagship activities that enhanced its visibility. They allowed best practices to be developed in accordance with Committee requirements, as had been the case for the projects in Aksum, Congo, Mozambique and Lalibela. Regarding the decision to amend the Operational Guidelines in relation to buffer zones, he said that the exercise was unnecessary as the terminology requested by the Committee – “property” instead of “core zone” – was already the one

used in the Operational Guidelines. As for the lexicon, he said that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, had underestimated the amount of work involved, and he apologized for not having been able to meet the deadline. He asked for more time to be given to produce the lexicon. Finally, he informed the Committee that the proceedings of the meeting related to buffer zones were now available on the World Heritage Centre's Website, and that they would be widely distributed. He then asked the Secretariat to provide more information on the workload exercise, which he had supervised.

The **Secretariat** invited the Committee to consult Document 33.COM/INF.5A3, which gave details on issues raised by the previous speakers and of which the Secretariat's Report contained only a summary. Concerning the lack of information on UNESCO staff members working in field offices in the Latin American and Caribbean region, he explained that IOS had sent a questionnaire to all the field offices but had received no answer from offices in the Latin America and Caribbean region. He also explained that these staff members were not World Heritage Centre staff, but were Culture and Science Sector staff who carried out activities for the World Heritage Centre in the field offices. He invited the Delegation of **Kenya** to consult pages 19 and 20 of the Report for additional information on the workload of the Africa and Administration Units.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS and asked it to provide information pertaining to its work. On behalf of the three Advisory Bodies, **ICOMOS** thanked the Spanish authorities for their hospitality. As had been their policy over recent years, whenever possible the Advisory Bodies would make joint statements in order to save the Committee's time and to allow more time for debate. It added that the Advisory Bodies welcomed the Report presented by the Centre, feeling that this contained some innovative proposals. It noted the proposal before the Committee to change the format of the Summary Records and asked that the Committee, with the support of the World Heritage Centre, find a solution to providing a paper version of the Summary Records in a reasonable timeframe. It said that it considered the written Summary Records to be an indispensable working tool for the State Parties, the Advisory Bodies and all those involved in preparations for the next meeting of the World Heritage Committee, as they could be rapidly read and understood, while recorded records could not. It thought that the written records were widely used. The Advisory Bodies welcomed the part of the Report that concerned their respective roles and their relationship with the Centre, and they welcomed continued discussion in order that roles were mutually respected and clear. ICOMOS also expressed the Advisory Bodies' preference for future reporting on this issue to be dealt with in a separate agenda item that would include all aspects of their work. It said that, as noted in the document, thematic studies were a responsibility of the Advisory Bodies (paragraph 174 of the Operational Guidelines), and it welcomed the support of Spain for work on prehistory and looked forward to working on the relevant studies. Finally, it said that the Advisory Bodies were keen to respond to points made regarding the Advisory Bodies' more complete reporting to the Committee, both in information documents and in documents for discussion, and it welcomed suggestions regarding the harmonization of reports between the Advisory Bodies. Finally it noted that the Advisory Bodies also shared the Committee's concerns about resourcing and overwork.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Zimbabwe and asked that Observers speak for no more than the two minutes they were entitled to.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Chairperson for giving it the opportunity to take the floor. Referring to paragraph 46 of the Document, it shared the concern of the previous speakers over the staffing issue and said that there was a direct link to the Audit Report 32.COM.17 presented in Quebec, as the Report discussed in the present session was a follow-up to this. It said that the Audit Report had recommended the creation of seven posts that were judged to be indispensable; including a P1/P2 in the Africa Unit without which, the Report had stated, natural sites in Africa would be affected. It concluded by seeking clarification on progress made in this area.

The **Secretariat** said that the procedure to fill the seven posts had not been agreed upon by the Committee, which had caused the Secretariat to resort to internal movements of staff and temporary appointments.

The **Chairperson** called for delegates to recognize the efforts made by the Secretariat on a daily basis in its work for the Convention and suggested including the appreciation of delegates in the Decision. Referring to Decision 32COM.5A, she called on States Parties to maintain their constructive attitude and recalled that the purpose of the Decision was to guide the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in their future work and future reports to the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the note-taking system was operating on an experimental basis, and said that an email address would be made available in the afternoon to facilitate the process. He informed the Committee that the Secretariat had included the amendments requested by Kenya and Bahrain, and that Israel had not yet submitted its amendment.

The **Chairperson** expressed the hope that this would be a useful amendment and asked Israel to submit it. She said that paragraphs 1 and 2 had not been the object of amendments, while Australia had proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.

Following a question raised by Morocco, she clarified that the Committee adopted Decisions as they appeared on the screen in their original versions, and that translation was finalized later. In case of doubt, it was the original version that should be referred to.

Paragraph 3 was adopted with the amendment proposed by Australia, as well as Paragraph 4 with the amendment proposed by Kenya.

The **Rapporteur** said that given the new technological tools at the disposal of the Committee, translation would be done at the end of the day, when both versions would be available for distribution. He read the additional paragraph requested by Kenya and recommended deleting the reference to the meeting in Turkey.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** fully supported the spirit of paragraph 4, but asked Kenya to include it in agenda item 5C on multilateral agreements, which was similar to Kenya's amendment.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that multilateral agreements concerned other institutions, while its amendment to paragraph 4 referred to UNESCO Conventions that were not multilateral agreements.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its satisfaction with the fact that Decisions were projected and amended on the screens and requested that the Rapporteur ensure that standardized spelling was used for words such as “Convention” and so on.

The Delegation of **Morocco** asked that the words “noted with gratitude” be replaced by “noted with satisfaction”.

The **Chairperson** asked that point 5C be read out, in order for the Committee to make a decision on where the text proposed by Kenya should be inserted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it agreed with the insertion of this paragraph wherever it was deemed most appropriate.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled the importance of cooperation between the various Conventions, which had been raised by the President of UNESCO’s General Conference, as well as by the Delegation of **Tunisia**. It said that paragraph 23 clearly showed that the World Heritage Centre had acted in accordance with the Committee’s repeated requests.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed on the amendment as proposed by Kenya.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked that the words, “the World Heritage Centre works with other Committees,” be replaced by “the World Heritage Centre works with the Secretariats of other Committees”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked that the whole paragraph be read aloud before expressing its agreement.

The **Rapporteur** read out the paragraph: “Such cooperation shall be encouraged and formalized as this will further strengthen the work of the Centre and help in the harmonization of the various UNESCO Conventions”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed, providing that comments were made on the structure.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it did not support the amendment because not all countries were Parties to the other Conventions, and it expressed doubts about the relevance of the amendment.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed deleting the end of the paragraph, so that it would end with the words, “would further strengthen the work of the Centre”.

The **Secretariat** asked the UNESCO Legal Advisor for comments on the legal aspects of the proposed amendment in relation to the UNESCO Conventions.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** agreed with the United States of America’s comment, and said that while informal contacts, exchanges of information and resource-sharing were possible, UNESCO could not formalize relations between its various Conventions. He asked the Delegation of **Kenya** to explain what it meant by “harmonization”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it was willing to delete “harmonized” and keep “strengthened”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** accepted Kenya's final formulation and asked that the words "finalizing" and "harmonizing" be replaced by "encouraging".

The Delegations of **Kenya** and Nigeria agreed on the amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked that the words "marine sites" be deleted and the title of the Convention used instead.

The **Chairperson** called for the meeting to be adjourned for lunch.

The **Secretariat** announced that the working group on issues pertaining to World Heritage in Asia including nominations would be meeting in the Ronda Meeting Room.

The meeting rose at 2.15 p.m.

FIRST DAY – TUESDAY, 23 JUNE 2009

SECOND MEETING

3.30 p.m. – 8.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

**ITEM 5.A REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES
AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE'S DECISIONS (Continuation)**

The **Chairperson** reminded all present that Item 5A would continue to be discussed. As the screens were not yet available, the Chairperson shared her own “report” on her last year as Chairperson. In this capacity, she had attended several meetings and events, including inscription ceremonies for the sites of Teide National Park (Spain) and Madain Saleh, the first site to be inscribed in Saudi Arabia and included on the World Heritage List during the 32nd session of the Committee in Québec. The Director-General of UNESCO had also attended this ceremony. She had attended a meeting organized by the Secretariat in Brazil during the process for the creation of a Category 2 Centre in Brasilia, which had received the positive support of the Executive Board. She had participated in several other activities for the conservation and management of World Heritage Sites. Together with ICOMOS, she had attended the St. Petersburg meeting, as well as the signing ceremony between the Government of Chile and UNESCO for activities in the Eastern Islands financed by the Government of Japan. She had also attended the Fuerteventura Meeting on Starlight Reserves and World Heritage, as well as other activities that were important for the development and implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The longest activity she had been involved in had been the Prehistory and World Heritage Initiative, with meetings held in Paris, Drakensberg and Burgos. All of these had been international meetings with the participation of well-known experts, the Advisory Bodies, site managers, and with a strong scientific input and focus. She had also taken part in meetings with the Advisory Bodies, International Assistance Panels, and others.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to continue with the adoption of **Draft Decision 32 COM 5A** and asked the Rapporteur to inform the Committee about the amendments received.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the following amendments had been received and read them out: paragraph 4ter (Bahrain), paragraph 5 (Australia) and paragraph 5a (Canada).

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Canadian proposal and enquired as to whether Australia would agree to remove 5b, given that it was up to the Committee to set the priorities for the work of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Australia** changed the word “priorities” to “criteria”, and said that it was up to the Centre to make discretionary decisions according to the budget available.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** warned against being too directive, while indicating that in its view paragraph 5a encapsulated 5b, thus making the latter redundant. It felt that the Committee should bear in mind the Centre’s workload rather than take an overly meticulous approach.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** indicated that it preferred to retain paragraph 5b, as there were many managers in the Centre, and the Committee needed to understand how they made decisions.

The Delegation of **Australia** clarified that its intention was to support the Centre in its work.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** agreed to go with the majority view.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5 of the original Decision as proposed by Bahrain, which requested that the Centre produce, on an experimental basis, an indexed audio verbatim record of the proceedings of the 33rd session, in addition to the standard Summary Records, produced since the 26th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested explanation of what an indexed audio verbatim record was and whether this system would be experimental or if the Centre would now start applying the new system.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to paragraph 5 of the working document, which mentioned indexing the audio recording. It supported the rest of Bahrain’s proposal, indicating that the idea was to start the experiment and see how it would develop.

Paragraph 5 was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that a new paragraph 6, proposed by Australia, included the outline provided by the Centre giving details of its role and of the roles of the Advisory Bodies, and noted that this topic could be further discussed by the Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

The Delegation of **Spain** pointed out that this amendment replaced the original paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Australia** reminded those present that the Advisory Bodies had asked for a separate agenda item to discuss their reports at the next Committee session, and it introduced an amendment to reflect this in the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments introduced by Australia with regard to the thematic programmes and their financing, and continued with amendments to paragraph 8b (Kenya) and 8ter.

La Délégation du **Maroc** signale avoir demandé la parole à plusieurs reprises sans l’avoir obtenu. Elle propose à la Présidente de se faire assister par le Secrétariat pour tenir compte de toutes les demandes de parole. Elle signale que le texte français de la proposition d’amendement n’est pas bien formulé, mélangeant programmes thématiques

et programmes régionaux. De plus, elle exprime sa préoccupation quant au retard accumulé dans l'agenda.

The **Chairperson** said that a closer look at the French version of the Decision would be undertaken in order to ensure a coherent version. She shared Morocco's concern about time management, but indicated that there had been many amendments and that items on this issue would need to be revised next year.

La Délégation du **Maroc** consciente de la nécessité d'avancer vite, précise qu'il faut avancer à bon escient.

The **Chairperson** repeated that translation would be dealt with later.

The Delegation of **Kenya** sympathized with French-speaking colleagues and the need to reflect the text properly, as well as with the issue of time management, but felt that the issues discussed were of major concern. It proposed a further change to the amendment.

The **Rapporteur** proposed merging the ideas received into one paragraph 8. He further indicated that the new paragraph 9 was originally paragraph 6. Paragraph 8 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel**, anticipating the next paragraphs on prehistory, proposed that several Committee Members work together as a drafting group to propose appropriate wording.

The **Chairperson** noted the interest of the following delegations to participate as members of the drafting group: Australia, Bahrain, Israel, Kenya, Spain and the United States of America, but noted that the drafting group would also be open to others.

The **Rapporteur** read out Israel's amendment to paragraph 11 and Australia's amendments to paragraph 12 and 13. The paragraphs were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out the new paragraph proposed by Australia with regard to organizing a workshop in Autumn 2009 on sustainable tourism at the Mogao Caves World Heritage Site in China.

The Delegation of **Australia** recalled that all States Parties were aware that tourism was not only one of the greatest opportunities, but also one of the most serious threats to World Heritage. There were many examples where World Heritage inscription had led to greatly increased numbers of tourists, it said, and the threat these represented needed to be dealt with. As the Operational Guidelines and the text of the Convention did not contain clear guidelines on the issue, the planned workshop, which has been developed with multilateral partners (WTO) and various stakeholders (the Advisory Bodies, UNF, NWHF), should pave the way. In presenting the workshop to the Committee, Australia was seeking its approval before going forward.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported Australia and proposed a minor change to the wording of the Decision.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** félicite l'Etat partie pour la bonne organisation et l'excellent accueil. Elle propose que les paragraphes se suivent par ordre alphabétique anglais et insiste pour l'amélioration de la traduction en français.

The Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Chairperson and supported the comments made by Australia. It noted that such workshops were not planned for the Latin America and Caribbean region, but they could be very useful tools as the World Heritage Sites of the region were also affected by tourism.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 14 and 15 as introduced by Australia, and these were adopted.

The **Chairperson** declared that the proposals of the drafting group should be awaited. She said that the debate was important for the implementation of the Convention, but was not sure that this was the best place for the discussion to take place. Next year's Committee sessions would need to continue discussion about these issues, while the Draft Decision should focus on the tasks of the Centre, the functioning of the Secretariat and internal matters, and should not include thematic studies.

The Delegation of **Brazil** fully supported this proposal.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Rapporteur propose a paragraph in the Draft Decision to reflect this approach.

ITEM 16 IMPLEMENTATION REPORT OF THE 2008-2009 BUDGET AND ADOPTION OF THE 2010-2011 BUDGET

- 16A: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION REPORT 2008-2009
- 16B: PRESENTATION OF THE BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE
 WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR THE 2010-2011 BIENNIUM

Documents: *WHC-09/33.COM/16A*
 WHC-09/33.COM/16B

Decisions: **32 COM 16A**
 32 COM 16B

The **Chairperson** announced that **Ms. Alissandra Cummins** (Barbados) would chair a working group on the budget and would report to the plenary at a later stage. She invited the Secretariat to introduce the item briefly and then to proceed to the creation of a Subsidiary Body according to Rule 21, indicating that discussion should take place once the recommendations of the working group had been presented.

The **Secretariat** introduced the item and its associated working documents and indicated that document WHC-09/33.COM/16B also contained ideas discussed within the UNESCO working group on how to cope with other issues, notably those due to the fluctuation of the value of the US dollar.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read out the Draft Decision allowing the creation of the Subsidiary Body.

The Delegation of **Australia**, while waiting for the preparation of the Decision, enquired as to whether the Advisory Bodies had been provided with the funding necessary for their activities, as the documents did not give any indication about the level of funding

provided. This was important information due to the forthcoming discussion under items 7A and 7B, in which a number of missions would need to be requested.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that several meetings had been held with the Advisory Bodies, which calculated their activities in an accurate way. The budgets would be provided to the Committee. He also stated that the Centre was willing to monitor the planned budgets for the missions during the discussions, in order to provide guidance for the Decisions. Details would be made available to the Subsidiary Body, which would be assisted by the members of the Secretariat throughout its meetings.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft decision on the creation of a working group on item 16 as a Subsidiary Body meeting for the duration of the session and reporting back to the plenary. The working group would be presided over by Ms. Cummins, and it would provide the Committee with a Draft Decision for consideration by the plenary. The draft decision was adopted as read out by the Rapporteur.

Ms. Alissandra Cummins announced that she would be convening the meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Wednesday 24 June from 14:30 to 15:30, noting that no interpretation would be available.

ITEM 14A REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/14A

Decision: **33 COM 14A**

The **Chairperson** informed the meeting of the creation of a working group as a consultative body for the discussion of the Future of the Convention (announced during the workshop held in February in Paris). She explained that the working group would welcome all the States Parties of the Convention and their participation, should they wish to do so. The Chairperson invited the Delegation of **Australia** to chair the group and to be in charge of time management. The working group would meet every day from 8:30 to 9:30 a.m. The Draft Decision for creating the consultative body under Rule 20 was proposed for adoption. The working group would report back to the Committee for debate at the end of the meeting.

The **Rapporteur** read the Draft Decision and asked for amendments.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for confirmation that the Advisory Bodies would be able to send representatives to the meetings of the working groups.

The **Chairperson** requested the Advisory Bodies to take part in the meetings of the working groups.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if this working group was open-ended.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the consultative body had been established under Rule 20 in order to allow all States Parties to attend. She asked the Rapporteur to include the detail requested by Israel in the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** included the changes in the Decision, establishing the working group as an open-ended consultative body.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the chairperson of the group should be named in the Decision, or if this should be left for later.

Le **Secrétariat** clarifie que ceci n'est pas nécessaire. La décision ne doit pas obligatoirement, selon le règlement intérieur, faire référence au Président du groupe. L'Ambassadeur Kondo ayant été désigné Président par le Groupe en sa capacité personnelle.

The **Chairperson** explained that some Members of the Committee had been asked to work as members of the group in order to facilitate its work. She informed those present that Ms. Cummins would lead the working group on the budget and that Mr. Greg Terrill would be responsible for leading the working group on the Future of the Convention.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.14A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** informed that interpretation for the working group meetings on the Future of the Convention would be available in the mornings.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested that States Parties be at the meeting room at 8:20, in order to be ready to start at 8:30 when interpretation would be available. This would help to avoid delays in the agenda and parallel sessions overlapping with the Committee.

The **Chairperson** was grateful for the generous contribution of Japan in providing lunch and facilitating space for the discussion of this issue.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 14A of the Agenda.

ITEM 5B REPORT ON WORLD HERITAGE AND THE SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES PROGRAMME (SIDS)

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM/5B*

Decision: **33 COM 5B**

The **Secretariat** presented the progress report on the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Programme, pointing out that it should be seen within the overall framework of UNESCO's work on SIDS, for which an inter-sectoral platform had been created in this biennium. The Director-General had presented a progress report on the Small Island Developing States Programme, including all the activities undertaken by UNESCO, during the last meeting of the Executive Board. The Secretariat explained that

UNESCO's work focused on implementing ten of the 19 actions of the Mauritius Strategy for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. The Report presented by the Secretariat included the progress achieved since 2005, when the SIDS Programme was launched. It also included statistics on results linked to the World Heritage Convention. The ratification of the Convention by the Cook Islands in January 2009, and the advanced state of ratification by the Bahamas, was also mentioned. It was announced that the first nomination from Cape Verde would be analyzed during this Committee session, and that three other nominations from Small Island Developing States were in the pipeline for next year. The Secretariat informed the Committee that capacity-building programmes would also be implemented, taking as an example the capacity-building programme in the Caribbean.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its appreciation of the Report, notwithstanding the fact that a lot of the work had been done earlier and in cooperation with a broad region. The Delegation indicated that it was more important for Barbados, as a country that was part of Latin America and also one of the Small Island Developing States, that it be able to see the results of the reports in the present format. It stressed that after the accession of the Bahamas, other countries in the region would follow with the support of the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Cuba** took the floor for the first time to commend Spain, the Chairperson and the region of Andalusia for hosting the meeting in Seville. It referred to the importance of the Caribbean programme. The Delegation said that countries in the region felt a strong need to examine possibilities for linking to other programmes related to the protection of heritage in the Caribbean. The Delegation referred to the Slave Routes Programme, which included a strategy for the identification of sites having exceptional value. It further stressed the huge potential of the region for addressing the issue of the representativeness of the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Australia** spoke of its strong relationship with the islands in the Asia-Pacific region. It wished to put on record the very significant efforts that the Pacific Small Island Developing States had made in activities related to the World Heritage Convention. The Delegation mentioned the ratification of the Convention by the Cook Islands this year and the development of five Tentative Lists. Other Small Island Developing States in the region had also had sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation stated that new nominations were in the pipeline, and it noted with pleasure that workshops held in the region were serving as an example for other regions. However, the Delegation wanted to introduce a note of caution: Pacific Island countries valued their regional distinctiveness, and many activities in the report were Pacific actions as well as Small Island Developing States activities, and it was requested that they be recorded in this context in the future.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the Small Island Developing States programme was a very good one, which it supported. It looked forward to the inscription of further sites in the region. It noted with satisfaction that Small Island Developing States in Africa had had sites listed. The Delegation suggested that the Draft Decision include a progress report for next year on the results of the capacity-building programme in the Caribbean. It said that it would also be useful to promote the exchange of experiences and ideas among Small Island Developing States in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa and the Asia-Pacific region.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** wished to put on record its thanks to Andorra, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and all those who had helped the Small Island Developing States Programme. These islands were of ecological and economic importance to the world at large. It expressed its readiness to provide support for the Programme, whether technical or in terms of human resources.

IUCN welcomed the progress of this Programme relating to one of the world's most-fragile ecosystems, notably due to the impact of climate change. IUCN emphasized three main issues: synergies could be explored with the marine programme; IUCN had recently established a Global Programme on Islands that could contribute to the implementation of the Small Island Developing States Programme, in partnership with UNESCO and other partners; IUCN welcomed the particular attention given to the Caribbean region, as it was establishing a Caribbean Programme that could contribute to the implementation of the SIDS Programme in the Caribbean region.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read the proposed amendments.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments to paragraph 3 (Kenya), which requested the Centre to continue to address specific issues under the regional programmes. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments proposed by Australia to paragraph 3, requesting that the Centre address specific issues under regional programmes. Paragraph 3 was adopted. Paragraph 4 was adopted, changing the order of the names of the mentioned countries to place them in alphabetical order.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the amendment suggested by Kenya had been included as a new paragraph between paragraphs 3 and 4. He read the amendment requesting the Centre to report at the next Committee meeting on capacity-building activities related to Small Island Developing States. Another paragraph was added requesting that the Centre promote exchanges among such states.

The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 5, amended by Australia and New Zealand, which requested that the Centre organize a regional meeting to review progress in the implementation of the Action Plan for the Caribbean and submit a report to be examined by the Committee in 2010.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as well as Paragraph 6, including the amendment proposed by Barbados, Israel and Australia, asking for more thematic studies to be done on the cultural landscapes and seascapes, routes (slave trade) and environmental features of the Caribbean, African and Pacific regions.

The Draft Decision **33 COM. 5B** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 5C THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND MAIN MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/5C

Decision: **33 COM 5C**

The **Secretariat** presented the Report requested by the Committee at its last session. The Secretariat explained that one of the principal mechanisms for cooperation was through the Biodiversity Liaison Group, which had met annually since 2002. It had been informed that Memorandums of Understanding had been signed between the World Heritage Centre and other organizations, such as UNEP and the Convention of Biological Diversity, among others. The agreements were oriented to the conservation of World Heritage Sites, in cooperation with the other organizations. A detailed description of the nature of the multilateral cooperation agreements was included in the Report. The Secretariat also mentioned other activities, including figures and agreements signed, which could be found in the Report.

IUCN welcomed the Report and noted the engagement with multilateral environmental agreements. IUCN informed those present that it was currently working to enhance relationships between IUCN and the Conventions. It was also working to create better working relationships within its own secretariat, including flagship programmes. IUCN indicated that it was important to connect World Heritage status and multilateral agreements.

The Delegation of **Israel** fully supported the Draft Decisions, and amended paragraph 5 by recommending a strategic approach to cooperation be discussed at the 34th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported Israel's recommendation. It also asked that greater consideration be given to the continuity between culture and nature in the multilateral agreements. The Delegation stated the importance of strengthening training and capacity-building opportunities, especially in Africa.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** underlined that a strategic vision was important for the future. It underscored the importance of the protocol agreements.

The Delegation of **Barbados** welcomed the report, indicating that it would be a useful tool for the Small Island Developing States, especially Barbados, in pursuing heritage conservation.

The Delegation of **Korea** believed that cooperation as a result of the multilateral agreements would enhance the credibility of the Convention. The Delegation welcomed the Report and supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** said the Report was a valuable document that could be improved at certain points. The Delegation stated its interest in sustainable development, which could be one way of improving the operation of the Convention. It brought up the need to reinforce dialogue between the Secretariat and the Conventions, and suggested that other institutions be invited to the next Committee meeting. The

Delegation also suggested that this item be kept for the next Committee meeting. Finally, it recommended that the Secretariat work on improving dialogue among partners.

The **Delegation of Zimbabwe** (Observer) commended the work of the Secretariat and suggested that the World Heritage Convention develop an agreement with CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora), asking if there was also an agreement for cooperation with the Convention against Desertification.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the suggestions of the Committee would be included in the Draft Decision. It also stated that the suggestions made by Bahrain would be further explored. The Secretariat explained that cooperation activities were being undertaken. Regarding the question from Barbados concerning coordinated approaches and harmonization mechanisms, the Secretariat indicated that there had been attempts to harmonize the reporting cycles of several Conventions, but that this had proved difficult as the work of the World Heritage Convention included cultural heritage, which could not be included in the other reporting mechanisms. The Secretariat indicated that the suggestion from Brazil of inviting cooperation from other Conventions was acted on each year by the Centre, and that the Committee relied on participation from representatives of other Conventions in meetings. Finally, it was indicated that the possibility of drawing up Memorandums of Understanding with CITES and the Convention against Desertification would be explored.

The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 5, amended by Israel, which requested the Centre to identify other Conventions and programmes in the field of cultural heritage, and recommended that a strategic approach to cooperation be discussed during the next Committee meeting.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. Paragraph 3 was amended by a minor amendment from Kenya. The Chairperson informed those present that a new paragraph before paragraph 4 had been proposed by Kenya.

The **Rapporteur** read the new paragraph proposed by Kenya for inclusion before paragraph 4: "Further notes the need for all States Parties to seek to address the great imbalance between nature and culture in the World Heritage List and to increase the information sharing between multilateral agreements for the conservation and for strengthening of training and capacity-building."

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that a similar amendment had been sent by email that had not been included.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked if Kenya would accept the inclusion of this proposal in Item 10B.

The Delegation of **Kenya** informed those present that it would be proposing another amendment for Item 10B and that it would prefer to include this one as it was.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique être en accord avec l'esprit de la proposition faite par la Délégation du Kenya mais elle souligne qu'il faudrait revoir la formulation du français. La Délégation se porte volontaire pour aider le Secrétariat.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with Morocco.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the texts had been introduced in both languages and that the new paragraph suggested by Kenya was adopted. Paragraph 4 was adopted..

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested the addition of two new paragraphs regarding the inclusion of the concept of sustainable development in the programme and suggested keeping this item on the agenda for the next session of the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** suggested including these paragraphs after paragraph 3 and made a small amendment to the wording of the final paragraph proposed by Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** constate que la traduction française n'est pas satisfaisante. Le dernier paragraphe, précise-t-elle, qui vient d'être adopté, pouvait être amélioré en évitant certaines répétitions. La Délégation souhaite que des efforts soient fournis pour améliorer les textes en français.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation for its comments regarding the use of language.

La Délégation du **Maroc** se réfère au paragraphe précédent concernant l'ordre du jour de la prochaine session du Comité qui n'a pas encore été développé, ni soumis pour adoption au Comité. La Délégation note qu'il serait préférable de parler d'inscrire cette question à l'ordre du jour provisoire de la 34e session.

Le **Secrétariat** confirme que l'ordre du jour est préparé au fur et à mesure sur la base de points reconduits et statutaires ainsi que certains points résultant de la discussion des membres du Comité pendant la session. Une anticipation sur la formulation de l'ordre du jour est donc souhaitable et possible.

The **Rapporteur** suggested including the final paragraph proposed by Brazil at the end of the Decision and suggested that it be renumbered as paragraph 6.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 6A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM/6A*

Decision: **33 COM 6A**

The **Director of the African World Heritage Fund** provided a Report on its strategic plan for 2008-2010. This focused on strengthening the operations of the Fund, mobilizing resources, implementing priority activities (including support for the nomination of more properties) and better management of sites. He explained that the Fund's targets included the delivery of eight nominations by 2010 for consideration by the World Heritage Committee in 2011. A second target consisted of the provision of

support to 10 African countries in the updating of Tentative Lists. A third target focused on helping to remove sites from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and a fourth concerned the mobilization of further resources for the Fund.

The Director explained that the Fund had a new board, consisting of five representatives from the region and representatives of the Director-General of UNESCO and of the African Union. He explained that board members served a two-year term, renewable once. Policies had been developed to raise funds and implement broad objectives, while efforts were underway to obtain UNESCO Category 2 Centre status. In implementing projects, the Fund had worked with partners such as the AECI, IUCN, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS, and this had helped implement strategic programmes and strengthen capacity to implement and monitor projects. There were now five staff members at the Fund, and their main task had been to raise resources. He reported that several countries had contributed, though the number of African countries having contributed remained small. The Director reminded the Committee that it was an African fund and that it should receive support from African countries. Once the Fund's endowment funds capitalization target was reached, self-financing would be possible, and there would be no need to seek further financing. The Director appealed to those who had not yet contributed to give their support to the Fund, and he encouraged those who had pledged to contribute their pledges as soon as possible. He expressed his awareness of the economic crisis, but said that Africa should not be abandoned in such times. If the Fund worked, it would be able to address the issues for which it was necessary. He listed a variety of activities in which the Fund had been involved and concluded by explaining that 17 projects had been supported in 15 countries.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Director of the African World Heritage Fund for his presentation and invited interventions from Committee Members.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its satisfaction with the presentation, as well as with the 2008 Annual Report, including the well-presented financial report. It congratulated the African World Heritage Fund and its Board of Trustees for showing accountability and transparency in its activities. It also pleaded for African countries that had pledged their support to the Fund to follow through with their pledges. It stated that the role of heritage was important, and that at this time of economic crisis, with its attendant moral decay, confusion and troubles, investing in heritage was a sound objective. It explained that it had prepared an amendment to the Draft Decision recommending that the work of the African World Heritage Fund be recognized and thanking the supporters of the Fund.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** commended the African World Heritage Fund as a home-grown body that enjoyed the support of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. It expressed satisfaction at seeing something original coming out of Africa that demonstrated accountability, transparency and integrity. It called for other organizations to emulate the African World Heritage Fund, and it ended by supporting the amendment of Kenya.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** also congratulated the African World Heritage Fund and emphasized its satisfaction with results related to capacity-building. It recognized the financial support provided by different partners and thanked them. It invited the partners to continue their support, and invited those that had pledged funds to follow through and make those funds available.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite le Président du Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain pour le excellent rapport qui a été présenté. Le Maroc, pays arabe faisant également partie du continent africain, est tout à fait favorable à ce Fonds et encourage ses activités, car elles contribuent à la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie globale. Il remercie tous les pays donateurs pour leur soutien et leur demande de continuer dans cette voie.

The Delegation of **Spain** thanked the Director of the African World Heritage Fund. It expressed its great satisfaction at the work accomplished, especially given the lack of human resources at the Fund. It stressed that the Fund was an important initiative that responded to the two main targets of Spanish cooperation assistance, which were the link between heritage and development and support for the Africa region. It called for all UNESCO Member States to support the Fund.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie la Présidente, et à travers elle le gouvernement espagnol, pour l'accueil attentionné et bienveillant qui a été fait aux membres du Comité ainsi que pour leur importante contribution au Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain. Elle félicite MM. Wakashe et Ngoro pour leur travail réalisé dans des conditions souvent difficiles, ainsi que pour leur motivation et leur engagement. Elle rappelle qu'à l'occasion de la séance organisée par la Délégation du Japon ce même jour entre 14h et 15h30, la Délégation de l'Ouganda a signalé qu'en Afrique, les gens n'avaient pas encore suffisamment conscience de l'importance du patrimoine. Pour les gouvernants africains, le problème essentiel est en effet la pauvreté. Or, les problèmes économiques et culturels sont liés. La Délégation de Madagascar souligne la nécessité d'une vision holistique du développement et propose aux responsables du Fonds de développer en ce sens les activités de promotion et d'information envers les dirigeants et les populations d'Afrique.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the importance of the African World Heritage Fund in the protection of heritage. The World Heritage Centre and the world as a whole should support the work of the Fund, because Africa was the cradle of humanity. Since the first human beings had appeared in Africa, the Fund should support archaeological work on this continent. It informed the Committee that Egypt would be holding a seminar in September 2009 on African archaeology, and it would like the support of the Fund.

ICCROM thanked the Spanish Government for its warm hospitality and for the excellent organization of the meeting. It congratulated the Director of the African World Heritage Fund for his excellent Report and expressed its pleasure at having been able to collaborate with the African World Heritage Fund on a number of fronts over the past year, in particular those presented in the Report, such as the courses to build the capacity of professionals from the region to prepare nominations and Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, and important initiatives like the Africa 2009 seminar on heritage conservation and poverty alleviation, which had taken place in Sao Tome and Principe in March 2009. It stated that this seminar had been strengthened thanks to the partnership of the African World Heritage Fund. ICCROM noted that though it was not in a position to contribute to the endowment fund, it pledged its continued support and partnership to the African World Heritage Fund.

IUCN, on behalf of the two Africa regional offices of IUCN in West and Central Africa and East and Southern Africa, commended the African World Heritage Fund for its collaborative approach to sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger in Africa. It stated that the African regional offices of IUCN and Global Programme were working closely with the Fund to address this matter, as well as to develop additional support to State

Parties in capacity-building and the assessment of managerial effectiveness at sites. It stated that with cooperation from two Centres of Excellence on Protected Area Managerial Training in Africa, Mweka in Tanzania and Garouva in Cameroon, the AWHF and IUCN were examining the possibility of enhancing training modules, with a focus on enhancing the capacities of site managers in Africa. It also said that IUCN, in cooperation with the AWHF, was examining the possibility of assessing sites in conflict areas, with a view to monitoring the condition of these sites. It invited the Africa World Heritage Fund to make further use of the wide network of local expertise on Protected Area Management available within IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas and the Species Survival Commission and its country offices.

The **Chairperson** closed the list of speakers. Regarding the Draft Decision, the **Rapporteur** indicated that one amendment from Kenya was proposed, introducing paragraph 3b., The Delegation of **Israel** noted that its proposal for an amendment appeared to have been misplaced, indicating that it had been on the computer earlier in the day. It then noted that the amendment had not been misplaced and was on the screen.

The **Rapporteur** apologized to the Delegation of Israel, and reminded the Committee Members of the email address to which proposed amendments could be sent. He read out the proposed amendment provided by the Delegation of Israel for translation into French.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose d'enlever le mot « inclusion » dans la formulation du paragraphe 3 bis, estimant que l'expression « soutien aux propositions d'inscriptions sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial » peut se passer du mot « inclusion » sans que sa signification ne s'en trouve altérée.

The Delegation of **Kenya** had no objections.

The **Rapporteur** made some recommendations for the sake of clarity to the proposed amendment from Israel to paragraphs 6 and 7, and the Delegation of **Israel** had no objections.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commented on paragraph 7, suggesting changes to give more comprehensive wording.

The Delegation of **Egypt** concurred with the suggestion made by Kenya, considering that the additions were unnecessary and that it was not necessary to go into the details of the activities undertaken.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the proposed changes made by Kenya.

The **Rapporteur** proposed some minor corrections to the syntax.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** suggère d'enlever le mot « conjointement » puisque la phrase contient déjà le mot « coopération ».

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que dans la traduction française faite à l'écran, l'expression « mettre en priorité » ne rend pas correctement le verbe anglais « prioritise » et qu'il faudrait trouver autre chose.

Les verbes « hiérarchiser » ou « établir des priorités », suggérés par les interprètes, sont présentés à l'écran. Le **Secrétariat** indique que ces deux verbes conviennent.

The **Chairperson** committed himself to improving the management of both languages on the overhead screens.

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

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

ITEM 6B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PACIFIC WORLD HERITAGE FUND

Document: **WHC-09/33.COM/6B**

Decision: **33 COM 6B**

The **Secretariat** provided a progress report on efforts to create a Pacific World Heritage Fund. The States Parties from the Pacific had presented their intention to create this Fund to the World Heritage Committee in 2007. In 2008, a regional workshop had taken place in Cairns, Australia, during which debate among the Pacific States Parties resulted in a document outlining the objectives of the planned Pacific Fund, taking the objectives of the Pacific 2009 Programme into account and adding a focus on communities. Participants at the meeting had agreed on terms of reference for a feasibility study to be carried out by the APIA office of UNESCO, in order to enable the States Parties of the region to decide on the best arrangements for the Fund in the Pacific context. It was felt that the endowment model of the African World Heritage Fund would not be ideal for the Pacific, particularly in the light of the current economic crisis. It was thought that the new funding mechanism would be better received if it were placed within an existing organization, as opposed to creating a distinct new entity. The study, to be ready by November for the next meeting of the Pacific States Parties, would provide further details and help States Parties to reach conclusions on the matter.

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the Report and highlighted the quality of the summary provided. It further emphasized the contribution of the African World Heritage Fund in sharing its experiences with Pacific colleagues regarding the shaping of sustainable funding arrangements. The Delegation explained that key differences related to the idea of developing a variety of mechanisms contributing to sustainable funding, as opposed to the creation of a single fund. The next step would be to complete the feasibility study and to discuss this later in the year at the next Pacific States Parties meeting.

The Delegation of **Barbados** offered its congratulations to both the African and Pacific regions for the progress made on this item. It noted the development of the funding mechanisms and anticipated that it would be able to draw lessons from these for the Caribbean region.

IUCN supported the proposal to explore Pacific World Heritage sustainable funding arrangements further, noting the importance of the natural values of the region, as highlighted in its intervention on Item 5B on the Small Island Developing States. It offered to provide support and advice on Tentative Lists, nomination processes and the effective conservation and management of potential World Heritage properties. It further noted that the links to the SIDS and Marine Programme already discussed could also be considered, as could priority areas such as capacity-building, community-based approaches to conservation, responses to climate change, the provision of sustainable livelihoods, and the response to invasive species. In this context, IUCN noted that through its Global Programme, its Pacific Programme and the recently opened IUCN Office in Fiji, as well as through Pacific membership of the World Commission on Protected Areas, it would be willing to provide advice on the feasibility study proposed in the Draft Decision, including with respect to structures and governance. It would be willing to identify how it could do more to support the States Parties in the region to participate effectively in the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** indicated that it was becoming clear that the delegation of heritage management to local communities represented the future of the World Heritage Convention, and it urged that the Pacific Region be supported in its efforts to establish the Fund, thus helping to realize the potential of article 5 of the Convention.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Decision and read the proposed amendment by the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegation of **Australia** further elaborated on the wording of the proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to examine the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

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

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

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

SECOND DAY – WEDNESDAY, 24 JUNE 2009

THIRD MEETING

10.00 a.m. - 2.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

**7.1 Progress Report on the Preparation of a UNESCO Recommendation
on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes**

Documents: *WHC-09/33.COM/7.1*

WHC-09/33.COM.INF.7B.Rev3

Decision: **33 COM 7.1**

The **Chairperson** opened the session and recalled that the UNESCO Executive Board had discussed a preliminary study on a new Recommendation on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes following discussion by the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention. She explained that the Executive Board had decided to include the item in the next session of the UNESCO General Conference. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to take the floor to introduce Item 7.1.

The **Secretariat** summarized the process by which the World Heritage Committee had discussed the need to update the existing framework for the protection of historic cities – initiated at the Vienna meeting in 2005 – by drafting a new Recommendation for submission to the UNESCO General Conference in 2011. He explained that other aspects of the work were related to the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes, used by the Committee during its discussions, and he discussed the need to include such Landscapes in the Operational Guidelines of the Convention. As a result, the Secretariat had proposed starting a process to include this concept in the Operational Guidelines, and he suggested that a Decision be taken by the Committee in 2010.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat and requested that Members of the Committee be brief, focusing their interventions on new issues and questions.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested that Members of the Committee express their views on the inclusion of the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes in the Operational

Guidelines, and asked whether this process should now begin since the final text of the Recommendation would be adopted in 2011.

The Delegation of **Israel** fully supported the initiative and pointed to the distinction between the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes in the *Operational Guidelines* and in the text of the Recommendation. It requested that the work be oriented towards identifying best practices, and recommended that evaluating the impact of the inclusion of the concept in the Operational Guidelines be done in tandem with evaluating the Recommendation.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the initiative and agreed to the inclusion of the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes in the *Operational Guidelines* and the development of strategies for different types of Historic Urban Landscapes. It highlighted the fact that the values of the Landscapes should be protected and not only their boundaries, and it underlined that Historic Urban Landscapes were living landscapes in which new architecture could create new values.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested that caution be exercised, since the Document contained two lines of action, the first concerning historic cities and the second related to threats from contemporary interventions. It requested that better criteria be arrived at to identify impacts and that this be done not only for cities, since other categories of properties were also affected.

The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed with Sweden, Israel and Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the initiative, but stated that the context was not appropriate. It said that discussion had not been thorough enough to lead to a change in concepts and principles, and it suggested that a workshop be held in order to discuss such issues in depth. This was especially needed given Bahrain's suggestion that both general and particular impacts be discussed, not only for new constructions, but also for changes in inscribed properties.

The Delegation of **Brazil** welcomed this idea and proposed hosting the workshop in Rio de Janeiro.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime son soutien au commentaire fait par la Délégation du Kenya et souligne qu'il faut être conscient de la diversité des paysages urbains historiques et des différentes perceptions qu'en ont les habitants. Rappelant que chaque bien comporte aussi bien une valeur universelle exceptionnelle que des valeurs spécifiques, la Délégation note que toutes réflexions sur la notion de paysage urbain historique doivent rendre compte de la diversité culturelle des différentes régions du monde. Enfin, la Délégation souligne l'importance que la Tunisie attache au sujet des paysages urbains historiques.

La Délégation du **Maroc** note que la question des paysages urbains historiques est un point sensible et se déclare satisfaite qu'un tel sujet ait été porté à l'attention du Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO, soutenu par ce dernier, et proposé pour examen par la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO. La Délégation salue l'organisation d'une réunion d'experts étudiant la notion de paysage urbain historique en vue de la rédaction future d'une recommandation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that equal consideration be given to urban heritage on all continents and supported the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes if these included all typologies of urban heritage, landscapes and historic villages.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** did not agree with the idea of discussing changes to the Operational Guidelines in 2010, but it supported the workshop and encouraged discussion of the expert report. It also wanted to know who would participate in the meeting.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the idea of a workshop to which experts from all continents would be invited.

The Delegation of **Korea** supported the proposal for a Recommendation and emphasized the role played by local communities. It said, however, that the content of the Recommendation was not yet in place and therefore revision of the Operational Guidelines would be premature. It also asked to participate in the workshop.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its work. It suggested including in the discussion the challenges of rapid urbanization, as well as the tensions between globalization and modernization.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Observers.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) informe le Comité que lors de la récente session du Conseil exécutif en avril dernier, la France a eu l'occasion d'affirmer son soutien plein et entier à l'élaboration d'une nouvelle recommandation concernant les paysages urbains historiques. Depuis elle a organisé début juin à Bordeaux des journées d'étude sur ce sujet. Organisées conjointement par la Convention France-UNESCO pour le patrimoine, ICOMOS France et une association de 200 villes historiques en France, ces journées ont rassemblé plus de 100 participants, praticiens et chercheurs de disciplines et domaines différents, élus et associations. Parmi les réflexions et suggestions, il a été souligné d'une part que la notion de paysage urbain historique est utile car elle permet d'appréhender l'espace urbain dans sa globalité – physique, environnementale, historique et culturelle ; (b) et d'autre part qu'à une époque où les villes connaissent de profondes mutations, la conservation des zones historiques doit s'étendre à une échelle très vaste, celle du grand territoire, et dans une démarche de projet ; (c) et enfin que certaines notions sont fondamentales : une connaissance préalable du territoire qui incorpore des données scientifiques et tient aussi compte des perceptions des habitants ; une maîtrise d'ouvrage urbaine solide au service des élus ; un partenariat entre public et privé ; l'élaboration de règles et d'outils opérationnels, etc. La Délégation indique que ces réflexions intéressantes pourraient nourrir le processus d'élaboration de cette nouvelle recommandation sur les paysages urbains historiques.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked Spain for its hospitality and noted that since this discussion had started four years ago, a conclusion was needed. It also pointed to the necessity of a more thorough debate on change as a whole, including how conservation efforts adapted to change and how the impact of change was to be evaluated.

ICOMOS, also speaking on behalf of **ICCROM**, stated that since the drafting of the Vienna Memorandum the Advisory Bodies had worked hard on the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes as a way of managing World Heritage Sites. It emphasized its full

agreement with Bahrain, Israel and the USA. ICOMOS had actively participated in regional workshops and case studies in which the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes had been used as a tool to manage change in urban areas. It also stated that the concept should be included in the Operational Guidelines.

ICCROM underlined the value of the concept of Historic Urban Landscapes as a management tool and supported the drawing up of a Recommendation to be applied to World Heritage Sites. It further expressed its support for the need to train professionals on the significance and application of the concept and underlined that the process should be a bottom-up one and should not take the form of the imposition of technical guidelines.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, tout en se félicitant de l'initiative ayant trait aux paysages urbains historiques, soutient les propos de la Délégation du Kenya concernant le large éventail des paysages qui ne devraient pas se limiter aux paysages strictement urbains mais également inclure des paysages qui ne seraient pas définis comme urbains. La Délégation souligne en outre que le travail de réflexion sur ce sujet ne devrait pas être influencé ou guidé par des restrictions budgétaires.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** thanked the Members of the Committee for their support and emphasized that the Action Plan consisted of two different but linked processes. The Recommendation would be global in scope, and it would be in line with previous standard-setting texts. It would work in tandem with a second action related to the work of the World Heritage Committee and to updating the Operational Guidelines. He stated that the concepts in Annex III of the Operational Guidelines defined cities as "groups of buildings". He underlined that the two processes in the Action Plan should be undertaken in parallel, but that the second should not depend on the first. He mentioned that four expert meetings had taken place, guided by top experts from all continents and with strong support from the Advisory Bodies. The Advisory Bodies could continue to work on updating the Operational Guidelines, but this should not be taken to mean that the Committee would approve such changes. He proposed calling on other experts if need be, but also on respecting the work already done.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Draft Decision were adopted. The Chairperson also indicated that Bahrain and Barbados had presented amendments.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its interest in including Urban Landscapes instead of cities.

The Delegation of **Australia** did not accept the planned changes to the Operational Guidelines and suggested reinforcing cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, in order to submit a report at the 34th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** did not approve of the proposal to update the Operational Guidelines, and said that a group of experts should be entrusted with submitting future proposals for action.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported Egypt's statement.

La Délégation de la **Maroc** propose d'amender le paragraphe 6 en remplaçant « Accueille favorablement la proposition... » par « Accueille favorablement le

principe... », ainsi que, si cet amendement est accepté, de modifier le paragraphe 4 afin d'ajouter « ...de poursuivre les efforts et les réflexions visant à élaborer un nouvel instrument... ».

The **Chairperson** requested that Morocco withdraw its proposal since it overlapped with paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested clarification concerning the use of the word “setting”, since the Committee had referred to properties and buffer zones.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** fait remarquer qu'un tel amendement est prématuré et recommande d'attendre les résultats des travaux du groupe d'experts.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the amendment proposed by Israel on the wording of the future Recommendation, and it supported the amendment proposed by Morocco concerning paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the text but proposed deleting the word “cities”.

The Delegation of **Cuba** agreed with the simplification of the Draft Decision and also agreed with leaving technical solutions to the expert group.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Israel if it agreed to accept Morocco's proposal.

The Delegation of **Israel** withdrew the amendment, but stated that the text was included in the main text of the Document. It suggested that it could be useful to take it into consideration in the Decision, since it had been a matter of discussion over the past four years.

The **Chairperson** thanked Israel and noted the deletion of paragraphs 6a, b, c and d.

The **Rapporteur** asked Israel if it agreed to delete the introductory paragraph.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to withdraw the amendment.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read paragraph 6.

Le Rapporteur présente le paragraphe 6 amendé par le Maroc « Accueille favorablement le principe d'adopter le concept de paysages urbains historiques mais demande d'approfondir la réflexion à ce sujet avant toute décision définitive... »

The **Chairperson** explained that the English text was being finalized and asked the members of the Committee for their approval.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the inclusion of the words, “any further decision”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification on the words, “adopt the principle of inclusion”.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification on whether the text was in the present or the future tense.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** mentioned a discrepancy between the English and French versions and proposed omitting the English version.

The **Chairperson** said that the original amendment had been included in the French version.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose de supprimer « à l'avenir ».

Paragraph 6 was adopted.

Regarding Paragraph 7; the **Rapporteur** explained that two amendments had been received from Sweden and one from Australia containing different proposals.

The Delegation of **Australia** explained that the intention of its text was for the experts to steer the process and, if needed, subsequently to change the criteria.

The **Chairperson** explained that this was a new paragraph.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said that it had submitted an amendment that did not correspond to the text on the screen. It said that it had proposed an amendment that had included a request for Historic Urban Landscapes to be defined with the help of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that the idea of experts working in collaboration with Advisory Bodies was not new. It requested that emphasis be given to the importance of case studies and best practices in managing properties and suggested submitting a progress report in 2010.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested the inclusion of a working group and a final proposal.

The **Chairperson** requested that Members of the Committee be brief and avoid unnecessary debate.

The Delegation of **Australia** did not accept the formulation as stated.

The Delegation of **Israel** accepted the proposal of Morocco to include “concepts” instead of “principles”.

The **Chairperson** requested a final position on the “principle of inclusion” and requested the Rapporteur to read the English version.

The **Rapporteur** suggested the inclusion of the words, “relevant section of the Operational Guidelines”.

The **Chairperson** asked Morocco if this proposal met with its objectives.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose d'amender le paragraphe 6 en y incluant « un projet de texte concernant l'inclusion éventuelle ».

The **Chairperson** requested agreement on “possible inclusion”. Consensus was achieved and paragraph 7 was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that an amendment had been submitted by Brazil to host the expert meeting.

The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil and proposed to add the words, “with appreciation”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** explained that it proposed to host the meeting in Rio de Janeiro in December 2009.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that reference not be made to a specific date for the workshop.

The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 8, according to the amendment submitted by Bahrain, including the words, “identify alternative methodologies”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested deleting the word “setting” and including “property or buffer zone” instead.

The Delegation of **Australia** withdrew its proposal but requested including the words, “impact on the Outstanding Universal Value”.

Israel requested including “Advisory Bodies” in the paragraph and requested further clarification concerning the term “alternative”.

The **United States of America** requested cooperation with the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with the amendment if the word “alternative” remained.

The Delegation of **Israel** refused to include the word “alternatives” and preferred the inclusion of the words, “identification of methods” according to the report from the group of experts.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** considère que le groupe de travail envisagera tous les points demandés et que le paragraphe proposé est donc prématuré.

The **Chairperson** suggested Bahrain include the word, “additional” instead of “alternatives”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** accepted.

The **International Union of Architects** took the floor, but the Chairperson asked this Observer not to speak, since she could not give the floor when a Draft Decision was being discussed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested ending the paragraph at the word “impacts”.

The **Secretariat** proposed including the word “the” in “impact of the inclusion of contemporary architecture”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested that the paragraph include the words, “the impact” at the end of the sentence.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7.1** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 7.2 REPORT ON REINFORCED MONITORING

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/7.2

Decision: 33 COM 7.2

The **Secretariat** introduced the background and methodology for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism as approved in 2007, and explained that no special provisions for this Mechanism were included in the Operational Guidelines and that it was difficult to define “exceptional cases”. He stated that two years’ experience was not much, but that it had allowed attention to focus on the activation of the Mechanism, its nature, its applications, the nature of the missions carried out, the calendar, and the financial consequences of the application of the Mechanism.

ICCROM made the following statement on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM:

“The Advisory Bodies would first like to congratulate the World Heritage Centre on the excellent paper on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, and note that it closely reflects the views of the Advisory Bodies.

As noted in the report, the Mechanism was approved with little forward planning, particularly in regard to administrative and operational issues. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies have now had several years to reflect on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in terms of its effectiveness of operation, and the result can be found in the working document. Just to highlight a few key points:

- 1. While, the concept of Reinforced Monitoring was initiated with the idea that it would be invoked only in “exceptional and specific” cases, the Advisory Bodies are concerned that this concept has become blurred, and it is already being used in a relatively large number of cases. A very clear definition would be helpful to determine which sites could be subjected to Reinforced Monitoring.*
- 2. The Advisory Bodies are concerned that this Mechanism not be used as a substitute for the List of World Heritage in Danger, which it was not designed to do. Rather, when used, it should have a clear scope and purpose; that is, to allow for better communication between the State Party concerned and the members of the World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, and Advisory Bodies and/or to facilitate missions which become necessary between Committee meetings.*
- 3. We are also concerned that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should not become an open-ended process with sites being kept under Reinforced Monitoring for long periods of time. We feel it should have a limited scope and time period, and should only be renewed when absolutely necessary.*
- 4. Finally, the Advisory Bodies remain concerned at the amount of resources that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism potentially takes up, given a financial system that is already under strain. Costs of implementation are potentially high. Human resource capacity is also of concern at both the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, given increased workloads.*

Based on these points, the Advisory Bodies retain a certain scepticism about the necessity for continuing the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, because, as the paper states, most of the benefits of the Mechanism could be achieved through the careful use of existing tools found in the Convention and well-established in the World Heritage System, such as Reactive Monitoring and In-Danger Listing. These tools, along with simple changes to some Committee Decisions calling for more frequent reports to the Committee during the year when necessary, could resolve many of the problems that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism is meant to address.

Nevertheless, the Advisory Bodies feel that if the Committee wishes to continue with the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, a revision of its parameters may allow it to give an added value along the lines outlined in the Document. These revisions involve more clarity in the nature of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and its modalities for activation, reporting and timeframe. In addition, we ask the Committee to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated for the implementation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, and that the mechanism itself, and the resources allocated for its implementation, continue to be evaluated over time to ensure that it is functioning correctly.

The Advisory Bodies will be happy in the course of the debate on this issue following the State of Conservation Reports to provide additional information and input to the Committee, as necessary.”

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** fait remarquer que le budget attribué est bien précis et demande quelle pourrait être la solution aux problèmes budgétaires.

The **Secretariat** proposed examining the financial consequences raised by the budgetary working group.

In consequence, the **Chairperson** suspended discussion on point 7.2.

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

Documents: WHC-09/33.COM/7A
WHC-09/33.COM/7A.Corr
WHC-09/33.COM/7A.Add
WHC-09/33.COM/INF.7A

Decisions: **33 COM 7A.1 to 33 COM 7A.31**

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)

The **World Heritage Centre** and **IUCN** noted that an upward trend in the conservation of key animal species was a determining factor in improving Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** mentioned that the status of the tiger population was critical and asked the Delegation of India (Observer) to update the Committee on it.

The Delegation of **India** (Observer) was not in a position to provide additional information immediately, but it offered to do so at the end of the day.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the State Party and said that this example again showed the need for indicators to track changes and measure progress over the long term.

Referring to Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.12**, the Delegation of **Israel** commented that the wording in the Decision should refer only to the Outstanding Universal Value. The original Draft Decision included the words, “conditions of integrity”, which Israel stated should be omitted. It also mentioned that “Outstanding Universal Value” should be capitalized.

The **Chairperson** mentioned that in the case of Manas, there was no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. She referred to the document prepared by the Centre that included the available Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN clarified that in the case of retrospective Outstanding Universal Value, the first step in the process should come from the State Party, with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre offering advice.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the Draft Decision did not give credit for the actions that **India** had undertaken in order to improve the state of conservation of the property. It reported that the Draft Decision recommended that the property stay on the List of

World Heritage in Danger and suggested that the Draft Decision applaud the State Party for the efforts made.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Draft Decision were adopted. Paragraph 7 was amended to reflect **Israel's** concern at mentioning Outstanding Universal Value, while also omitting the phrase "conditions of integrity"; Outstanding Universal Value was also capitalized.. Paragraph 8 was adopted, as well as the original paragraph 9. .

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.12** was adopted as amended.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)

The report by the **World Heritage Centre** highlighted several issues. The elimination of invasive species was overall reported as having been a success, and this had been identified as the biggest long-term threat to the Site. Big-headed ants and Mediterranean fruit flies were noted as key on-going threats to the property. Inspection was a challenge because of the many air and maritime arrival points on the islands; limiting these access points was a key factor in long-term conservation efforts.

The Report pointed out that cruise-ship tourism has been stabilized with no new permits issued, but that the rapid rise in land-based visitation was a key driver of economic growth. Such rapid growth resulted in high immigration pressures, which led to further risk of the arrival of invasive species. The **Centre** and **IUCN** recommended keeping the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members for their interventions.

The Delegation of **Cuba** thanked IUCN and the Centre for the clear presentation. It congratulated the Delegation of **Ecuador** on the progress made and suggested that the State Party be authorized to speak and describe in more detail its efforts within the framework of the action plan to improve the property's State of Conservation.

The Delegation of **Ecuador** informed the Committee that national policy for the protection of the property had existed for 50 years. It mentioned that 95% of the island's ecosystems were still intact, and that overall progress had been achieved. It appealed to the Committee to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated Ecuador on its efforts and commented on the positive implementation of the action plan in mitigating threats to the Site. It supported the suggestion to include recognition of this in the Draft Decision in paragraph 3. It also suggested that perhaps at the next Committee meeting in 2010, if progress continued, the property could be considered a candidate for being taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger. It recommended that a Reactive Monitoring Mission be fielded in order to check progress of implementation on the corrective measures.

The Delegation of **China** recognized the positive results of the work carried out by the State Party. It mentioned that it appeared that the State Party of Ecuador had many of the problems under control, but that other threats, particularly from tourism, had been identified since the inscription on the In-Danger List. It also suggested that tourism limits be identified and the zoning of the property for tourism be carried out.

The Delegation of **Peru** endorsed the proposal by the Delegation of Spain that Ecuador be encouraged to complete actions related to the In-Danger Listing Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** recognized that positive corrective measures had been taken, as noted by the Delegation of Spain. It said that the issue of climate change should also be addressed at this property.

The Delegation of **Korea** said that it appreciated the work of the State Party on the issue of invasive species. It also reported on the introduction of ticks, and the need for the elimination of this invasive species in the islands. Finally, it concurred with the Delegations of Spain and Peru on the need to modify paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** rappelle que les problèmes de conservation dans les îles sont complexes. Elle reconnaît que l'exemple de l'Equateur est admirable, et souhaite également que le projet de décision soit renforcé afin que soient reconnus les efforts de l'Etat partie.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. Paragraph 3 was amended by Spain and Cuba on the progress made by Ecuador. Paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted. Paragraph 6 was amended to omit the phrase “conditions of integrity”, as suggested by Israel for the previous Decision. Paragraphs 6 and 7 were adopted. Paragraph 8 was amended at the request of Spain and Cuba, reflecting their suggestion to field a Reactive Monitoring Mission to assess progress at the property. The Delegation of Cuba proposed a specific date for the Mission.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for a change of phrasing in the paragraph to, “assess the progress on the implementation of the decisions of the Committee.” A new paragraph 8 was approved.

The **Secretariat** suggested that the Committee consider not including a specific date in the Decision because of the need for it to plan its work schedule by taking into account its mission schedule. Paragraph 9 was adopted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A. 13** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** highlighted the dramatic decline of the property's wildlife. The security situation linked to the ongoing conflicts in Sudan and Chad were generating the main threat to the property -- poaching for bush meat. It was reported that there had been no actions undertaken by the Central African Republic to carry out the recommendations of the 2001 Danger Listing Action Plan. The Reactive Monitoring Mission undertaken by the Centre and IUCN had concluded that the condition of the Outstanding Universal Value was difficult to assess; the Mission proposed that an emergency action plan be implemented. IUCN also noted the critical situation and said that an emergency action plan needed to be implemented.

The **Chairperson** asked for Committee input to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** emphasized the potential imminent loss of Outstanding Universal Value at the property. It recommended that a concerted effort be made for the conservation of the property and requested intervention by the Director-General of UNESCO. Canada said that this was a clear case of the need to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported Canada's suggestion for the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, and said that international aid was crucial for the property to be maintained.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the interventions of Canada and Bahrain. It noted that the Central African Republic was now in control of the site and that IUCN had stated that the Outstanding Universal Value could be recuperated. Finally, it advocated that this case be considered as a special one deserving of high-level support.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** considère cet examen comme un cas très particulier. Elle propose que l'information donnée par le Secrétariat sur la reprise du bien après 10 ans soit reconnue. Elle rappelle que dans le cadre de la coopération internationale, il est important que l'Etat partie soit soutenu dans ses efforts de restauration de l'intégrité du bien, et ce malgré les conditions de travail très difficiles auxquelles il est confronté.

The **Chairperson** invited IUCN to respond to the questions and issues raised by the Members of the Committee.

On the issue of knowing how many intermediary monitoring reports would be needed, **IUCN** said that one intermediary report would be enough. It also said that during the Reinforced Monitoring Mission, direct contact with the Central African Republic authorities had been made. IUCN pointed to the need to explore other modalities for intervening at the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that IUCN also clarify the recommended timeframe for the Reinforced Monitoring process.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the intervention of the United States and reacted to IUCN's response. It stated that a Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism with only one report was the same as a Reactive Monitoring Mission. It stressed the importance of differentiating between the two.

The Chairperson requested that IUCN clarify the timeline for the evaluation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

IUCN recommended that the timeline for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at this property be evaluated every year.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision on a paragraphs-by-paragraphs basis. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were adopted. Paragraph 10 was amended to omit the phrase "conditions of integrity" as suggested by Israel for the previous Decisions. Paragraph 11 was amended to include the need for the intervention of the Director-General of UNESCO in organizing a meeting. Paragraph 12 was amended to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mission for one year.

The **Chairperson** announced a suggestion by the Delegation of **Canada** to add a paragraph 13, in order to have the Director-General of UNESCO organize a meeting with the State Parties of Chad and Sudan. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Canadian proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked how the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism could be introduced without a general debate in the Committee on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the idea that recommendations for Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism Missions continue to be referred to in discussions of Draft Decisions of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.1** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** reported that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been severely degraded. It was reported that the State Party of Cote d'Ivoire had regained control of the property. The reports mentioned the possibility of mining concessions being generated.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested to the **Chairperson** that the Delegation of Cote d'Ivoire be given the opportunity to provide additional information on the issues mentioned in the report, particularly the issue of mining.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** remercie le Comité de lui donner la possibilité de s'exprimer. Elle informe que le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril n'est plus qu'une question de temps. En effet, près de 1,9 millions de dollars des EU ont été mobilisés auprès de la Banque mondiale pour soutenir les actions de renforcement des capacités et de mise en œuvre des activités du plan de gestion. Contrairement aux informations fournies par le Secrétariat, elle affirme n'avoir pas connaissance de projet d'exploitation de mine près du bien. Par contre, elle souligne que les actions de l'Etat partie concernent l'implication des communautés, soutenue par l'Union Européenne qui

vient de mettre à disposition US\$ 500,000, D'autre part, l'Etat partie mettra à disposition US\$ 3,000,000 pour le paiement des salaires du personnel du parc.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if a definite timeframe for corrective measures had already been set. It reiterated the position of the Committee, which considered World Heritage properties to be "no go" areas for mining.

The Delegation of **Canada** recommended drafting the amendments in such a way as to suggest that mining concessions respect international standards with regard to World Heritage properties.

The **World Heritage Centre** mentioned that wildlife populations at this property had been degraded, and that these needed to recover before removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger could be considered.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.2** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Centre** reported that a State of Conservation Report from the State Party had been received. An important obstacle mentioned was the structure of the management system of the property. IUCN said that the issue of mining concessions relating to the Tata Steel Company in Cote d'Ivoire had been resolved, and that there was a commitment by the Tata Steel Company not to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in Cote d'Ivoire.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed thanking the Tata Steel Company for exercising social responsibility and for following socially responsible practices. It recommended that the Secretariat write to the CEO of the Tata Steel Company in order to express the Committee's appreciation of its actions. Paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision was amended to reflect Canada's recommendations.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision on a paragraphs-by-paragraphs basis. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10 were adopted. Paragraph 6 was adopted with the amendment proposed by Canada.

Concernant le paragraphe 7, la Délégation du **Maroc** souhaite savoir si on s'adresse aux deux Etats parties ou alors seulement à la Guinée ; auquel cas, un changement du libellé de ce paragraphe serait souhaitable.

The **Secretariat** explained that this consultation process only referred to the mining project in Guinea.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.3** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 2 p.m

SECOND DAY – WEDNESDAY, 24 JUNE 2009

FOURTH MEETING

3:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

The **Chairperson** announced the continuation of the discussion on item 7A. on State of Conservation. She welcomed Ms. Françoise Rivière, UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, who is attending the Committee meeting on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO.

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the Chairperson to the fact that the Decision pertaining to the general report on the Democratic Republic of Congo needed to be considered first by the Committee (Report 31 at the end of Working Document 7A). He informed the Committee of the Reinforced Reactive Monitoring process in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

It was indicated that, at its 31st session in Christchurch, the Committee decided to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to all five DRC properties. The Committee further requested that the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee convene a meeting with the DRC authorities to discuss progress in addressing the deteriorating State of Conservation of these properties.

The State Party submitted reports on the State of Conservation of the DRC properties on February 2. A report on the Reinforced Monitoring of the DRC properties was also circulated to the members of the Committee. He mentioned that, to date, the DRC authorities have not yet proposed a new date for the requested high-level meeting following the cancellation of the May 2008 meeting. He indicated that the State Party was present in the room and that the Committee might want to seek from the Delegation information on the status of the meeting.

He furthermore indicated that since the 32nd session, the security situation has deteriorated significantly in the east and northeast of the country, affecting in particular three of the five World Heritage properties: the national parks of Kahuzi-Biega, Virunga and Garamba. Since January, the DRC army has started joint military operations with the Rwandan and Uganda armies to oust the rebels of the Rwandan Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) and the Ugandan Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). This not only resulted in fighting in and around some of the properties, but also resulted in the DRC army taking up positions inside some of the properties.

Unfortunately, the World Heritage Centre has been informed of several incidents where elements of the DRC army have been involved in poaching and other natural-resource extraction activities in Kahuzi Biega, Garamba and Virunga National Parks and in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve.

The Director-General of UNESCO sent a letter to the President of the Democratic Republic of Congo on 27 January expressing his concerns about the impacts of the fighting in Garamba and Virunga.

Following contacts between the World Heritage Centre and MONUC, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the UN also sent a letter on 28 May to the Minister of Defence expressing his concern regarding ivory trafficking and poaching by the national army in the World Heritage Sites. In addition, the Chairperson of the Committee last week sent another letter to the President of the DRC on this issue.

The World Heritage Centre was informed that on 6 June a meeting was held in Kahuzi-Biega between the Minister of the Environment, ICCN staff and the Minister of Defence. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Ambassadors of Great Britain, Spain, France, Germany and the European Commission were also present to discuss this problem. The hope is that this will have an impact and also further increase cooperation between MONUC and the protected area authority.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain convinced that the high-level meeting could create the necessary political momentum to achieve these essential conditions for progress on the conservation of the DRC properties, and they will continue to advocate for its organization.”

IUCN reiterated its commitment to providing support to the State Party and the Committee and said this was an example of support provided to sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also praised the World Heritage Centre for maintaining contact with the State Party and considered the work accomplished as a good example of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. It also noted that IUCN had re-established its office in Kinshasa and praised the work of its staff. IUCN expressed its interest in exploring opportunities with the State Party for increasing awareness about the importance of protecting the wildlife and habitat in the property, while maintaining security in the country.

It finally expressed its support for the families of Congolese staff who had lost their lives in recent events.

The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN for its presentation and asked to proceed with the State of Conservation Report on the Virunga National Park.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the Committee has first to proceed with a review of Draft Decision 33 COM 7A.31 on the general report.

The **Chairperson** asked for comments on the Draft Decision pertaining to the five sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its concern that the meeting on the DRC properties had been postponed. It commended the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their work and announced the presence of the DRC and MONUC delegates in the room. It suggested that the DRC representative be given permission to comment.

The **Chairperson** invited the DRC representative to take the floor.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo (RDC)** commence par remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'attention et l'intérêt portés à ses biens. Elle ajoute que toute avancée est le produit de nombreux efforts puisque, pour la première fois, le déploiement des forces des Nations unies a abouti avec succès. Elle se dit très satisfaite des résultats, tout comme le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN. La Délégation souligne également la présence de Madame Joyce, membre de la Délégation, qui peut témoigner du travail de préservation des biens de la République Démocratique du Congo par le Patrimoine mondial (RDC).

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo and announced that acoustic signals would be used for moderating the debate, with 30 seconds given to NGOs, three minutes to Committee Members, and two minutes to Observers. Two warnings would sound to alert speakers.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that at the Committee meeting in Christchurch, the Delegations of Israel, Kenya and Benin had proposed the high-level meeting. It expressed its concern that the meeting had not been held and urged the State Party to fix a date.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs-by-paragraphs. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed merging paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Draft Decision by adding the words "International Community" and replacing the words "States Parties" with "State Party".

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with Israel and asked to add the words, "particularly the implementation of corrective measures" to the Decision. The **Chairperson** suggested adding the word "proposed" corrective measures, with which the Delegation of **Kenya** agreed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.31** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** then asked the Secretariat to proceed with the presentation of the detailed State of Conservation Reports for each property, starting with Virunga.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N63)

The **Secretariat** indicated that Virunga National Park has been particularly affected by the deterioration of the security situation in the east. At the beginning of October 2008, there were renewed clashes between the Congolese army and the rebels of the National Congress for the Defence of the People (CNDP). As a result, a large area of the Park was occupied by the rebels, including the Rumangabo Station, which had to be abandoned by Park staff.

In December 2008, stabilization of the situation allowed the ICCN to negotiate the renewal of conservation activities in the southern and northern sectors of the property with the CNDP. However, shortly thereafter security in the Park was again affected by the joint military operations of the Congolese and Rwandan armies to oust the FDLR rebels.

Several attacks on Park staff and infrastructure demonstrate that the situation remains extremely vulnerable. Examples include an attack on the Tshiabirimu Station on 8 January by a group of Mai Mai rebels, during which a guard was killed. Another attack occurred on 5 May on Rumangabo Station by members of the Congolese military and armed villagers involved in the charcoal trade. This happened after Park guards arrested five people while they were making charcoal in the Park. The military commanders involved in this attack have in the meantime been punished.

Poaching also remains a major problem, involving not only rebel forces but also military from the regular army. On the pictures on the slide you can see an elephant which was killed in the southern sector of the Park by soldiers of the DRC army. The blurry pictures show soldiers involved in the butchering of the animal. At the moment, 8,200 military personnel are operating in and around the Park, resulting in increased poaching incidents. Only last week, four chimpanzees were reported to have been shot by the military.

The problem of illegal charcoal production also continues to present major challenges to the Park authorities. The Centre has received reports on on-going heavy deforestation and charcoal production in the Nyaragongo sector of the Park by FDLR rebels.

This problem of illegal charcoal production in Virunga has been highlighted in a 14 May report by the Expert Group on the Democratic Republic of Congo to the UN Security Council. The Report noted that charcoal production, as well as other forms of illegal exploitation of natural resources, was controlled by FDLR rebels, who continue to hamper the work of Park guards.

To respond to this challenge, the ICCN is not only trying to control the illegal trade by police actions, but is also promoting alternative sources of energy, including the production of biomass briquettes and promoting reforestation. The World Heritage Centre, with funds from the French-speaking community of Belgium, is supporting these efforts.

The World Heritage Centre has also continued to follow up on the issue of oil prospecting. An oil-prospection and exploitation permit has been granted to two companies: Dominion Petroleum and Heritage Oil. The area of the permit overlaps the property in several areas. However, in order to become valid, such permits must still be ratified by presidential decree. In response to a letter from the World Heritage Centre

requesting information concerning the granting of these permits, the DRC Minister of the Environment indicated that he had informed his counterpart responsible for hydrocarbons of the matter, and recalled the existence of national legislative provisions forbidding this type of activity in a protected area. It should be noted that the same two companies have also been granted exploration permits covering the Selous Game Reserve and World Heritage property in Tanzania.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain very concerned regarding the situation of this property. Due to the continued deterioration in security, it is difficult to initiate a verifiable “ecological restoration of the property”. Emphasis continues to be placed on damage limitation and the safeguarding of ecological capital.

Therefore, in view of the situation at the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend the continued application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.”

The **Secretariat** concluded by saying that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended maintaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that IUCN had no comments.

The **Chairperson** called for interventions from the floor.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that poaching and charcoal exploitation were reported upon yearly, and expressed the frustration of the Committee in the light of the repetition of these practices over the years. It was explained that even the DRC army is involved in poaching, and the Delegation asked for serious commitments to be made at the level of the DRC President. It also called for serious action to be taken by the State Party. It proposed giving an opportunity to the Delegation from the DRC to clarify the matter.

The **Chairperson** asked Kenya to make its question more precise.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the State Party was in a position to act and make changes in the field and whether the Committee could do anything to reverse the current repetitive pattern, noting that the DRC army itself was involved in the damage caused to the property.

The **Chairperson** asked the Representative of the Democratic Republic of Congo to respond to the Delegation of Kenya.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (RDC) explique que ce sont surtout des groupes de rebelles en provenance des pays voisins qui sont à l'origine de l'insécurité. La RDC a besoin de la communauté internationale et notamment la MONUC pour résoudre cette question. Avec l'aide de la communauté internationale au gouvernement congolais dans sa lutte contre ces rebelles d'autres états, une paix définitive pourrait être établie dans la partie de ce bien du patrimoine mondial à l'Est du pays.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie la Présidente et précise que tout ce qui arrive en RDC est aussi quelque chose qui peut se produire ailleurs en Afrique, où des conflits latents risquent d'exploser. Les institutions constitutionnelles sont complètement démunies par rapport à l'échelle des conflits auxquels elles font face. Il faut donc les encourager. La Délégation demande directement à l'ICCN si, à part ce qui a été fait en matière d'appui technique et financier, ils ont demandé du soutien au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour une solution rapide de ce problème.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the Democratic Republic of Congo was suffering from a war-like situation, with the presence of FDLR rebels and the LRA in Garamba, and he mentioned the lack of discipline in the regular army – a problem that the ICCN was not in a position to address. He drew attention to the need for a high-level meeting and for a political commitment from the Committee to holding such a meeting.

The **Chairperson** asked for the Decision to be displayed, and underlined the fact that it incorporated a draft amendment by the United States of America. Paragraphs 1 to 8 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The **United States of America** asked that, for reasons of consistency, paragraph 9 incorporate the need for a “draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and for a desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property...”.

The **Secretariat** said that this standard paragraph had indeed been forgotten and that it should be added as formulated in other decisions.

The **Chairperson** thanked the United States of America and asked the Secretariat to incorporate the paragraph. She then invited the Committee to examine paragraph 10, as amended by the United States of America, adding a reference to alternative resources. Amended paragraph 10 was adopted, as was paragraph 11 without change.

The **Secretariat** read out the additional paragraph requested by the United States of America: “Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as well as a proposal for the desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger for examination by the 34th World Heritage Committee at its next meeting ...”. He also noted that the site had a Statement of Significance, but did not have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** noted the addition of a paragraph and asked the Secretariat to attribute a number to it. She asked the members of the Committee to look at the last two paragraphs of the Draft Decision on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism while the former amendments were translated into French.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification over whether a State Party needed to approve the adoption of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that the Committee had settled the mechanism relating to In-Danger Listing but had not yet settled the point relating to the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. He stated that it was up to the Committee to decide this.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism would be applied for one year.

The **Secretariat** said that yearly application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was customary.

The **Chairperson** said that Israel sought confirmation on the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for an additional year.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.7A.4** was adopted as amended.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N137)

The **Secretariat** said that the occupation of the Kahuzi Biega National Park was a major factor affecting the property, in addition to mineral extraction. He indicated that Security problems also continue to affect the Kahuzi-Biega National Park. Militia of the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) still occupy a part of the lowland sector, making it inaccessible to Park staff.

FDLR militia men remain active in the Park. According to the recent report of the Expert Group on the DRC to the UN Security Council, large numbers of FDLR fighters have withdrawn into the Park, using it as a base for their military operations, while at the same time continuing the extraction of mineral resources from the artisanal mining sites.

On 7 May, the Nzovu Park Station in the low-altitude sector was attacked and looted by FDLR militias. Fortunately, no ICCN guards were killed in the attack, but the ICCN was forced to abandon the Station.

In the meantime, the Congolese army is preparing a large-scale military operation to oust the remaining FDLR rebels from the South Kivu region. In preparation for these attacks, the Congolese army has been gathering troops in the region. Since the end of March, a large military contingent has been stationed in the Tshivanga Park Station. Another battalion is stationed at the Itebero Station in the lowland sector. Unfortunately, these troops have also been hampering the conservation activities of Park staff and even denying access to ICCN staff.

At the same time, some of the military are involved in poaching, charcoal-making and other illegal resource-extraction activities. The picture shows charcoal ovens operated by DRC soldiers in the Park, discovered by a joint patrol of the ICCN and MONUC. In spite of numerous requests from Park management and even the Minister of Environment, these problems seem to be continuing. In the general presentation on the DRC, a meeting was mentioned that took place on 6 June in the Park between the Ministers of Defense and the Environment, in the presence of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the UN and several ambassadors. The Centre has received reports that as a first result of this meeting, the United Nations Organization Mission for the Congo (MONUC) is now deploying blue helmets at the Park Station, and that these will engage in joint patrols with park guards. It is hoped that these will help to dissuade the military from further engagement in illegal activities.

Since the preparation of the Working Document there have been further developments in relation to the project to rehabilitate the RN3 highway crossing the highland sector of the property. The map shows clearly how the road passes through the living area of some gorilla families. As mentioned in the Document, beginning in February the World Heritage Centre was informed of the imminent start of the rehabilitation work for the first stretch of the road from Miti to Hombo, with support from MONUC.

The World Heritage Centre immediately sent a letter to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, informing him of its concerns regarding the potential impacts of the road rehabilitation on the State of Conservation of the property. As a result, MONUC decided to postpone the start of the rehabilitation work until a compromise had been found with the Park authorities to minimize the direct and indirect impacts of this rehabilitation on the property. On 29 February, an agreement was signed

for the management of environmental impacts during the rehabilitation of 23 km of the RN3 highway.

The revised version of the Environmental Impact Study, which was requested by the Committee at its 31st session, was finally sent to the World Heritage Centre by the Minister of Environment on 13 April, together with a copy of the mentioned agreement. After review of the EIA by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, the Centre requested further guarantees from the State Party that all the recommendations of the EIA would be implemented. Of particular importance is the need to rehabilitate the Miti – Hombo stretch as a local road only, the need to realign the road going around the Park, and the need to assess whether rehabilitation work should continue beyond Hombo, connecting it to the city of Kisangani. If this connection is realized, traffic on the road will increase significantly and might affect the gorilla populations in the highland sector. In his reply, the Minister for Environment stipulated that he fully supported the proposal for road alignment around the Park if rehabilitation work proceeded beyond Hombo.

The **Secretariat** indicated that, to take the new developments in the RN3 highway into account, a revised Draft Decision has been proposed by the Secretariat, amending paragraph 6 of the Environmental Impact Assessment. It was added that as a result of the recent information received, a revised Decision had been circulated to the Members of the Committee.

IUCN noted that the road would lead to fragmentation of the habitat within the property affecting the movement of wildlife. The endangered gorillas would be particularly affected by the noise and increased human activity associated with both the construction and use of the road. It emphasized the importance of reducing the use of the road including speed and volume of traffic and noted that additional enforcement would be required as a road would provide access to the formerly remotes areas of the property and so make illegal activities easier.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat and IUCN for the Report, and asked for the distribution of the amended Decision proposed by the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** said that this had been done the previous day, and underlined the fact that the revision concerned paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

Paragraphs 1 to 7 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted a repetition in paragraphs 8 and 9 on the Desired State of Conservation and the Outstanding Universal Value. It proposed changing the order of the two paragraphs, mentioning Outstanding Universal Value first.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to replace the word “further” with “moreover”.

New paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted

The **Chairperson** suggested adding the standard paragraph that was missing – with regard to the Virunga National Park, the need for a Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and for a Desired State of Conservation.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.5 Rev.** was adopted as amended. .

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

The **Secretariat** explained that the problems in Garamba had come as a result of security orders linked to the presence of LRA rebels from Uganda, who were hunting in the property. He said that when the DRC and MONUC had taken action against the rebels, the unfortunate result had been that civilians had been held hostage and killed by the rebels.

Through the Rapid Response Facility (RRF), the World Heritage Centre had been able to provide 30,000 USD for the replacement of essential communications equipment and the resumption of surveillance operations. The Park also received substantial support from Spain and the European Union in order to rehabilitate or replace the infrastructure, but the violence was continuing.

He added that poaching for ivory was continuing, and as no traces of the white rhino had been found, he concluded that the subspecies was probably extinct. He said that both the Centre and IUCN recommended keeping the property subject to the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

IUCN commented on growing concern at the probable extinction of the white rhino, and explained that although this was a key species in Garamba, there were other important biodiversity and ecosystem values that justified the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It proposed undertaking a joint WHC/IUCN mission to consider the State of Conservation Report and to update corrective measures, and it suggested reviewing the Decision accordingly.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its great concern and its sympathy for the Democratic Republic of Congo and its people. It approved the mission, while drawing attention to the difficulty of undertaking such a mission under current security conditions. It doubted that the mission proposed could accomplish its objectives.

The **Secretariat** assured the Delegation of Kenya that the mission would only take place if security conditions allowed it, and if it were possible for the mission to examine the progress made and to draft a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and a Desired State of Conservation, with a view to removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with the statement by Kenya, and reiterated that the situation was a very difficult one. It asked to focus attention on the white rhino population, and asked whether the subspecies existed in the neighbouring regions. It also asked whether captive individuals existed, and wondered if this subspecies had now been lost entirely.

IUCN said that this was the last population of the white rhino in the world and that no white rhino existed in neighbouring areas. Nevertheless, it said that two individuals were present in the Czech Republic, but that no breeding programme existed. It said that attempts had been made to locate other rhino, but that prospects were not encouraging.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with Bahrain on its preoccupation at losing the species, and asked whether other flagship species that were part of an alternative Outstanding Universal Value would allow the site to be maintained on the List, or whether the Committee should consider removing it.

The **Secretariat** replied that the issue was discussed at the World Heritage Committee meeting in Vilnius, and that the white rhino was indeed a key species. Nevertheless, he recalled that the property was inscribed under criteria 7 and 10. He said that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value needed to be redefined, but that the loss of the white rhino did not entail the loss of all the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the relocation of the remaining rhinos had been proposed in the past, and it had offered to host this population until it could return. It said that Kenya would maintain its proposal should the species be found again.

The **Chairperson** thanked Kenya for its offer, and in the absence of other interventions moved to consideration of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 to 7 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked that paragraphs 8 and 9 be switched to mention Outstanding Universal Value before corrective measures, as per its request in the previous Decision. It wondered whether it was appropriate to add the word "renewed" in front of Outstanding Universal Value, in view of the probable loss of the rhino species.

The **Chairperson** said she believed there was no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and asked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to work on drafting one. She then asked the Rapporteur to integrate Israel's amendment in the text of the Decision and to include the usual provision of one year for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.6** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that the implementation of the corrective measures began in January 2008 and is on-going. Unfortunately, there have been delays in the implementation as a result of internal problems in the ECOFAC project, which provides major support to the management of the property.

The threats mentioned in previous reports remain present. Security and intensive poaching are the main issues. To these, a lack of funding must be added, which remains a serious obstacle to the successful conducting of conservation activities.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge the progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures, but they are concerned about accumulated delays. In the case of the Salonga National Park, located outside the area of armed conflict, the lack of security is directly linked to the presence of professional poaching bands, and without a doubt the restoration of security is a prerequisite for the improvement of the State of Conservation of the property. This improvement should also benefit the local populations.

The resolution of the issue concerning the villages located in the property and the use of the unsustainable resources of the Park can only be dealt with once the security of the property has been established.”

The **Secretariat** said that in view of the current situation at the property, it should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommended the continuing application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, and added that IUCN had no comments.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the Corrective Measures that had been forgotten had to be added.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.7** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** reported on the results of the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, in which it was noted that the okapi population had diminished by 43% and that agricultural activities occupied 10% of the Reserve. He said that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been seriously damaged, but that it could be adequately restored through corrective measures, which he then described. He underlined that a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and a Desired State of Conservation with indicators were being prepared, and proposed that in the light of the actions taken by the State Party, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be suspended, while keeping the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN noted the alarming decline in the okapi species, but also noted improvements, thanks to concerted actions in the field and of security conditions at the property. It mentioned threats related to the reconstruction of a road, and explained that the rehabilitation of the wildlife would take time to accomplish. It concluded that the work accomplished on the property was a model for future development at other properties.

The Delegation of **Canada** recognized the progress accomplished, and congratulated the State Party and the ICCN, while informing the Committee that it had submitted a draft amendment. Making reference to indicators, it requested that further information be given for the Committee’s future reference.

The **Chairperson** agreed on the need to combine positive incentives with congratulations and concrete means.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, and expressed its gratitude for the work accomplished. It called for this experience to be used to encourage other States Parties and communities. It added that increasing the number of species was no small task, and proposed changing the wording by deleting the word “seriously” in front of the word “damaged”. It also outlined the relationship between development, conservation and community needs, particularly given the significant increase in the number of inhabitants on the property. It suggested either allowing the population to live on the property or relocating it.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the State Party for its work with the Advisory Bodies and asked if the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was available. If it was not, it asked that its request be included in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie la présidente et signale que le tableau sombre que nous voyons démontre la volonté de l'état partie de faire face à la situation de façon drastique. Ils encouragent la RDC. Ils félicitent encore l'Etat partie et l'IUCN pour ces efforts.

The **Secretariat** said that regarding Canada's question on indicators, the mission had developed indicators on the basis of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value drafted by the Centre and IUCN in discussion with scientists and site managers, and that the indicators reported on page 23 explained how these had been arrived at and listed them. The indicators included the monitoring of deforestation and illegal actions, the closure of mining sites and others, he said.

Regarding Kenya's question on the Outstanding Universal Value, the **Secretariat** indicated that said the decline in the populations of okapi and elephants had been sharp, amounting to close to 50%, and that these populations were central to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. He underlined the security improvements and expressed the hope that a recovery in these species would take place. He drew the attention of the Committee to a road crossing the property, and said that the resident population in the property had increased from 4,000 at the time of inspection to 21,000 today, as the area was an immigration destination from Kivu. He added that the road attracted new immigrants and underlined the need to regulate immigration as an important corrective measure. Regarding the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, he said that IUCN and the World Heritage Centre had prepared a first draft, and that the mission had discussed it in Kinshasa and with the site managers. He hoped the Statement could be finalized soon and submitted to the Centre.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** asked about the financial implications of applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, since the Committee would have to apply it to five sites.

The **Secretariat** said that the difference lay in the translation costs of the document, which needed to be circulated to the Committee between sessions. However, the mission costs were the same as usual.

The **Chairperson** asked IUCN to deliver its view.

IUCN said that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism depended on the size of the site, and that costs could not be quantified. It recalled that this issue was due to be discussed at the end of the session, and underlined that this activity, coordinated by the World Heritage Centre, had been made possible thanks to the extra-budgetary funds that had enabled the production of the excellent report, as well as regular contacts and updates.

The **Chairperson** asked to examine Draft Decision 33 COM 7A.8 with a An amendment was proposed to paragraph 3 by Canada congratulating the State Party for its efforts and giving further encouragement to continue its efforts. Paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to remove the reference to the Government of Uganda in paragraph 6, as the Committee should not dictate courses of action to countries, as had been previously discussed in Committee meetings in Vilnius and Christchurch.

The **Chairperson** asked Kenya to clarify its statement.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed replacing the words “Uganda” with “its neighbours” in relation to issues of border security and timber trafficking.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat for its input on the issue of cooperation with other States Parties.

The **Secretariat** said that the United Nations had reported the illegal timber trade on the DRC-Uganda border, and that Uganda’s cooperation was important in order to stop this. He invoked Article 6 of the Convention regarding the contributions of other States Parties to the conservation of properties.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read the amendment.

Le **Rapporteur** informe l’assemblée de l’existence d’un amendement du point j) de la décision en français : “préparer un plan de zonage des aires forestières qui jouxtent le bien pour protéger celui-ci des impacts négatifs de l’exploitation non durable du forêt ».

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to the question by Kenya and asked about the link between the border problems and the values of the property and about any problems relating to rebel groups. It also asked to replace the word “site” with “property” in paragraph 8.

At the request of the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Israel** precised its question; that is to know if the buffer zone of the property had any relationship to areas situated in the neighbouring countries.

The **Secretariat** said that the property did not have an official buffer zone, but that the overall forest landscape of the Itari Forest was essential for demonstrating the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that the Decision include reference to stopping the illegal trafficking of timber, minerals and ivory across the north-eastern border. It also asked for direct reference to Uganda to be deleted.

The Draft Decision **33COM 7A.8** was adopted as amended.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the monitoring mission requested at the 32nd session of the Committee had been scheduled immediately after the session (4-10 July).

With regard to the implementation of the corrective measures, the relocation of the Arquazye village in order to establish the corridor linking the extension with the rest of the Park was reportedly underway with support from the World Heritage Fund. However, the new boundaries had no legal status so far and were awaiting publication in the official gazette. No timeframe had been given for the completion of this process. The extension of the Park's boundaries was seen as a key element in preserving the Outstanding Universal Value, as most Walia ibex and Ethiopian wolves lived outside the current site boundaries. The issue of uncontrolled grazing was also a major threat to the property, and addressing it was central to its successful management. However, the new draft Management Plan for the property, submitted in early 2009, did not mention a strategy or activities to address this problem, which was a major concern for the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. This important issue would have to be addressed during the next monitoring mission, which would also review the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value proposed by the State Party and discuss the desired Statement of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. These actions would provide a clear basis for a decision regarding the possible removal of the property from the In-Danger List.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that there had been very successful cooperation between the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, which showed the potential for removing this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Many corrective measures had been taken, and the populations of Walia ibex and Ethiopian wolves were increasing. However, it wished to hear from the State Party on why the grazing issue, which was considered a major concern, had been removed from the updated Management Plan. The Delegation further expressed its hope that should this property not be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger during this session, this step could be taken at the next session.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** (Observer) informed the Committee of the accomplishment of all corrective measures except one – the significant reduction of human settlements in the core area of the National Park. However, relocation of one village had started, and a project proposal (for 8 million USD) had been developed with the Centre and with the engagement of local communities. The State Party hoped to attract the support of the international community for this. It explained that the relocation of the villages in the park was considered to be the most durable solution.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Ethiopian government for its work, and recognized that very few countries could commit to moving people, as this was a complicated solution. It wanted to introduce an amendment to congratulate the State Party on its efforts.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** (Observer) agreed with Kenya, while noting that the total financial commitments arising from the project for the State Party would come to almost

20 million USD, with 8.7 million USD committed for finding alternative livelihoods. The State Party should be helped to raise this money by the holding of a donors' conference. It also stressed the need to apply a holistic approach, and for the World Heritage Convention to work in concert with other Conventions and programmes in order to solve the problems.

The **Chairperson** noted amendments and language corrections proposed by Canada, Kenya (the new paragraph congratulating the State Party for its efforts) and Israel.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.9** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that the report received in early March from the State Party provided information on its efforts to implement the corrective measures with the assistance of the UNDP/GEF-funded COGERAT project. However, there had been no clear information on the current security situation and its impacts on conservation activities, and only scarce information on the impacts of implementing corrective measures (in particular when compared to the size and scale of the property). The ecological restoration of degraded lands so far only covered 406ha., a small percentage of the targeted 55,000ha. More support was needed to restore the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in order to achieve this the international community needed to expand its support for the full implementation of the corrective measures.

IUCN recalled the serious decline in the populations of critical wildlife species. The critically endangered Addax, reported in the IUCN Red List of 2008 as being present in sporadic groups, was feared extinct by the State Party. The Centre and IUCN therefore reiterated their recommendation that a comprehensive wildlife survey be undertaken to establish the presence and absence of key species, and that specific wildlife-restoration measures be implemented. They encouraged the State Party to discuss the results with IUCN species specialists. Such a study would be the basis for defining the desired Statement of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN also emphasized the importance of developing a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in order to ensure that the management and protection of the property focused on the restoration of the property's values.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.10** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** provided information on progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures, in particular efforts to reinforce anti-poaching activities and discussions with local pastoralists to address livestock issues. As requested by the Committee, the State Party had submitted a copy of the three-year Priority Action Plan it had developed following the 2007 monitoring mission, which planned activities to rehabilitate surveillance infrastructure and purchase equipment, rehabilitate some

habitats, enhance the Park for the benefit of local communities, and implement research activities. The total projected budget was 21.5 million euros. No information was available on the implementation status of the Plan, nor on progress in addressing threats from the illegal cutting of *Borassus* palms, the uncontrolled use of fire, the spread of invasive species and associated drying out of marshes, the planned construction of a dam on the Gambia River, or the planned Tambacounda National Highway.

While the State Party indicated that there had been progress in addressing the main threat of poaching and in the implementation of the corrective measures, **IUCN** had received alarming contradictory reports, according to which poaching had actually been increasing on the property. Staff training remained inadequate, and the Action Plan was not being implemented. The levels of threat to the property seemed not to have diminished, and there seemed to be no evidence of recovery in large mammal populations. The Centre and IUCN recommended that the State Party invite a mission to the property in 2010, in order to determine the extent to which the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been affected. They also recommended that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be applied to the property to help support actions essential if the Site was to retain its long-term conservation value.

The **Chairperson** asked IUCN to give indications about how applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism would help.

IUCN responded that it had a regional presence, a country office existing in Senegal, and that its networks would be able to provide information. It felt it had the necessary infrastructure to be able to assist and increase the level of discussion beyond statements of concern.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that this was an important site, located in a strategic place, and it was alarmed to hear that corrective measures had not been applied and that poaching had increased. On the other hand, the State Party had made certain efforts to improve the situation, and it should be given the opportunity to give information on its view on the need to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. Perhaps this would not be necessary, and the funds could be used elsewhere.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** (Observateur) remercie le Secrétariat et l'UICN pour leur rapport mais précise que les menaces identifiées dans ce compte rendu, concernant notamment l'autoroute Tambacounda, ne peuvent pas avoir d'impact sur le site car l'autoroute se situe à 100kms de la frontière nord du Parc. La Délégation souligne que, malgré les difficultés économiques actuelles dont il est question dans le rapport, le Sénégal a pris les mesures nécessaires pour identifier de nouvelles ressources et les mettre à la disposition du Parc. 170 agents ont par exemple été recrutés pour encadrer le site et contribuer à sa gestion. Il précise, de plus, que la période de deux ans n'est pas suffisante pour résoudre l'ensemble des problèmes rencontrés, mais que des débats consultations peuvent avoir lieu avec l'UICN, dont la présence est assurée au Sénégal, pour tenter de remédier à ces problèmes sans recourir à la mise en place d'un suivi renforcé.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie le **Sénégal** pour les clarifications apportées et s'associe à la déclaration de la Délégation du **Kenya**. La Délégation demande à reprendre la parole en fin de débat sur la question des sites en péril.

In thanking the State Party of Senegal for efforts made to protect the site, the Delegation of **Egypt** felt it was necessary to underline the need to encourage all States Parties. It further emphasized the role of the international community in protecting heritage, and the positive message that this could convey.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** note l'exemplarité des efforts par l'Etat partie du Sénégal et souligne la nécessité d'encourager et d'accompagner le processus de consultation en cours.

Ayant pris connaissance du rapport et des clarifications apportées, la Délégation de la **Tunisie** confirme avoir bon espoir pour l'état de conservation du site malgré les difficultés rencontrées.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether there had been coordination with the AWHF, and if it would be reasonable to mention the prioritization of sites.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que l'inscription d'un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril a pour but d'attirer l'attention de la communauté internationale sur la nécessité de soutenir en priorité ce bien afin de mieux gérer les difficultés rencontrées. Elle attire l'attention du Comité sur l'ensemble des sites examinés, notamment ceux de la République Démocratique du Congo, inscrits depuis dix ou quinze ans sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et pour lesquels la situation n'a guère évolué. Elle demande à ce qu'une réflexion sérieuse soit engagée dans le cadre de la discussion sur l'avenir de la Convention afin d'envisager d'autres mécanismes.

IUCN responded that in its view a mission to the property was the key to assessing the current situation of the Outstanding Universal Value. While it felt that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was the key to this situation, IUCN stated that it would not insist on applying it if the Committee felt it was premature. Concerning the involvement of the AWHF in West Africa, it noted that IUCN worked in cooperation with the AWHF, and it suggested looking at constructive tools, such as the Enhancing Our Heritage Mechanism, which could be developed to support the sites. Programmatic and strategic cooperation with the Fund was in place.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 (with a suggestion from **Kenya** to add the word "some" before "corrective measures"), as well as 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were adopted. **Kenya** made reference to the need to delete the original paragraph 11, as per the indications of IUCN.

La Délégation du **Maroc** soutien la proposition de retrait du paragraphe 11.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.11** was adopted as amended

ARAB STATES

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)

Le **Secrétariat** présente un bref résumé concernant l'état de conservation du site. L'élévation de la nappe phréatique, causée par un vaste programme d'irrigation, et des effondrements de structures avaient provoqué l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril du bien en 2001. Depuis cette date, le Comité a encouragé les autorités égyptiennes à prendre des mesures pour interrompre le processus de dégradation. En 2005, une mission de suivi réactif a établi, avec les responsables égyptiens, un plan d'action comprenant un certain nombre de mesures d'urgence.

Le Secrétariat poursuit en expliquant que le rapport de l'Etat partie reprend en grande partie celui de 2008 dans lequel il indiquait déjà un projet d'abaissement de 5 m de la nappe phréatique qui devrait démarrer prochainement et serait achevé d'ici 3 ans. Bien que l'Etat partie n'ait pas soumis la requête d'assistance internationale suggérée par le Comité pour l'élaboration des plans de conservation et de gestion, le rapport indique son intention d'en soumettre une pour un montant de 4 à 5 millions de dollars, sous la forme d'une campagne internationale de sauvegarde du bien. Toutefois, le rapport ne fait pas état de la mise en œuvre des mesures d'urgence demandées par le Comité à ses 3 dernières sessions, telles que l'étude complète de l'état des vestiges, la consolidation des structures, l'élaboration de plans de conservation et de gestion et des consultations avec les parties prenantes, en particulier la communauté du monastère moderne de Mar Mena. Dans le cadre de l'exercice des rapports périodiques, l'Etat partie prépare une Déclaration de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle qui devrait être soumise prochainement.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne qu'il s'agit d'un site important d'architecture en terre, fragile et difficile à entretenir. En particulier, l'Etat partie rencontre des difficultés à faire face aux dégradations causées par la nappe phréatique. La Délégation propose de donner la parole à l'Egypte.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that it had already taken the floor during the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, and therefore that it did not intend to take the floor at this session. The Egyptian authorities had paid attention to safeguarding this important site. Some 40 million Egyptian pounds had been spent on its protection, in particular on solving the issue of the water table and building a wall around the site. Serious restoration and conservation missions had been undertaken. Egypt had significant experience in safeguarding this type of heritage site, and projects had been prepared and implemented by Coptic experts (who were Christian) on the invitation of the authorities. A major problem was that the World Heritage Centre relied only on the State Party's report, when it was important that the Centre send a mission to the site.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souligne les divergences entre le Rapport présenté par le Secrétariat et le contenu de l'intervention de l'Egypte. Le gouvernement déploie beaucoup d'efforts pour la sauvegarde du site. Même si ces efforts n'ont pas mis fin à

tous les dangers, il faut féliciter l'Etat partie. La Décision devrait comprendre des encouragements à l'Etat partie dans la poursuite de ses efforts.

The Delegation of **Jordan** underlined that the Delegation of Egypt had provided information on the corrective measures being undertaken. These measures were welcome and necessary, and the Committee should thank the Egyptian authorities. The Delegation of Jordan suggested removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party on the work achieved and recommended that rather than recommending the State Party to apply to the Fund or seek the assistance of the Committee, ICOMOS, ICCROM and other Advisory Bodies should help the State Party in its efforts at conservation. The Delegation of Kenya announced that it would provide an amendment to the Draft Decision that reflected its view.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported interventions that suggested congratulating the Government of Egypt on its efforts.

ICOMOS welcomed the additional oral information provided by the State Party and stressed that this information had only come after the preparation of the Working Document. However, as was stated in the Draft Decision, a Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was still deemed necessary. It also underlined the importance of having a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value prepared for the property, and said that a commitment to the conservation of the property from the State Party was desirable.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur if any amendment to the Draft Decision had been presented.

The **Rapporteur** answered that there was only the amendment proposed by Kenya.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its disagreement with the use of the verb "regrets" in the Draft Decision, saying that this was not appropriate.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that during the Bureau and also at some stage in the Orientation Session, it had been said that from an ethical point of view it was desirable that States Parties not propose amendments to Draft Decisions concerning the Status of Conservation of properties situated on their own territories. The Chairperson suggested that the Delegation of Egypt ask another delegation to submit the amendment, and she moved on with the adoption of the Draft Decision. She then noted that the verb "regrets" was not in the Draft Decision concerning Abu Mena.

The Delegation of **Egypt** clarified that its comment referred to the Draft Decision concerning Thebes.

The **Chairperson** took note and asked the Rapporteur to proceed with the reading of the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read the additional paragraph proposed by the Delegation of Kenya: "urges the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, as well as any other relevant bodies, to cooperate with the State Party to put in place corrective measures".

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose d'insérer une phrase félicitant l'Etat partie pour ses efforts dans la sauvegarde d'Abou Mena.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the new paragraph could be inserted after the existing paragraph 4 and explained that the thinking that inspired the formulation of this paragraph was the one behind the Abu Simbel Campaign. As had been the case in the Campaign, the State Party should not be left alone to face the difficult task of conserving the property.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** emphasized the importance of mobilizing the international community as a whole to ensure the conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read proposed amendments.

The **Rapporteur** read an amendment in French proposed by Tunisia.

The **Chairperson** asked the typist to go back to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, where the amendment proposed by Tunisia should be inserted. However, the **Rapporteur** proposed to insert the paragraph separately as paragraph 3b.

The **Chairperson** summarized the amendments made.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.15** was adopted as amended.

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

Le **Secrétariat** présente un bref résumé concernant l'état de conservation du site. Le rapport transmis par l'Etat partie signale, comme en 2008, une dégradation due à l'érosion et aux infiltrations des eaux du Tigre dans la partie orientale du bien, et insiste sur la nécessité d'intervenir rapidement. Il apparaît néanmoins que, malgré des demandes réitérées auprès du Ministère des ressources hydrologiques, aucune action n'a encore été mise en œuvre. L'Etat partie demande l'assistance technique et les conseils scientifiques du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS pour résoudre ce problème.

Le rapport de l'Etat partie indique que la gestion et le gardiennage du site sont assurés, par l'établissement d'une unité de gestion et l'emploi de 12 gardes. Il assure que l'état général de conservation est satisfaisant à l'exception de la Porte de Tabira. Des fonds ont été alloués pour sa restauration qui devrait commencer prochainement. Le rapport mentionne également le non avancement du projet de barrage pour encore 5 ans et semble considérer qu'il ne sera pas repris. Enfin, l'Etat partie annonce son souhait d'établir à Assour une école de fouilles et de conservation archéologiques.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any interventions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** explained that Ashur was one of humanity's most ancient sites, relating to the ancient history of Iraq and the Assyrian Empire. It drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the people of Iraq were suffering. It explained that it had

hoped last year, and the year before that, that the World Heritage Centre would assist Iraq, and it regretted that the Centre had not provided assistance, probably excusing its inaction by referring to political reasons or the security situation in the country. It nevertheless expressed the hope that a way could be found to assist Iraq.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souscrit à l'opinion de l'Egypte quant à l'importance du site, et souligne les difficultés que traverse actuellement l'Iraq. La Délégation demande que l'Irak donne son opinion quant à la faisabilité des actions demandées dans le projet de décision, compte tenu de la situation dans le pays.

The Delegation of **Iraq** (Observer) informed the Committee that two reports had been provided to the World Heritage Centre, in Arabic and English respectively. It hoped that the Committee would maintain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It explained that circumstances beyond its control had prevented the country from implementing the previous Decision of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Jordan**, noting the absence of a report from ICOMOS, requested clarifications on the measures which had been taken to protect the sites of Ashur and Samarra. The sites were under threat, particularly owing to the presence of American occupying forces, which had installed military encampments within the sites. The Delegation requested that ICOMOS give its opinion in this regard.

The **Chairperson** suggested grouping all the questions to ICOMOS and the Secretariat together before giving them the floor. After having noted that the Members of the Committee had put no further requests for the floor forward, she gave the floor to the Secretariat.

Le **Secrétariat**, en réponse à l'intervention de l'Irak confirme que le rapport de l'Etat partie avait été effectivement traduit en anglais, et reflété dans le rapport sur l'état de la conservation du bien (document 33 COM 7A.Add). A la connaissance du Secrétariat, il n'y a pas d'occupation militaire sur le site d'Assour (la situation est différente pour Samarra ou d'autres sites). Le Secrétariat souligne que le rapport de l'Etat partie est positif quant à l'état de conservation d'Assour, excepté le problème d'infiltration des eaux du Tigre.

Le Projet de Décision **33 COM 7A.16** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq)

Le **Secrétariat** présente un bref résumé concernant l'état de conservation du site. Le rapport de l'Etat partie indique qu'une étude a été menée sur l'état de conservation de certains monuments, affectés par le manque d'entretien, l'érosion et les infiltrations de sel, l'humidité et d'autres facteurs naturels ainsi que par des dommages dus au conflit. Les monuments concernés sont le minaret hélicoïdal de la Malwiya, la Grande mosquée, le palais du Calife et la mosquée d'Abu Dalaf. L'Etat partie s'alarme de cette situation et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'ICOMOS d'apporter une assistance technique pour résoudre ces problèmes. Il précise également que la base

militaire implantée sur le site n'a toujours pas été démantelée et mentionne des projets d'expansion de la ville nouvelle qui ne semblent pas menacer le bien.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed that what had been said about Ashur could also be applied to Samarra, another important site.

The **Delegation of Nigeria** stated that all States Parties should cooperate because the loss of one country's heritage was the loss of the entire international community.

The **Chairperson** started the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed using the same formulation for this Decision as had been used in the decision for Ashur: "call the international community to provide..."

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.17** was adopted as amended.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

Le **Secrétariat** présente un bref résumé concernant l'état de conservation du site. Les problèmes majeurs qui avaient motivé la mise en péril du bien s'étaient accrus à un tel point que le Comité a adopté des mesures correctives et un calendrier pour éviter le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Les efforts considérables de l'Etat partie, en particulier de l'organisme chargé de la conservation des villes historiques, le GOPHCY, soutenus par l'organisme national du Social Fund et par l'agence de coopération allemande, la GTZ semblent modifier peu à peu cette situation.

La mission de l'ICOMOS et du Centre du patrimoine mondial qui s'est rendue à Zabid en janvier 2007 avait défini un plan d'action d'urgence, renforcé par le lancement, en 2007, du projet de la coopération allemande, la GTZ, envisagé pour une période de 9 ans. Ce projet se concentre sur l'amélioration des conditions économiques des communautés, la réhabilitation urbaine et la préservation du patrimoine. L'Etat partie a pris un certain nombre de mesures et d'engagements, sur le plan juridique, financier, la coordination institutionnelle, la gestion, l'arrêt des constructions illégales, la préparation du plan de conservation avec une révision de la réglementation et l'élaboration d'un système d'information géographique... répondant ainsi aux demandes du Comité. La situation semble donc connaître un renversement de tendance très encourageant. Les habitants sont conscients que la réhabilitation pourrait leur être bénéfique et ils s'investissent dans les projets.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any interventions.

The Delegation of **Sweden** commended the State Party for the efforts made in the conservation of this property, and noted that its inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger had been beneficial to its preservation and had actually improved its State of Conservation. The Delegation of Sweden asked what rationale had led to the use of certain formulations in the Decisions on some properties and not on others. In particular, it asked why the assistance of the whole international community was sought only in some cases.

ICOMOS reminded the Committee that the Historic Town of Zabid had been placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in response to the accelerating downward spiral of destruction of its structures. In order to address these problems, a specific and detailed Action Plan had been developed as a result of the mission in 2007 that had defined what needed to be achieved in the span of two years in order to reverse the situation. ICOMOS also said that there was still a need to see more defined indicators to demonstrate that the degradation of the structures had been reversed. Regarding the specific question raised by the Delegation of Sweden, ICOMOS said that in this case the formulation used for other properties (“calling upon the whole international community for assistance to the State Party”) was not necessary, as the property had already had considerable support from GTZ.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the report mentioned an architectural survey, carried out in 2008, according to which more than 70% of the original city’s features were still there, whereas a survey carried out in 2005 had put that percentage at 50%. It wondered if there was an explanation for the difference in the findings of the two surveys.

The Delegation of **Jordan** proposed to give the floor to Yemen.

The Delegation of **Yemen** (Observer) thanked Jordan for the opportunity to take the floor. It explained that two reports were available: one prepared by the Government of Yemen, the other by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. It explained that when GTZ had presented its project to support the institutions in the city, a more detailed survey had been undertaken, and GTZ had made some corrections, especially concerning the percentage of damage in the city. The problem was that differences in the percentages depended on the accuracy of on-site surveys.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** commended the State Party, as the conservation of the property was going in the right direction. However, it noted that time might be necessary before the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also asked about the scope of the mission carried out by the Secretariat in 2009.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souligne les efforts louables de l’Etat partie dans la sauvegarde du site et suggère d’entreprendre des activités pour informer les populations locales de l’importance de ce site et des efforts que la communauté internationale déploie pour sa sauvegarde.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the intervention of Tunisia and explained that Yemen had more than one department specializing in safeguarding archaeological sites, in particular at the University of Sana’a, but also at other universities. Yemen only needed further guidelines and support to achieve positive results.

La Délégation du **Maroc** se prononce en faveur du retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, ce qui pourrait être envisagé à la prochaine session. La Délégation avance également une proposition d’ordre général, afin d’harmoniser les formulations utilisées dans les textes de différentes décisions, car trois différentes formulations sont utilisées : « Plan de gestion », « Plan de conservation », « Plan de conservation et de gestion ». Elle propose d’utiliser la formulation « Plan de gestion », qui figure dans la *Convention* et qui englobe tout les éléments.

Le **Secrétariat** en réponse à l'intervention du Bahreïn précise que la mission effectuée en 2009 était demandée par l'Etat partie. Il ne s'agissait pas d'une mission de suivi réactif demandée par le Comité, mais d'une mission d'expertise pour visiter Shibam et Zabid et examiner, avec la GTZ et la GOPHCY, l'état d'avancement du projet.

ICOMOS explained that in this instance the Conservation Plan was a very specific and detailed one, while the Management Plan was a more general document on the conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

The **Delegation of Canada** clarified that the paragraph it had proposed should have been inserted between paragraphs 6 and 7.

The **Rapporteur** read the paragraph proposed by the Delegation of Canada: "Reiterate its request to the State Party to continue its efforts towards..."

The Delegation of **Israel** felt that there was repetition in paragraphs 8 and 9 and that one of them could be deleted.

The **Chairperson** supported the intervention of the Delegation of Israel.

La **Présidente** prend note de l'amendement proposé par le Canada ainsi que des corrections rédactionnelles proposées par le Maroc et Israël, et compte tenu également d'une clarification par le Secrétariat concernant la formulation proposée dans le projet de décision.

Le Projet de Décision **33 COM 7A.19** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

ASIA PACIFIC

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

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a report from the State Party on the State of Conservation of this property on 18 June 2009, confirming the information provided in the working document and in particular with regard to the protective walls constructed along the Jam and Hari Rud Rivers following the floods of 2007. These walls were some 120 metres long. UNESCO intended to assist the State Party in completing this essential work, including exploring the feasibility of constructing what engineers call a "diaphragm" – a horizontal structure at the foot of the protection wall meant to prevent soil erosion underneath the wall due to underwater currents. Following an expert meeting with Afghan participation that had taken place at ICCROM last June, and which had identified priority actions to be implemented, UNESCO intended to work together with the State Party in monitoring the Minaret and assessing its foundations – preconditions to undertaking further consolidation work after the repairs to the masonry of the lower part of the structure that had been carried out over the past few years. In addition, it was proposed to complete the mapping of the property and to train site guards and staff from the Ministry of Culture. ICCROM, for its part, would assist

the Afghan authorities in devising a strategy for capacity-building in the area of cultural-heritage conservation. Part of these activities would be implemented, when compatible with security conditions in the area, through the Italian and Swiss Trust Funds and with Afghan resources. A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value still remained to be prepared for the property, and the World Heritage Centre would assist the State Party with this within the framework of the forthcoming Periodic Reporting cycle. It thus appeared that there was some way to go before achieving the desired State of Conservation. The Secretariat announced that additional information in the form of a report had been submitted after the preparation of the Document, and it therefore proposed changing paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

The **Delegation of Israel** recognized the importance of this astonishing monument and asked about efforts made to coordinate the UNESCO mission with the monitoring mission. It also asked about the situation concerning the looting of the archaeological site.

The **Secretariat** answered that over the last two years it had not been possible to send out missions because of the deteriorating security conditions, and it added that until then all UNESCO missions had been carried out within the framework of extra-budgetary projects and had been closely coordinated by the UNESCO Kabul Office and the World Heritage Centre. Combining the missions of UNESCO with those of other bodies was done frequently.

On the issue of looting, **ICOMOS** said that because of the deteriorating security situation, looting of the property was also declining, as traders had more difficulty in finding potential buyers. Regarding the archaeological remains, ICOMOS noted that several universities were no longer able to carry on their courses, as they could not visit the site, once again because of worsening security conditions.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether the report of the meeting held at ICCROM was available.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that it was available on the Internet and that if it could not be found there, this was due to a mistake that would be immediately corrected.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the Secretariat if the report submitted by the State Party included any reference to the archaeological site.

The **Secretariat** indicated that this was not the case.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose de supprimer la phrase « regrette que l'Etat partie n'ait pas soumis le rapport ».

The **Rapporteur** read the amended paragraph 3: "Takes note of the report provided by the State Party on the State of Conservation of the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session".

The **Delegation of Israel** proposed adding the following text at the beginning of paragraph 7: "Recognizing the support of the governments of Italy and Switzerland...."

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.20** was adopted, as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** made a presentation stating that the World Heritage Centre had received a report on the Statement of Conservation of this property from the State Party on 18 June 2009. This had not included the requested Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but it had contained information on de-mining activities, the consolidation of the niches of the Buddha statues, and encroachments onto the inscribed property due to building activities and communications infrastructure. With respect to the four elements of the desired Statement of Conservation, progress had been made in increasing security at the site through additional guards and de-mining activities, both supported by Japan. Regarding the stability of the Giant Buddha niches, scaffolding had been set up and an accurate survey of the cliff rock had been carried out using laser scanning by ICOMOS Germany (partly funded by UNESCO through Japanese Trust Funds and partly funded by Germany). A supporting wall, destroyed in 2001, had also been rebuilt. The report also mentioned a number of capacity-building activities, carried out in the framework of the Japanese Trust Fund Project. This training would continue in September, with a focus on site management in particular.

The Cultural Master Plan for the Valley of Bamiyan – a land use plan – had been adopted three years previously. In 2008, UNESCO had provided support and advice on its implementation. The Management Plan for the property, on the other hand, was still in progress.

The Centre had organised a meeting of the expert group to discuss technical matters related to the on-going activities. This had identified specific recommendations for the Afghan Government and for the future implementation of the Japan FIT Project.

In conclusion, some progress had been made – also thanks to the fact that Bamiyan was in a relatively safe area – but much remained to be done, starting with the drafting of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the completion of the Management Plan and underpinned by substantial capacity-building.

The **Delegation of Israel** wondered if a desired State of Conservation report had been drafted for this property.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that there was one.

The **Chairperson** started the examination of the Decision, proceeding paragraph by paragraph.

La Délégation du **Maroc** suggère de remercier le Japon et l'Allemagne pour le soutien apporté.

The **Rapporteur** introduced into the text of the Decision the wording proposed by Israel in the previous Decision, adapting it to the two States Parties concerned in this case: “Recognizing the support of the governments of Germany and Japan....”

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.21** was adopted, as amended.

The Delegation of **Israel** wanted to thank those on the podium, the members of the Secretariat and the interpreters for a long day's work.

Before the closing of the session, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Secretariat**, which made three announcements about three meetings that were going to be held over the following days: the first a meeting of the Arab Group, the second a meeting on tourism, and the third a reception by the Ambassador of Iraq.

The meeting rose at 8.30 pm.

THIRD DAY – THURSDAY, 25 JUNE 2009

FIFTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. –2.00 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Afghanistan) (C1208)

The **Secretariat** provided a summary of the report received from the State Party. The report included a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which would be reviewed by ICOMOS over the coming months for examination by the Committee at its next session in 2010. The report also contained information on progress made with regard to the desired State of Conservation. This focused in particular on conservation work carried out within the Citadel, continuing investigations to map archaeological remains and other heritage elements within and around the property. It also concerned security at the Arg-e-Bam and the process for the legal adoption of the Management Plan. A draft of the updated nomination file had been prepared, but the final version was expected to be submitted only in 2010. Regarding the completion of all other corrective measures, the State Party noted that these might take longer than the current date of 2010, and suggested that a new, more realistic timeframe could be proposed later in 2009.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the earthquake that had taken place had shocked everyone and made it clear that earthen architecture was particularly vulnerable. The Delegation submitted an amendment to congratulate the State Party and enquired about measures needed to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** made some corrections to the syntax of paragraph 3 and received support from the Delegation of **Israel**.

The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision for translation into French.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.22** was adopted as amended

Fort and Shalimar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171-172)

The **Secretariat** described the progress achieved in the desired State of Conservation, as per the State Party report and the monitoring mission report. It further noted that the Master Plan approved by the Committee had been adopted in February 2009 and that implementation had begun. The mission report noted the need to strengthen the capacity of the local authorities following the transfer of the property from the federal to the state level. Conservation work on the property had been carried out at the West Gate of the Shalimar Gardens and at the Fort, particularly the lower part of the ramparts, though sections of the external walls remained in a dilapidated state. The hydraulic structures of the Gardens had been partially restored. It appeared that progress had been slow in regard to the establishment of buffer zones. Though the mission had received a proposal for such changes, these had not yet been formally proposed to the Committee. The proposed boundaries also appeared to have left out important elements that previous Committee recommendations had suggested be included. In conclusion, the Secretariat noted that significant progress had been made, but that important aspects of the desired State of Conservation remained to be addressed, and that in order to do this the State Party needed to build capacity. The State Party was encouraged to apply for international assistance in this regard.

ICOMOS explained that threats to the property were complicated and long-standing, and it noted that the local authorities were sincere in addressing them. However, some measures required dealing with threats that were not within their remit, and these required support from other, higher authorities. It further noted that the Master Plan had been developed, but that this did not entirely concur with previous recommendations.

La Délégation du **Maroc** constate, tant pour le site de Bam que pour celui-ci, les progrès importants accomplis. Ces progrès devraient être reflétés dans la décision, qui devrait envisager un retrait prochain de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, afin de donner un signal fort à l'Etat partie.

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

The Delegation of **Kenya** addressed paragraph five of the Draft Decision and commented on the fact that the Committee at its 32nd session had asked for a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and for conditions of authenticity and integrity to be met. It questioned the proposed amendment, which would remove reference to authenticity and integrity from the Draft Decision, and asked if this was coherent with the 32nd session decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** responded, clarifying the point made the previous day, and stating that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value included matters of integrity and authenticity by its very nature and that there was no need to refer explicitly to them in the Decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that in the Operational Guidelines, the notions of authenticity and integrity were presented separately from the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but it accepted that the matter be dropped.

ICOMOS noted that Outstanding Universal Value was differentiated from authenticity in the Operational Guidelines, but that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value did in fact include authenticity and integrity.

The Draft Decision **33 COM. 7A.23** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** presented its report.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** (Observer) thanked the Government of Spain for hosting the meeting. It noted that it was committed to conserving the Site and appreciated the Advisory Bodies' and World Heritage Centre's efforts in helping to ensure the property's conservation. It listed its efforts in addressing the corrective measures, specifically: 1) a Twinning Programme with Cinque Terre that had been initiated; 2) a globally important and indigenous Agricultural Heritage Systems Programme, which had held a planning session the previous day in order to discuss the promotion of traditional agricultural practices; 3) a manual on the construction of infrastructure for rice terraces that was under preparation; 4) the Ifugao Provincial Government had continued to pursue community-based tourism strategies; 5) the identification, mapping and consolidation of irrigation systems and stone walls in the Rice Terraces continued to be undertaken; 6) the third phase of the Nurturing Indigenous Knowledge Experts Project was underway; and 7) a comprehensive research programme identifying indigenous and endemic species in the watersheds was underway. It concluded by encouraging the Committee, the Centre and the international community to help preserve the property.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its interest in the report on the current conservation status of the property and expressed its admiration for the State Party's commitment, further noting the cooperation between the private and public sectors and with local communities. It highlighted this as an approach that should be emulated for other properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It concluded by congratulating the State Party on its efforts.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Delegation of Sweden and reminded the Committee that it had participated in a benchmark meeting in Paris two years ago, during which this property had been used as a case study. It noted that the work carried out with the community demonstrated the value of considering it as a benchmark, and it further noted that it had proposed a Draft Decision intending to congratulate the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted another aspect of this positive example – particularly with regard to the fact that the State Party itself had requested that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It wondered about the long-term recovery of the landscape and enquired about the timescale thought to be required for removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the State Party, particularly in regard to the initiative on developing the Desired State of Conservation. It wondered about the timeframe involved in processes related to having the property

removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It remarked that the draft Desired State of Conservation had been submitted to the Secretariat last February, but that the Draft Decision called for its examination only in 2010. It wondered why the draft Desired State of Conservation had not been examined by the Committee during the current session, and whether this delay might slow progress in removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated the State Party for its progress and efforts.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated the comments of the Delegations of the United States and Peru and expressed the wish that the State Party be encouraged and congratulated. It should also be given an opportunity to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique que des questions demeurent sur le retrait de biens de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. En effet, il s'agit d'un site emblématique de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation du Maroc reconnaît les efforts de l'Etat partie et s'interroge sur les liens existant entre l'assistance internationale et un retrait possible. La Délégation du **Maroc** considère que le Comité devrait s'orienter vers une possibilité de retrait pour donner l'exemple et encourager d'autres Etats parties.

The **Secretariat** responded to the questions on the timeframe for removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the approval of the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It indicated that numerous activities had been included in the plan provided by the State Party, each with different timeframes, hence the difficulty in establishing a clear timeline for eventual delisting. The Secretariat would review the Desired State of Conservation to identify key indicators for the Committee to assess progress and time for completion. The Secretariat explained that removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger next year was not feasible, and that there was therefore no rush to adopt the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.7A.24** was adopted as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan)(C 958)

The **Secretariat** reported that a good deal of progress had been made in recent years, recognized by the January 2009 mission of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. There has been excellent cooperation with the State Party. New information obtained from the Permanent Delegation on 15 June 2009 had revealed new developments. A meeting with the Permanent Delegation and the site manager had taken place with the Secretariat on 15 June 2009 in order to discuss a number of new developments, including the decision on the protection of the buffer zone, the integration of the Conservation Management Plan and progress made in reply to requests made at the 32nd session of the Committee and by the mission. The Permanent Delegation had informed the Centre that the State Party had complied with the requests of the Committee and with the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring Mission of January 2009. At the same time, the State Party had also provided comments on the World

Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission report, pointing out in particular: 1) the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been transmitted by the site manager to the Centre on 1 June 2009; 2) on 25 May 2009, the cabinet of ministers had adopted a decision establishing the buffer zone (document transmitted by the site manager to the World Heritage Centre on 1 June 2009 and transmitted to ICOMOS for review). The Permanent Delegation had explained that no changes could be made within the buffer zone without the agreement of the State Historical-Architectural Preserve "Icheriheher"; 3) the public hearing on the Master Plan was underway and a presentation had taken place on 19 June 2009; 4) on 10 April 2009, an email from the site manager had stated that work on the draft of the Detailed Conservation Master Plan for the Historic Centre was being finalized, though the Centre noted that this had not yet been approved and nor had the Centre received it; and finally, 5) on 6 March 2009, the President of Azerbaijan had appointed a new Head of Administration for the State Historical-Architectural Preserve "Icheriheher," and the appointee was also the site manager. ICOMOS and the Centre had reviewed the information provided and had proposed the revised Draft Decision to the World Heritage Committee. ICOMOS and the Centre were now of the view that a mission could verify whether the measures had all been implemented and therefore added the words, "with a view to consider removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger".

ICOMOS welcomed the progress noted in the new information provided by the State Party, but emphasized the importance of ensuring that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value be used as the basis and guide for the management of the property, while also providing a framework for the Conservation Master Plan. ICOMOS noted that this had not occurred.

La Délégation de **Corée** félicite l'Etat partie pour ses efforts, notamment dans le cadre de la création d'une nouvelle entité de gestion et d'une zone tampon. Elle indique son souhait d'entendre l'Etat partie sur les travaux et les modes de financement. Elle indique également que le Comité devrait envisager un retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Egypt** joined its voice to that of Korea and made the remark that the results already achieved were not in line with the presentation. It read the report, quoting:

"The conclusions of the mission report indicated that the State Party has put in place all of the corrective measures specified by the World Heritage Committee at the time of the inscription of Baku on the List of World Heritage in Danger: a) the administrative structure and related programmes of the management agency are fully functional and have been provided with an annually approved budget; b) an inventory of all monuments, buildings and their infrastructure indicating their physical condition as well as expected rehabilitation methodologies has been completed; c) the Integrated Urban Area Management Action Plan has been completed and is being implemented."

The Delegation of Egypt did not consider the Draft Decision to be appropriate, and it proposed an amendment.

The Delegation of **Spain** reiterated the reasons for which the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, which had included the illegal

demolition of historic buildings and uncontrolled construction and reconstruction within the Walled City, and the lack of a management system and insufficient coordination between the national and municipal authorities. The Delegation noted that the measures taken by the State Party had focused on the illegal constructions, the creation of a new department, and the setting up and implementation of a whole range of projects. It considered that there was no further danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that the Committee should remove it from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation proposed an amendment to this end.

The Delegation of **Cuba** indicated that the relevant points had been covered by the Delegations of Egypt and Spain and confirmed that the Outstanding Universal Value was no longer in danger, and therefore that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It supported the amendment.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the previous interventions. It noted that the State Party had done its best to address the obligations raised by the Committee. It further expressed its surprise that the State Party was being penalized by the recommendation that the property remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger, despite its having done what had been asked of it. Kenya recommended that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** (Observer) to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** (Observer) thanked the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat for their on-going assistance. It indicated that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been prepared and submitted, that new buffer zones had been approved, and that a management plan was also in place. It further noted that a mechanism for public consultations had been launched. It explained that while the Draft Decision distributed by the Secretariat contained recognition of this new information, it suggested that the proposal to maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was no longer valid. It noted that a 20 million USD investment in conservation measures being planned for the next three years would be at risk if the property remained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the State Party on its efforts to improve the property's conservation. It also agreed with Spain's proposal to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for three reasons: 1) the property had been listed on the List of World Heritage in Danger for six years, and the State Party had made great efforts to improve its conservation, having implemented the requested corrective measures and making a good deal of progress; 2) the main danger to the property was not under its control; and 3) inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger was intended to reduce threats and to improve cooperation, and the report showed that this aim had been achieved.

The **Chairperson** noted that several other Delegations had indicated their agreement with the proposed removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and decided to end further discussion on the issue.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that several proposed amendments repeated each other. Coordination was required in summarizing them.

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

The Delegation of **Canada** enquired why the reference to the Master Plan had been deleted from paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Spain** noted that this reference had already been included in paragraph 6, and it recommended asking for an updated report.

The Delegation of **Israel** approved the explanation provided by the Delegation of Spain, and made further recommendations to paragraph 6, which would result in the removal of paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Australia** raised a procedural point and requested that its name be included in the proceedings.

The Delegation of **Israel** clarified its proposal to modify paragraph 6, in order to achieve proper recognition of the Management Plan.

The **Chairperson** asked Spain if the new paragraph 7 was acceptable.

The Delegation of **Spain** accepted the change.

The Delegation of **Kenya** referred to paragraph 8 and explained that the State Party should be required to report back to the World Heritage Committee even if the property were to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** recommended that a mission should still be carried out to the property, despite the recommendation that it be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Cuba** reminded the Committee that on the previous day discussion had taken place on the link between missions and results. It wondered why Reactive Monitoring had been included.

The Delegation of **Spain** agreed that a mission was excessive and that a report from the State Party should be sufficient.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed a new amendment relating to the carrying out of a mission to the property, without making reference to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed that it believed that paragraph 9 should only call for one specific measure, which was to continue the cooperation between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre. It believed that this would be an appropriate amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the suggestion that a mission should not be carried out this year.

The Delegation of **Kenya** accepted not requesting a mission to the property.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the report had been requested in the previous paragraph and agreed with the Delegation of Kenya in suggesting the deletion of this paragraph. The Chairperson then put to the Committee the deletion of the paragraph concerning a Reactive Monitoring Mission. Seeing no objection, the paragraph was deleted.

The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 10 pertaining to sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, this having been replaced by the amendment supported by the Delegations of Cuba and Spain. It was recalled that the first amendment, supported by the Delegations of Spain, Cuba and Egypt had been eliminated by retaining paragraph 6, and that the State Party had been asked to submit it to the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** referred to the proposal to remove the Walled City of Baku with the Shirvashah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Israel was given the floor.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether a site that had been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger had to be reinstated on the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** said that it was not necessary.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.25** was adopted as amended.

Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany)

The **Secretariat** reported that the Dresden Elbe Valley had been inscribed as a Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List in July 2004 and that this property had been included on the List of World Heritage in Danger during the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2006. Following the proposal to construct a bridge (the Waldschlösschen Brücke) and a detailed visual impact study, Decision 30 COM 7B.77 had been taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session in Vilnius in 2006, requesting a halt to the bridge project. At its 31st session, held in Christchurch in 2007, the Committee had noted with satisfaction (Decision 31 COM 7A.27) that extensive consultation had taken place in 2006 and 2007 between different stakeholders, including the State Party authorities, the Land Sachsen and the City of Dresden, as well as international experts, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. Furthermore, the State Party had been asked to continue its efforts to find an appropriate solution, taking up the alternative proposals discussed at the moderated workshop of May 2007. The Committee had also decided to "delete the property from the World Heritage List...in the event that the construction of the bridge has an irreversible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property". In addition, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism had been applied in order to monitor the State of Conservation of the property. In 2008, a Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism Mission had confirmed the irreversible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property of the construction of the bridge, and the Committee had decided to retain the Dresden Elbe Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to delete the property from the World Heritage List at its 33rd session in 2009 should the planned work on the bridge continue and the damage already caused be irreversible.

The **Secretariat** provided the following new information: On 20 April 2009, a letter dated 8 April 2009 and addressed to the Chairperson had been received from the Mayor of

Dresden. The letter explained that the Dresden Administrative Court had dismissed complaints regarding environmental issues on 30 October 2008. The Court had indicated that the construction of the bridge did not violate European nature conservation law, and it noted that a tunnel would have a considerable additional impact on the protected course of the Elbe. It also emphasized that the property was a “developing cultural landscape”, which meant there was a need not only for preservation but also for careful, forward-looking development. The letter invited the Chairperson to visit Dresden, and it explained that the German Government had set up a funding programme for investment in national UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

On 30 April 2009, the Chairperson replied to the Mayor of Dresden, informing her that official procedures demanded that a report be submitted by the State Party through the official channels. This was subsequently submitted.

Between March and May 2009, the Centre received many letters or copies of letters from NGOs or individuals, most of them expressing concerns about the building of the bridge and asking for the construction to be halted.

On 25 May 2009, the Centre received a letter dated 22 May 2009 from the Permanent Delegation of Germany that included a letter dated 21 April 2009 from the Mayor of Dresden. This latter letter had included an excerpt from the judgement handed down by the Dresden Administrative Court in the case of the “Waldschlösschenbrücke Bridge-Planning Approval”.

The letter informed the Centre of the judgement of the Dresden Administrative Court on 20 February 2009, which had held that the tunnel was “objectively impossible” as an alternative, mainly due to the serious consequences it would have on the natural environment of the Elbe Valley. It would be at least 23 million euros more expensive, and operating costs would be higher than for the bridge. The letter noted that possible alternative sites for the bridge had been ruled out because they could not meet the purposes of the project, or could only partially meet them. The main purpose of the bridge project was to reduce traffic in Dresden Neustadt, in the city centre, and on the existing bridges. The proposed bridge would be integrated into the city’s road network, and convenient traffic connections would be created between important development areas in the city. This letter stated that the Committee should not make a decision based on information that was “entirely out of date,” and it asked it to postpone the case to the 34th session in 2010.

The Centre had also received a letter dated 5 June 2009 from the Saxon Ministry of Science and Fine Arts, which had included a letter dated 1 June 2009 detailing further information or developments concerning the Dresden Elbe Valley and three expert legal assessments on the judgement by the Dresden Administrative Court.

The letter said that the option of a new referendum being held was with the Court, and no judgement was expected before the completion of the bridge because of the Court’s timetable. It said that the lawsuit brought by environmental organizations against the construction of the bridge had failed, but an appeal had been filed with the higher courts. It opposed the claims made by the Mayor of Dresden in her letter of 21 April 2009, and it noted that the Court specifically had not ruled out the legal permissibility of a tunnel, and nor had it ruled out alternative bridges at the same location.

The letter noted that the construction of the bridge was continuing according to an accelerated schedule, but that the option of transforming the existing construction into a tunnel still existed and that at 2009 prices tunnel and bridge costs were approximately the same. The letter asked the Centre and the Members of the Committee to consider allowing Dresden to retain its title as World Heritage in the event that the bridge construction was halted and an alternative tunnel solution was implemented.

One last piece of information received was that although federal funding for World Heritage in Germany had been made available to 32 of the 33 German World Heritage properties, Dresden was not among them.

ICOMOS considered it relevant to recall that all due procedures had been followed in past Committee sessions. Impacts had been assessed as a basis for the Decision at the 30th session, and the conclusion was that that the bridge would result in the loss of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that the State Party of Germany be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Germany** (Observer) explained that the Decision would set an important precedent for the Convention. The deletion of a site from the List had not been imagined at the time the Convention was passed, and the Convention did not contain the necessary instruments to delete sites, since these were contained in the Operational Guidelines. It recommended that all avenues be tried in order to ensure that a consensual decision be reached, taking into account the State Party's concerns. The Delegation did not believe that all the conditions for deletion had been met. It asked that the Decision be postponed to allow for further consideration of the options, noting that a full debate had not taken place on the issue in the Committee. The Delegation raised the issue of the harmful impacts of a tunnel and of concerns regarding European law, explaining that time was needed to review the issue. It referred to paragraph 196 of the Operational Guidelines, which indicated that the Committee should not delete a site without consulting the State Party. It explained that it felt it had not been adequately consulted on the matter. It also expressed its interest in examining the possibility of a boundary change under chapter 3.1 of the Operational Guidelines, as well as a possible modification of the criteria under which the property was inscribed. It noted that in its 2004 Decision, the Committee had been asked to consider criterion 6, and that there seemed to be justification for studying a proposal according to paragraphs 165 and 166 of the Operational Guidelines. It stated that it fully supported the Convention and that by asking for a postponement of the Decision it was only asking for its right as a State Party for all procedures to be respected. It asked the Chairperson for permission to let the Mayor of Dresden speak.

The **Mayor of Dresden** delivered the following statement:

“Madame Chair,
Distinguished members of the Committee,
Ladies and gentlemen,

As Mayor, I represent a city of cultural and historical importance which continues to develop its awareness of the responsibility for its cultural assets and for the values of the UNESCO Convention.

It is in this context that I would like to ask for your support today. I ask you to keep the World Heritage status awarded to the City of Dresden. The Waldschlösschen Bridge is part of a developing cultural landscape – and will also permit unforgettable views over this landscape.

The Waldschlösschen Bridge also fulfils a social function, by joining two dynamic city districts, and the citizens of Dresden voted for the building of a bridge in a public referendum which has been confirmed by the highest Supreme Court in Germany.

A new decision of the Administrative Court in Dresden has introduced an important new fact: the court does not consider the tunnel an alternative.

After listening to experts, the court came to the conclusion that a tunnel would have greater impact on the protected Elbe landscapes than a bridge, with more serious consequences for flora and fauna.

The opposing party has entered an appeal against the decision. We hope that the decision will be taken next year. The Committee resolution passed in Quebec – namely to stop the construction work and to plan a tunnel as an alternative – is thus not possible for legal reasons.

This places us in a difficult situation in Dresden: we want to preserve the World Heritage status. But we cannot ignore the law to do so.

The Dresden World Heritage Site is a cultural landscape whose 32 square kilometres present a unique historical city and a unique harmony between architecture and nature. It is a cultural landscape that has developed over the course of 800 years, and which the people of Dresden have shaped in a manner which you considered worthy of inscription as a World Heritage Site.

A bridge is more than just a technical structure, and the World Heritage Site in Dresden is more than the building site for a bridge. The World Heritage Site is an expression of the love of Dresden’s citizens for their city.

On behalf of all the people of Dresden, therefore, I appeal to you: view the World Heritage Site in Dresden in its entirety. Take the new legal situation into account in your decision. Give us time and please help us to achieve a consensus. Dresden is able and willing to contribute wherever it can.”

The Delegation of **Israel** raised a point of order, indicating that though it was important to hear from the State Party, the Committee should be given the opportunity to address questions or raise particular issues.

The Delegation of **Jordan** felt that it was unfortunate that the authorities had continued to build the bridge despite clear warnings from the Committee. It considered that this challenged the authority of the Committee, and it supported what the local community and various academic institutions had said. The Delegation of Jordan proposed deleting the property from the World Heritage List and proposed a new nomination in the future.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its regret over the issue. It thanked ICOMOS and the Secretariat for their good work, and it thanked the State Party of Germany for its words. It noted that Germany had been a good friend of Kenya, and explained that this had resulted in additional pain in dealing with the issue. It called on Germany, as a leader under the Convention, to set an example in matters relating to conservation. It explained that there were difficulties in dealing with the need to conserve on the one hand, and the needs of the various State Parties to develop and grow on the other. However, it noted that this particular case had been discussed in several previous Committee meetings, and it wondered what impression it would make if the Committee did not go along with the advice of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It wondered how this might affect other cases where deletions from the World Heritage List could be under consideration. It further noted that clear action must be taken, and best practices must be put in place and not just recommended. It wondered whether this had been the case in this case. It asked whether, should the Committee decide not to remove the property from the World Heritage List, this could not be interpreted as arrogance on the part of the Committee.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** reconnaît que le Comité est confronté à un grave cas de conscience et que la situation est délicate. Elle est peinée de voir que les choses n'ont pas évolué et se demande s'il ne serait pas possible de trouver un compromis, comme par exemple le retrait de cette partie du bien. La Délégation rappelle les besoins de la population de Dresde.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique que son pays est mal à l'aise avec la prise d'une telle décision qui aurait de graves conséquences pour l'avenir, pour l'Etat partie mais également pour la Convention. La Délégation rappelle que le projet comparait actuellement devant un tribunal étudiant des solutions alternatives, et qu'il faudrait peut-être mieux reporter la décision plutôt que de se hâter. Elle mentionne également le paragraphe 196 des Orientations selon lequel les consultations avec l'Etat partie n'ont pas été totales, alors que l'Etat partie a toujours « été un bon élève ». La Délégation du Maroc insiste pour reporter la décision du retrait à la prochaine session.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that this was a crucial case involving the credibility of the World Heritage Committee. Three chances had been given to the State Party over recent years, but the Delegation could not see any sign of a commitment to demolish the bridge. There was only one solution available if the credibility of the Convention was to be preserved. This was a sad decision, it said, but one that had to be taken. Therefore, the Delegation of Bahrain supported the Draft Decision as presented in the Working Document.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the concern was not so much the construction of the bridge in itself, but the impact that this would have on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. Could ICOMOS articulate this more specifically, and at the same time provide information on a measurable threshold that could enable the World Heritage Committee to establish whether or not the impact already caused was irreversible?

Noting that the World Heritage Committee had already considered this question at previous sessions, **ICOMOS** recalled that the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of a Statement of Significance and under four different criteria, supported by corresponding attributes. The landscape element, where the impact of the bridge could be observed, was one of the key attributes supporting the value of the property, and this was made explicit in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value contained in the ICOMOS evaluation. ICOMOS quoted the relevant passages from the Statement, which set out, in ICOMOS's view, extremely clearly the importance of the landscape in visual terms, as well as the fact that this quality had always been appreciated and had indeed determined the way Dresden had been planned since the 19th century. With regard to the issue of a threshold for reversibility, ICOMOS noted that the World Heritage Committee had also dealt with this point at its previous session in Quebec in Canada in 2008. ICOMOS felt that while it was obvious that the "first spade into the ground" did not qualify as irreversible damage, there had to be a point when the on-going work would be considered to have irreversibly affected the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It was the view of ICOMOS that this point had now been reached.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted that this was a difficult issue, and it regretted that the situation had come to the present stage. It considered that the reports presented by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS were very important. As an art historian, the representative of the Delegation had been inspired by the views of the Dresden landscape, as had great artists in the past, such as Canaletto. The Delegation considered that the World Heritage Committee had made various attempts to delay its Decision, despite a very clear impact assessment report having been presented to it at previous sessions in 2006 and 2007. It felt, therefore, that the World Heritage Committee should now be firm and consistent, not only with regard to the case of the Dresden Elbe Valley, but also because the credibility of the Committee and indeed of the entire World Heritage Convention was at stake. Concurring with the Delegation of Jordan, the Delegation of Barbados was in favour of deletion. It added that perhaps there could have been room in the Decision by the World Heritage Committee for the suggestion that the State Party envisage submitting a new nomination based on new boundaries and criteria.

The **Chairperson** stated that she would allow all members of the Committee to intervene, as different views were being expressed.

Après avoir entendu l'Etat partie, la Délégation de la **Tunisie** se dit perplexe quant au retrait du bien et rappelle que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'est pas une donnée fixe mais, qu'au contraire, elle évolue dans le temps. Elle considère donc qu'il faudrait suspendre le jugement jusqu'à ce que la décision du tribunal administratif soit connue, et propose de différer toute décision sur l'éventuel retrait du bien à un futur proche.

The Delegation of **Egypt** concurred with many of the speakers that had taken the floor and recalled its special ties with Germany. It said that removing a property from the World Heritage List was not the best way to preserve the heritage values embedded in the property and suggested that the World Heritage Centre come up with ways of helping the State Party, for example by creating an international committee of experts that could agree on a proposal to resolve the issue.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that this was a painful issue. It stressed that at its 31st session the World Heritage Committee had recalled that it was its responsibility to make every possible effort to save a property. The four years of discussion and negotiation that had taken place had been important, including the attention paid to the Fifth Strategic Objective of the World Heritage Convention, which was a concern for communities. However, the Delegation of Israel felt that a point of no return had been reached. The State Party had been sufficiently consulted on the matter, and now a Decision had to be taken. The Delegation was therefore in favour of deletion, understanding that this was a precondition for considering a possible new nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** concurred with previous speakers on the fact that the issue at hand was not an easy one. It understood the difficult situation that the State Party and the local authorities of Dresden were in, and it regretted having to support the proposed Draft Decision. However, it considered the construction of the bridge to be incompatible with the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Noting that the credibility of the World Heritage Committee was at stake, the Delegation suggested, as other previous speakers had done, that perhaps a new and different nomination could be considered in the future.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that the task of the World Heritage Committee was to protect heritage without hampering development, and it wondered if an alternative solution to deletion could be found, including the proposed tunnel.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stressed that Cultural Landscapes were places for people, and that they must accommodate their needs. Warning against the possible repercussions of the proposed Draft Decision if it were to be adopted, it suggested that an alternative solution should be found. This might include the exclusion of a portion of the site from the property, or even the inclusion of the bridge as an example of contemporary architecture. The Delegation was not in favour of deleting the property from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Australia** was not opposed in principle to delisting, but it was very uncomfortable with the proposed Draft Decision. Bearing in mind the discussion of the World Heritage Committee regarding the site of Garamba, the Delegation sought clarification from ICOMOS on whether the loss of the landscape element would imply the complete loss of the site's Outstanding Universal Value. The property had in fact been inscribed under four different criteria, and perhaps some of these were still justifiable.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the complete Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger were available in Document WHC-09/33.COM/INF.7A, and that these referred to the criteria of inscription for the property.

In response to the request from the Delegation of Australia, **ICOMOS** stated that the landscape and its visual integrity was a crucial attribute underpinning all of the four criteria used for this property, and that indeed it was mentioned in their justification.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked all the previous speakers for their thoughtful comments. The Delegation considered that the possible deletion of this property from the World Heritage List would constitute a watershed moment in the history of the Convention. Never before had a property been deleted on the volition of the World Heritage Committee, since in the case of the Arabian Oryx of Oman in 2007, it had been the State Party itself that had proposed the deletion. Having said that, the Delegation considered that the World Heritage Committee could not be accused of taking the Decision in haste. Discussion had taken place over four years, and the State Party did not appear to be willing to seek a compromise. The credibility of the World Heritage Committee was thus at stake. Was the Committee willing to make tough decisions that in the long term could strengthen the World Heritage Convention? The Delegation of the United States of America therefore supported the Draft Decision, and it wanted to ask the State Party if it was considering a new nomination.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed postponing discussion of the removal of the property from the World Heritage List to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee, and it did not support the proposed deletion.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Delegation of Brazil propose an amendment if it wished to do so.

In acknowledging the complexity of the issue under discussion, the Delegation of **Spain** recalled that the construction of a tunnel was not a viable alternative solution, since it would have greater environmental impact. It also recalled that the Committee had had the opportunity to debate the issue from its 30th session in 2006 onwards, and that the Committee was therefore now in a full position to deliberate.

The **Chairperson**, proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted. She then introduced the four new paragraphs proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked that these paragraphs be considered together, so that the Members of the Committee could understand their general meaning.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked the Rapporteur to read out the proposed amendments one by one.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked that the new paragraphs be read out and discussed one by one.

The **Rapporteur** read out the four new paragraphs 4 to 7, as well as the rest of the Draft Decision, including a new paragraph 10 proposed by the Delegation of Barbados that suggested that the State Party might envisage a new nomination in the future.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked that the words “to postpone the deletion to next year” be added to the end of the new paragraph 10 proposed by the Delegation of Barbados.

Noting that this addition contradicted current paragraph 9, which proposed the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the Delegation of Canada elaborate on the rationale behind its proposed amendment, and in particular where the wording used came from.

The Delegation of **Canada** explained that its text was taken from the Decision made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in Christchurch in 2007, which concerned the deletion of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, referring to the new paragraph 10, proposed replacing the word “could” (in “a new nomination could be envisaged”) with “should”.

The **Chairperson** noted that it was up to the State Party to decide whether it wished to submit a new nomination, and asked the Delegation of Nigeria if it would accept the word “could” in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** agreed.

The **Chairperson**, noting that currently paragraphs 9 and 10 were contradictory, asked the Committee if it now wished to consider the four paragraphs proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Israel** wondered if the Committee could not start by looking at the last two paragraphs, since this would make consideration of the rest of the Draft Decision easier, and it asked that the possible procedures for a vote be clarified by the Secretariat.

In his response, the UNESCO **Legal Adviser** started by suggesting that the addition proposed by the Delegation of Egypt to the paragraph proposed by the Delegation of Barbados be made a new paragraph 11 in order to make the process easier. He then clarified that if the Committee wanted to proceed to a vote, the Chairperson had the responsibility of deciding which proposed amendment was the farthest removed from the original text and that she start with voting on that one. The Legal Adviser suggested that the new paragraph 11 proposed by the Delegation of Egypt be considered the “farthest removed” from the original Decision, since it proposed not deleting the property. After voting on this paragraph, and based on the outcome, the Committee could then proceed to vote on all the other amendments and finally on the original Draft Decision as a whole.

The **Chairperson** noted that if the Committee had wished to proceed to a vote, this should have been concerning paragraph 11 as proposed by the Delegation of Egypt first.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered if the intention of the Delegation of Egypt was to postpone deletion, or to postpone consideration of the question to next year.

The Delegation of **Egypt** clarified that its proposed text did not mean delisting the property at the present session, but rather meant giving the State Party more time to consider other options, with the support of a group of international experts convened by the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the words “postponing the decision to delete” were acceptable to the Delegation of Egypt, which agreed and requested that the Legal Adviser explain to Members of the Committee the procedures for a vote in this case.

The **Legal Adviser** explained that there were two possible ways of proceeding. One option was to apply Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee and adjourn the debate on this issue. In that case, no decision on substance would be taken, only a procedural decision. Another possibility, as the Delegation of Egypt had proposed, would be to introduce an amendment to the Draft Decision proposing to postpone consideration of the delisting of this property to the next session of the Committee. In this case, the Committee would have to proceed to a vote on the amendment. In this case, the Legal Adviser suggested that the amendment could be considered as being of a procedural character, in which case a simple majority would be sufficient. The Legal Adviser also read out Rule 25, concerning procedures for voting on amendments.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked the Chairperson whether a decision to proceed to a vote had been taken. With regard to the proposal by the Delegation of Egypt, it wondered if the paragraph could not have been rephrased using the standard wording for such cases, which was “the Committee decides to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, affirming that there was no issue concerning this property, stated that it agreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Canada.

In view of this statement, the **Chairperson** requested that the Delegation of Egypt read out the exact wording of its proposal.

While waiting for Egypt to redraft its proposal, the **Chairperson** suggested that the session be suspended for ten minutes in order that all questions concerning procedures for a possible vote could be clarified by the Legal Adviser.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the possible rejection of the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt would automatically imply the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** assured the Delegation of Kenya that this question would be answered after the break.

The session was suspended.

The **Chairperson** resumed the session. She introduced the newly drafted proposal presented by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil and explained to the Members of the Committee that she did not feel that the question raised in the amendment was a simple procedural matter, since the deletion of a property from the World Heritage List was at stake. Therefore, the Chairperson considered that if a vote were to take place on this amendment, a two-thirds majority should apply.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the view of the Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked the Legal Adviser to clarify how a vote should be called for and whether this had been done.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the question of the type of majority required should be dealt with first, after which all the clarifications requested would be provided.

The Delegation of **Cuba** recalled that the issue under discussion referred to a procedural matter and therefore required a two-thirds majority vote.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the vote was on the proposed amendment submitted by the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that the situation was not clear. If the Committee, through a vote, did not agree on the amendment proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil or on the deletion, would it have to go back to reconsidering paragraphs that it had previously decided to eliminate?

The **Legal Adviser** clarified that the draft amendment proposing to “adjourn the decision” (quoting from the most recent amendments proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil) was the farthest removed from the original Draft Decision. It was the amendment that the Committee would have to vote on first. If the Committee did not approve this amendment, then it should proceed to considering all other amendments, starting by the farthest removed from the original Decision. As for the nature of the question (whether or not it was a matter covered by the Convention requiring a two-thirds majority), this was for the Committee to decide, according to Rule 38 of its Rules of Procedure.

The **Chairperson** asked the Members of the Committee if they considered the issue a matter covered by the Convention.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that in its opinion the issue at hand was indeed a matter covered by the Convention.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked whether the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt had been modified during the break, since there seemed to be a new text on the screen. What was the meaning of the new draft?

The **Chairperson** confirmed that a new revised amendment (a new paragraph 11) had been jointly prepared during the break by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil, and she asked the Delegation of Egypt to address the question from the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that its intention was to postpone the Decision on delisting for one year.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting that the new amendment proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil included a reference to the “legal implications” of the possible Decision to delist that was under consideration by the Committee, asked for clarification about these implications.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Egypt if it could agree to divide its proposed amendment into two, with the second part (new paragraph 12) containing simply the

proposal to postpone the Decision to delete the property from the World Heritage List. If this was acceptable, the Committee could then proceed to a vote on this last paragraph since it was the farthest removed from the original proposal.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed to this suggestion.

The Delegation of **Jordan** asked that the Delegation of Egypt clarify the purpose of adjourning the Decision to delete the property from the World Heritage List for another year.

The Delegation of **Egypt** explained that the purpose of adjourning the Decision to delete the property from the World Heritage List for another year was to give time to the World Heritage Centre to organize an international expert meeting to discuss ways of solving the problem.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked that before proceeding to a vote the full sequence of the original and amended paragraphs of the Draft Decision be scrolled through once again on the screen.

The **Chairperson** went through the Draft Decision once again and explained why the proposal was to proceed to a vote on the last paragraph, i.e. 12.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated its question regarding the “legal implications” of a possible Decision to remove the property from the World Heritage List and the “consultations with ICOMOS” referred to in the paragraph proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil (now 11). Information on these two points was essential to being able to vote on the last paragraph 12, which proposed a postponement of the Decision, it said.

Asked to give his view, the **Legal Adviser** noted that the question was not clear, and that he could not interpret the intentions of the proponents of an amendment.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that there was no need for further clarifications since everything had already been said. What the Delegation wanted was to postpone the Decision to delete the property from the World Heritage List. It could see no contradiction within the proposed amendments submitted, as reflected in paragraphs 11 and 12.

The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to a vote on paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, not feeling comfortable with a reference to legal implications whose meaning had not been explained, proposed to delete the current paragraph 11.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed to this proposal for the sake of time management.

The **Chairperson** requested that the Legal Adviser explain to the Committee the rules that applied to the procedure for voting. She reminded the Members of the Committee that the vote was on paragraph 12 and that a majority of two-thirds would be needed since the issue was considered a matter covered by the Convention.

The **Legal Adviser** read out the rules for voting from the Rules of Procedure of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked that voting be done by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Cuba** also supported voting by secret ballot.

The **Secretariat** recalled the procedure for voting, including the need for two tellers, and suggested that two persons from two different Delegations of States Parties that were Members of the Committee volunteer to act as tellers during the voting.

Following consultations, the **Chairperson** asked one person from the Delegation of Egypt and one person from the Delegation of the Republic of Korea to act as tellers. The Chairperson then announced a break for lunch, during which the ballot papers would be prepared by the Secretariat so that voting could take place immediately after the resumption of the session at 15:30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 2.00 pm

THIRD DAY – THURSDAY, 25 JUNE 2009

SIXTH MEETING

3.30 p.m. – 8.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (Continuation)

Ballots were distributed.

The representatives of the Delegations of **Korea** and **Egypt** were called to the podium as tellers for the vote.

The **Chairperson** asked to proceed with the voting. She explained that only 21 ballots would be distributed and reminded the Committee that a two-thirds majority was needed to adopt the Decision. She recalled that the voting concerned the amendment proposed by the Delegations of Egypt and Brazil, which would give the State Party an additional year and send a high-level expert mission to the site before the Committee considered the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List, i.e . ***“to adjourn the consideration of the subject until the forthcoming session of the Committee”***.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for clarification on the mark to be made on the ballots.

The **Chairperson** asked the UNESCO Legal Advisor for a ruling on a cross.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that any form of cross or sign was acceptable as long as it was understandable.

The **Chairperson** started with the voting and asked the Secretariat to call Members of the Committee in alphabetical order.

The **Secretariat** called for voting the representatives of all members of the Committee. He then announced that the casting of votes was complete and asked for the votes to be brought to the podium for counting, inviting the tellers from Korea and Egypt to count them.

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the voting: eight votes in favour of the amendment and 13 against. She announced that the amendment had not been adopted.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 of the draft Decision were adopted. She indicated that paragraphs 4 to 7 were subject to an amendment by Canada and that they could not have been adopted earlier, as they were linked to the Decision on paragraphs 8 to 10, themselves related to the voting and the possible deletion of the site.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the Delegations of Barbados and Australia to clarify whether their amendments to paragraphs 9 and 10 were meant to be part of a “package deal”, or if they could be changed if paragraph 9 was not adopted by a two-thirds majority.

The Delegation of **Barbados** replied that its amendment was related to the conclusion of paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** asked the UNESCO Legal Advisor to answer the question raised by Israel: if a decision on paragraph 9 was not taken, what was the way forward?

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that the Committee had chosen to vote without debate. Since the vote had not been conclusive, the way forward was to engage in debate on deletion. If there was no conclusive decision in favour of deletion, the result would be to maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if that was agreeable to the State Party, arguing that its intervention would help give time for discussion.

The **Chairperson** asked the UNESCO Legal Advisor if a State Party could intervene during discussion on a Draft Decision concerning one of its properties.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that the Delegation of Germany had not asked for the floor and therefore that the question had not been posed.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it only wanted a point of clarification.

The **Chairperson** said that in the light of the Legal Advisor’s response, she was not inclined to give the floor a second time to the State Party and asked to move on with the Decision. She asked the Committee Members if they concurred with her opinion, and having received no objection, she asked to proceed with voting on paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** proposed to vote by show of hands, reminding the Committee Members that voting on paragraph 9 was crucial and that a two-thirds majority was needed for its approval.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed a secret vote, supported by the Delegation of **Bahrain**.

The Delegation of **Korea** wondered what advantages a secret vote would have.

The **Chairperson** said it was purely a question of rules, and that if two Delegations had asked for a secret vote, the Committee had no option but to carry one out. She asked the Secretariat to display the text of the vote and suggested to the Delegations of Peru and Bahrain that they provide two tellers for counting the votes.

The **Secretariat** invited the two tellers to go up to the podium.

The **Chairperson** announced that the distribution of ballots was complete and read paragraph 9, which was the subject of the vote: “decides to delete the Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) from the World Heritage List”. She recalled the necessity of a two-thirds majority before the text could be adopted.

The **Secretariat** called for voting by the Members by Committee in alphabetical order. He then announced that the casting of the votes was complete and asked for the votes to be brought to the podium for counting.

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote: two blank votes, 14 votes in favour of the proposal and five votes against. She announced that the property had therefore been deleted from the List. She added that the Committee had reached a very difficult and sad decision and that the failure to preserve a World Heritage Site on the List was a collective failure. She added that all present shared in the pain of the State Party.

The **Chairperson** asked that the other paragraphs be looked at carefully, as they constituted the message that the Committee wanted to convey.

Paragraph 4 was adopted as per the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada, paragraph 5 was adopted without change, and paragraph 6 was adopted with an amendment by the Delegation of Australia that added “and conserve the Outstanding Universal Value” of the property, and another amendment by the Delegation of Israel that added “as inscribed,” prior to “Outstanding Universal Value”. Paragraph 7 of the Decision was adopted with an amendment by the Delegation of Canada, and paragraph 7 was adopted after deleting “and integrity”, as per the proposal from the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Spain** referred to the proposal by the Delegation of Barbados concerning the possibility of allowing the State Party to present a new nomination in the future, and it suggested that paragraphs 10 and 11 be moved up in the text of the Decision.

Given that paragraphs 10 and 11 were interrelated, the **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read out paragraph 11 as amended by the Delegation of Canada, which had added “and that the process for considering such a new nomination would be governed by the provisions of Section 3 of the Operational Guidelines”.

Paragraph 10 was adopted as amended by Barbados and Australia.

The **Chairperson** asked to re-examine paragraph 11, as proposed by Barbados and amended by Australia and Canada. The Delegation of **Israel** asked to add “a new” in front of “Statement of Outstanding Universal Value”, and the Delegation of **Bahrain** asked to replace the word “Statement” with “Justification,” before then withdrawing its proposal.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to replace the word “envisage” with “considered”, but the Delegation of **Barbados** rejected this proposal, arguing that “considered” would put pressure on the World Heritage Committee, and that following the deletion of the

property from the List, the State Party could move ahead with a new nomination. The Delegation of **Kenya** therefore decided to withdraw its amendment.

La Délégation du **Maroc** exprime sa peine à la prise d'une telle décision et rappelle qu'elle pourrait avoir de lourdes conséquences à l'avenir. Concernant le paragraphe de l'article 11, la Délégation souligne la formulation incertaine qui pourrait donner l'impression qu'il s'agit du retrait de l'Allemagne toute entière, au lieu du site de Dresde. Elle suggère de reformuler le paragraphe de façon plus élégante afin qu'il soit clair que seul le site de Dresde est concerné. En outre, elle suggère d'inclure un texte mentionnant que l'Etat partie pourrait proposer à l'avenir une nouvelle proposition d'inscription liée au patrimoine de Dresde.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members to propose a specific text following the intervention by the Delegation of Morocco, and she agreed that the Committee needed to take into consideration Germany's efforts to protect its heritage.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, in agreement with Morocco, proposed to add, "a new nomination of the Dresden Elbe Valley, based on...".

The Delegation of **Israel** asked that the wording be made less specific, in order to allow the State Party greater freedom in deciding which site to nominate.

The Delegation of **Kenya** disagreed and argued that the Committee needed the Decision to be specifically related to the deleted site and that it was not dictating to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Korea** proposed replacing the name of the "Dresden Elbe Valley" by "the property".

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed "a new nomination... related to the heritage of the Dresden Elbe Valley", and this option was accepted by **Kenya**.

The **Chairperson** announced that Morocco had submitted an amendment.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande que la proposition soit affichée sur l'écran, pour reformulation éventuelle.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read the French text and to prepare the translation into English

Le **Rapporteur** lit la proposition du Maroc : « considère qu'une nouvelle proposition d'inscription de la Vallée de l'Elbe à Dresde, qui justifie d'une Valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE) et d'une délimitation appropriée puisse être présentée par l'Etat partie ».

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to check the text.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** withdrew its request to replace the word "statement" by the word "justification".

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed merging the amendments proposed by Barbados and Morocco.

The **Chairperson** asked Barbados and Morocco to formulate a common proposal.

La Délégation du **Maroc** explique que la différence réside dans la référence à la Vallée de l'Elbe, à la proposition d'inscription liée à la vallée. Le reste est une question de style. La proposition du Maroc mentionne une nouvelle proposition d'inscription de la vallée, alors que la proposition de la Barbade parle de l'héritage de Dresde. La Délégation du Maroc propose également d'éviter de répéter trois fois le mot « nouvelle ».

The **Chairperson** asked Barbados if it accepted the proposal by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Jordan** suggested that the first sentence be rephrased as, “considers a new nomination for the property”, since the Dresden Elbe Valley had been affected by the construction of the bridge.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for clarification concerning the boundaries of the property should the bridge be removed.

The **Chairperson** asked if Kenya was in favour of “appropriate delimitation”, as suggested by Morocco.

La Délégation du **Maroc** explique que dans la proposition, elle a pris en considération le titre du bien tel qu'inscrit initialement dans le document, et que, par conséquent, le texte est clair. Si le Comité décide d'opter pour une nouvelle proposition d'inscription, il pourrait utiliser la formulation « patrimoine culturel de Dresde ».

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that the Dresden Elbe Valley was no longer on the World Heritage List, and it was therefore irrelevant to consider retrieving parts of it. Instead, it was important to know whether elements that had determined the site's Outstanding Universal Value still remained, adding that the Committee should not delete a property one day and then re-inscribe it the next. It invited the State Party to complete a review and analysis of the situation, and to consider new boundaries, criteria and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It also agreed with the amendment by the Delegation of Canada, as follows: “considers that a new nomination related to the heritage of the Dresden Elbe Valley based on new boundaries, new criteria and a new Statement of Outstanding Universal Value could be envisaged”.

The **Chairperson** supported the use of the words, “the heritage of the Dresden Elbe Valley”, in order to give the State Party the freedom to make future proposals, and she supported the amendment put forward by Morocco that would allow the State Party to decide on how to propose a new nomination. It asked Committee Members for their input.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked to keep the word “envisaged” instead of “considered”.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its support for the proposal and recalled that the Committee was discussing point 26 of the document on the State of Conservation of the site named the “Dresden Elbe Valley”.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported Australia’s proposal for “consider that a new nomination related to the heritage of the Dresden Elbe Valley which justifies Outstanding Universal Value and appropriate delimitation could be envisaged”, and the Delegation of **Morocco** agreed.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked to delete the words “new nomination” to avoid repetition, and the Delegation of **Kenya** agreed.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked to remove the words “with appropriate delimitation” and also “and that the process for considering such a nomination”.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that any new nomination would require a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and it suggested deleting the words, “which justifies Outstanding Universal Value”.

The **Chairperson** called for the Members of the Committee to resume their interventions.

The Delegation of **Jordan** agreed with Australia and suggested capitalising the “D” in Dresden.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested keeping the reference to Outstanding Universal Value, contrary to Australia’s suggestion. It argued that the loss of Outstanding Universal Value had been the reason why the property had been deleted, and **Australia** agreed.

The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 11: “considers that a new nomination related to the heritage of the Dresden Elbe Valley based on justified Outstanding Universal Value could be envisaged and be governed by the provisions of Section 3 of the Operational Guidelines”, and this was adopted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.26** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** said that in view of the importance of the matter and the difficulty of the case, she had accepted all the interventions. She expressed the sadness of the Committee at the situation that had led to its deleting the Site of the Dresden Elbe Valley from the World Heritage List.

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

The **Secretariat** briefly presented the current State of Conservation Report on the property. It mentioned that the State Party had reported on activities undertaken within the property, and substantial advances had been observed in clearing and arranging the industrial area. Advances had also been reported on preparatory work for drawing up a study to update the Management Plan for the site, and a contractor would be developing regulations for the buffer zone. The final report on the assessment of structural interventions on 19 buildings, as part of a Request for International Assistance, had been received by the World Heritage Centre, and this was now being revised by

ICOMOS, as requested by the Committee. Nineteen studies of structural consolidation proposals, typology of fabrics, and the progress of damage had been identified. The documentation included a comprehensive study of the historical and oral sources of the information, and a complete and accurate mapping of the property. The State Party had also reported advances in the security measures in place in the main buildings. Information regarding the project for a perimeter enclosure for the Humberstone and Santa Laura offices had also been received.

The **Secretariat** explained that a Reactive Monitoring Mission would be useful in providing the State Party with a technical assessment that could ensure the stability and long-term conservation of the property, once the analysis and diagnosis of damage and depredation has been finalized for the 19 most-affected buildings. The Mission would also be able to assess finalization of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the Desired State of Conservation report.

ICOMOS welcomed the progress made with the assessment of the property, but expressed its concern at the State of Conservation, particularly in the light of deficiencies highlighted by the State Party in regard to technical expertise and the required funding to address conservation issues comprehensively. It suggested that project proposals needed to be drawn up from the planning stages to implementation, in order to ensure a functioning management system that would address not only conservation concerns, but also the public use of the property and regulatory measures for the proposed buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Israel** enquired about the possible involvement of ICCROM in the capacity-building process.

The Delegation of **Cuba** informed the Committee that it had sent some amendments to the Draft Decision to the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Spain** subscribed to the amendments proposed by Cuba. It requested that the floor be given to **Chile**, so that it could explain when the assessment would be completed.

The Delegation of **Chile** (Observer) thanked Spain for the opportunity to take the floor and congratulated the Chairperson for her excellent work. It explained that a number of measures had been taken for the site, in particular its experimental closure and the setting up of security systems. It further explained that the assessment was in its final stages, and that it would be completed over the following few months. This would result in the formulation of a proposal for some minor changes to the boundaries of the site. It also informed the Committee that an agreement had been reached on urban planning and on the Management Plan for the site, and that the State Party was working on a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the context of the Mission. The State Party welcomed the Reactive Monitoring Mission suggested by the Committee in the Draft Decision and expressed its interest in finalizing the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value during the Mission, in coordination with Mission members. It furthermore clarified that a number of structures had been created for the site. The Delegation of Chile (Observer) stated that the Government of Chile was committed to ensuring that the work was done as fast as possible, and it requested the prompt removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICCROM expressed its interest in cooperating with the State Party in long-term capacity-building at the site.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Cuba** proposed the deletion of paragraph 3.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande au Secrétariat de clarifier la question des langues de soumission des rapports par les Etats parties.

The **Secretariat** explained that the Committee had decided to include paragraph 3 in cases where the State Party had not submitted a report in one of the working languages of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Spain** underlined the fact that each country should draft its Statement in its own language. The Statement should then be translated into one of the working languages of the Committee and not one of the languages of the Convention. It gave as an example the Spanish language, which was one of the languages of the Convention, but not a working language. It further suggested that in cases where a report had been submitted without translation, this should be mentioned. The Delegation supported the deletion of paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the deletion of paragraph 3 proposed by Cuba.

The **Chairperson noted the deletion of** paragraph 3, Paragraph 4 was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment to paragraph 5 by the Delegation of Cuba, which replaced the second part of the paragraph with “to finalize the assessment phase and to begin interventions in buildings at risk and to secure the required resources for effective implementation, to revise the Management Plan and to finalize the definition of regulatory measures for the buffer zone”.

Paragraph 5 was adopted with the amendment of Cuba.

Paragraphs 5b, 6 and 7 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment to paragraph 8 by the Delegation of Canada: “reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a proposal for a 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 34th session in 2010”.

Paragraph 8 was adopted with the amendment by Canada.

Paragraph 9 was adopted with amendments by Cuba, Israel, Kenya and Tunisia.

Paragraphs 10 and 11 were adopted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.28** was adopted as amended.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C366)

The **Secretariat** briefly presented the current State of Conservation of the property. It mentioned that the State Party had successfully undertaken actions to control illegal farming, the illegal occupation of archaeological areas in the buffer zone, and vehicle traffic along illegal routes. The Peruvian national and local authorities had developed actions aiming to update the map of the property and the buffer zone in the wake of international cooperation agreements. In the case of the buffer zone, the surface area would be extended to include archaeological areas not within the limits contained in the Management Plan. Various other actions had been successfully undertaken, including the installation of vegetation barriers; the continuous and systematic control of the water table; research and conservation projects for the walled complexes; the identification of the sequence of construction of different places; and the protection of particularly significant and vulnerable areas from rainfall by installing covering modules and then landscaping recovery.

Progress reported by the State Party included the implementation of the Management Plan. No official submission of minor boundary changes had been received. The Secretariat said that full implementation, in the light of new pressures from tourism, necessitated that a strategy for public use and visitor management be included in the Management Plan, as had previously been requested by the Committee. Moreover, a Desired State of Conservation and a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be drawn up, and the Emergency and Risk Preparedness Plan should be finalized.

The Delegation of **Israel** questioned the Secretariat about the connection between the report received on 3 February 2009, which detailed corrective measures taken in meeting the timeframe for taking the property off the List of World Heritage in Danger, and paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** said that detailed information had been provided by the State Party, outlined in the State of Conservation Report, and that this concerned two issues: the continued implementation of the Management Plan, and the site's legal protection and the revision of the pending law.

The Delegation of **Peru** took the floor to clarify that Peru had submitted a State of Conservation Report in January 2009, including a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It further stressed that Peru had complied with the recommendations of the Committee. Therefore, it requested that paragraphs 4 and 7 be modified. With regard to paragraph 6, it said that Peru was in the final phase of modifying Law 2861 concerning smallholders on state-owned land. At the end of this process, the relevant recommendation of the Committee would be met. It stated that Peru was continuing efforts to meet the Committee's recommendations, and that in particular progress had been made to protect the property through the establishment of a buffer zone and the drawing up of zoning regulations. Peru was also implementing conservation projects within the framework of the Master Plan for Chan Chan, including the earmarking of some 3 million USD for activities to be detailed in the next report. Finally, the Delegation added that disaster-protection measures were continuing, in order to prevent a drop in the water table and to counter rainfall, in particular through the construction of drains and the installation of roofs over tourist spot signs.

The Delegation of **Kenya** questioned the State Party's being given permission to intervene directly on a matter related to a site in Peru. Had this been in line with the Rules of Procedure? It also requested that an amendment be made to paragraph 3, adding the words "and appreciation".

The **Vice-Chairperson** clarified that State Parties on the Committee seeking to speak on properties in their own countries considered for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger must seek the floor as Observers and make a two-minute intervention.

The Delegation of **Cuba** requested that further details be provided to the Committee by the Secretariat and ICOMOS regarding the development of the situation, particularly with regard to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** reiterated the comments of the State Party with reference to paragraph 4 and the revision of the relevant law, and it enquired if the request for information by the Delegation of Cuba was in connection with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Cuba** clarified that it had enquired about the Desired State of Conservation of the property.

The **Secretariat** explained that up-to-date information was still needed from the State Party concerning the Risk and Emergency Preparedness Plan and the definitive delimitation of the buffer zone, as well as regarding the pending law.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

Paragraph 3 was adopted with the amendment by Kenya.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested an amendment to paragraph 4: "takes note that the State Party has developed a proposal ...and urges the State Party to complete its review in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies".

Paragraph 4 was adopted with the amendment by Israel.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 were adopted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose de reformuler "quant à la pleine application" en "quant à l'application pleine et stricte".

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification on the wording proposed by Morocco.

The **Secretariat** explained that pending Law 2861 was needed for improved regulation and for the implementation of the Management Plan.

The **Rapporteur** underlined the disparity between the words "implementation" and "enforcement" and proposed the word "enforcement".

The Delegations of **Kenya** and **Morocco** agreed to the proposed amendment.

La Délégation de Tunisie propose une reformulation de la traduction française du paragraphe 7.

The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment to paragraph 7 by Tunisia. Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended by Tunisia, as were paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

The Delegation of **Kenya** highlighted that there could be confusion if State Parties sent information directly to the Centre and / or the Advisory Bodies.

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to ensure consistency between the French and English texts.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.29** was adopted as amended.

After the adoption of the whole Decision, **Peru** stated for the record that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been submitted to the Centre.

Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (C658)

The **Secretariat** briefly presented the current State of Conservation of the property. It mentioned that the State Party had not submitted a State of Conservation Report or additional information regarding the condition of the property. The Secretariat recalled that the Committee had requested the State Party officially to approve an integral plan to set up a management structure to manage the property as one entity, implementing financing systems for interventions to ensure the structural consolidation of the most-damaged protected buildings and to complete an integrated drainage system. –As the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS had expressed concern about the fact that no report had been submitted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.30** was adopted as amended.

Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C724 bis)

The **Chairperson** requested Committee Members to adopt the text without debate and to adjourn the item until the next session.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.27** was adopted.

AFRICA

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C144)

Le **Secrétariat** présente brièvement l'état de conservation actuel du bien. Il explique qu'au moment de la rédaction du document de travail pour le Comité, l'Etat partie n'avait toujours pas soumis le rapport qui lui avait été demandé à la 32e session. Ce rapport avait été finalement reçu le 19 avril 2009. Entre-temps, la mission de suivi réactif demandée par le Comité lors de la 32e session, s'est déroulée du 2 au 9 mars 2009. D'après les constatations de celle-ci, l'état de conservation des monuments s'est améliorée grâce à la poursuite du travail de consolidation des structures à Msongo Mnara et Kilwa Kisiwani. La communauté locale est désormais officiellement impliquée suite à la création d'un Comité sur les ruines. Le plan de gestion est désormais considéré comme un document directeur d'actions ciblées. Il existe un impact visible de l'aide qui a jusqu'à ce jour été accordée par les donateurs internationaux. Le tourisme s'est également développé avec une augmentation du nombre de visiteurs, ce qui offre des possibilités d'opérations durables pour le bien.

La mission a également établi des recommandations sur les points suivants :

- (i) Finaliser le projet de déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle : Cette recommandation a été remplie par l'Etat partie le 11 juin 2009.
- (ii) Sur la délimitation du bien et de la zone tampon, la mission a recommandé que celle-ci soit finalisée et qu'un relevé cartographique complet soit effectué.
- (iii) Sur la conservation des monuments, et après avoir noté que près de 25% des structures monumentales avaient été stabilisées avec succès, la mission a estimé que le but de 70% des structures demandées par le Comité semble réalisable.

Enfin, le Centre a reçu le 15 juin 2009, une lettre de l'Etat partie l'informant de l'organisation d'un atelier, du 15 au 17 juillet 2009, visant à élaborer une stratégie claire visant au retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. L'atelier est financé par le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain.

ICOMOS explained that the property was very extensive, and that it suffered from complex problems combining coastal erosion with the structural instability of the major monuments, encroachment, and a lack of adequate resources. It acknowledged the considerable progress that had been made, but highlighted the need to bring various initiatives together and to establish a clear overall rationale for the management of the property. It recalled that within the Desired State of Conservation, the Committee had requested a structured approach to the long-term conservation of the property, as well as for urgent action to be taken to address immediate threats. ICOMOS welcomed the workshop proposed by the African World Heritage Fund as a way of focusing on an overall strategy that could prioritize resources, and expressed its readiness to support this initiative.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged the complications associated with the conservation of the property and the work carried out by the State Party and Advisory

Bodies. It requested that the State Party make a statement on its conservation activities and justify the proposed extension in relation to the site's Outstanding Universal Value. It proposed an amendment to the Decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Tanzania** accepted the report of the monitoring mission of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS and said that it regretted the delay in submitting the State of Conservation Report. It recognized the major challenges and that climate change was impacting negatively to solve the problem. It added that it would appeal to the World Heritage Centre for technical and financial assistance from the Centre, UNESCO and development partners in this case. The Delegation underlined the fact that looting had stopped following greater cooperation with the local population in the conservation activities, and it agreed to the recommendation for a mission to assist in the demarcation and definition of the monuments. It stressed that an extension was unrealistic and that this should be pursued later.

The Delegation of **Spain** stated that the Decision should include congratulations to the State Party for its efforts in preserving the property, and it informed the Committee that it had transmitted to the Secretariat an amendment to the Draft Decision.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

Paragraph 3 was adopted with the amendment by **Kenya**.

The Delegations of Cuba, Spain, Kenya, Israel and Bahrain made amendments and text modifications to paragraphs 4 and 5.

Paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 were adopted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A.14** adopted as amended.

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

Documents: *WHC-09/33.COM/7B;*
 WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add
 WHC-09/33.COM/7B.corr

Decisions: **33 COM 7B.1 to 33 COM 7B.147**

The **Chairperson** asked Committee Members to be concise in their interventions in order to get through the agenda. Time limits would be more strictly applied.

The Delegation of **Canada** shared positive news regarding the law passed by the Canadian parliament the previous week, which had approved the expansion of the Nahanni National Park, as requested by the Committee in Vilnius in 2006. The Park had been expanded to over 30,000 Km² (six times its present site), and the process was continuing with active community involvement.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to proceed with examination of Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B on natural sites.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the State of Conservation Reports had been analyzed as part of a consultation process between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. These included State of Conservation Reports demanded at the previous session of the Committee, those demanded at the time of inscription, those demanded as part of the Reactive Monitoring Mechanism, and those having to do with site inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Secretariat indicated that a document setting out trends had been prepared and that this had been distributed on 7 January 2009. The Secretariat briefly indicated the recommendations of this document, explaining that reflection on these trends was scheduled at the end of the agenda. It was explained that the Document under discussion included references to continuing work on climate change, and that projects in that area were currently under discussion, with a focus on climate-change mitigation and risk-preparedness programmes. The Secretariat mentioned two programmes, one regarding World Heritage Sites threatened by black carbon and the other on greenhouse-gas reduction. Regarding the State of Conservation process, the Secretariat said that a two-year cycle had been implemented at certain properties, in order to be able to review State of Conservation Reports from other properties that had not been assessed by the Committee, as well as to give a longer time for follow-up on Decisions.

The Delegation of **Sweden** thanked the Secretariat for the excellent summary and indicated that these were the types of documents that the Committee needed. The Delegation supported the analytical summary of the past five years and the suggestion to define different kinds of threats. It suggested using the resulting information for evaluation, Requests for International Assistance, and State of Conservation Reports. It also suggested that the Document be generally distributed. It noted with surprise the large number of State of Conservation Reports to be examined, especially those coming

to the Committee shortly after inscription. It indicated that most of the sites had been referred to the Committee because of management issues, a fact that in itself should be carefully examined. It requested that during the nomination file evaluation process and at the time of inscription, a larger emphasis on management issues be requested of States Parties in order to avoid future problems. One way of improving management could be the use of In-Danger Listing. On the other hand, delisting could be used to create a more dynamic and credible World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Centre for the report and welcomed the discussion to take place at the end of the session. It indicated that one important point to take into account in the Decisions would be consistency regarding the impacts of climate change.

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N506)

The **Secretariat** made a comment on the issue of climate change, explaining that there was a paragraph specifically on the issue of black carbon that could be applied to all the properties that suffered from it. The Secretariat briefly presented the State of Conservation Report for the site, indicating that there was no new information to be presented.

The Delegation of **Israel** indicated that this site was also flagged up in another document related to the Wadden Sea, but that this had also flagged up the issue of the East African Flyway, and that this offered a way of dealing with the management and cooperation issues between various States Parties proposed in the Draft Decision. The Delegation remarked that when referring to climate change, the Convention should refer to “adaptation” and not “mitigation”, especially for climate change affecting cultural and natural properties. It understood the amendment proposed in this sense.

The **Chairperson** started with the examination of the Draft Decision

The Delegation of **Barbados** indicated that it was not opposed to highlighting the critical issue of climate change, but it said that it was important to indicate a note of caution as this was also a Ramsar site.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted. Language issues were pointed out by **Sweden** in paragraph 5, which was adopted after the substitution of appropriate wording.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported Barbados and asked how the Committee would react, as this was an issue that could come back.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the fact that the Committee was asking Mauritania to assess adaptation measures in responding to climate change was unfair. It proposed adding that the State Party should do this with the assistance of the international community and then ask the international community to cooperate with Mauritania. Kenya proposed this as an amendment to paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested adding the words “other environmental phenomena” instead of “climate change” to paragraph 6.

Paragraph 6 was adopted, with the amendments from Kenya and Barbados. Paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 were adopted.

Israel and Kenya proposed amendments to Paragraph 11 reflecting the need to strengthen the cooperation of management and research activities with regard to conserving migratory species along the East Atlantic Flyway, and also requesting that the State Party, in conjunction with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, strengthen cooperation on management and research activities.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.11** was adopted as amended.

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N1167)

The **Secretariat** presented the site, which was proposed to be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A joint IUCN/WHC mission had been held in January 2009. The conclusions of the mission's report had pointed out that although the State Party had made improvements, the property continued to face serious threats. All three parts of the serial nomination contained areas that did not contain the values for which the property had been inscribed and these should be excluded. The mission did not recommend listing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, this proposal had been made by IUCN at the time of inscription and repeated in the 2006 and 2007 Reactive Monitoring Missions. A strong political response was urgently needed to control factors affecting the property.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** (Observer) responded to the Report indicating that it did not agree with the proposal to place the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It explained that efforts had been made and threats had been reduced. It indicated that at this moment, inclusion on the In-Danger List would create a negative perception among stakeholders and discourage people working on the conservation of the site. From a political point of view, such listing would not contribute to stopping or reversing the current tendencies. It asked for the support of the international community in implementing the Emergency Action Plan, repeating its commitment to implementing the recommendations of the latest mission and reviewing the Emergency Action Plan.

IUCN underlined the consensus that the property met the criteria for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested an update from the State Party on the actions undertaken and included in the Report.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** (Observer) explained that the country had taken several measures to control threats affecting the park. The development of an Emergency Action Plan had been initiated with the support of the Governments of Spain and Germany. The improvement of budgetary and human resources was another measure that had improved management. A presidential decree to crack down on illegal activity had been

approved by the Government, and this had halted illegal activities on the ground. Indonesia did not agree with the Decision to include the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and it requested the Committee not to inscribe the site on the In-Danger List.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** indicated that given the serious measures taken by the State Party and the cooperation with the Governments of Spain and Germany, it would ask the Advisory Body if these measures could be taken into consideration to avoid putting the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Spain** also expressed its concern at the proposed Decision, saying that it wondered if the inclusion of the property on the In-Danger List would have a positive impact. It pointed out that foundations were being laid at the property that would help to mitigate the danger and that local communities had become involved, both of which would be good starting points for future implementation.

The Delegation of **Sweden** indicated that since other Committee Decisions and three missions had already clearly demonstrated the fragile State of Conservation of the property, after its careful reading of the mission report it would support inscription on the In-Danger List.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** rappelle qu'il est important de ne pas négliger la volonté politique témoignée par l'Etat partie et demande aux Organisations consultatives de prendre en compte ce fait.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, en remerciant pour toutes les informations supplémentaires, exprime son soutien à l'intervention de l'Espagne et fait remarquer qu'il existe des contradictions entre les informations fournies par l'Etat partie et l'UICN.

IUCN responded by explaining that the World Heritage Centre had also received conservation reports from people living and working in the area that had reported on the fragile State of Conservation of the property. IUCN was talking about facts, not desires, and placing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be a positive way of achieving conservation objectives faster.

The Delegation of **Egypt** underlined its full support for the positions expressed by Spain and Morocco, with a view to encouraging the State Party in its future work.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked IUCN if there was a possibility that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be preserved with a change in boundaries. The Delegation also noted action initiated in the Philippines, neighbouring Indonesia, which had itself initiated the idea of placing properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It recalled that paragraph 189 of the Operational Guidelines gave the Committee the power to allocate a significant portion of the World Heritage Fund to financing actions intended to ameliorate sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation stated that this was not a Decision intended to censor a State Party. Instead, it was intended as a way in which the State Party could be supported in going forward. It thus urged the State Party to reconsider its position.

IUCN stated that the mission had concluded that there was still Outstanding Universal Value in the property, but that there was also encroachment that could not be reversed.

Regarding the border issue, it required proper assessment that could not presently be done.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed the additional information provided by the State Party. It suggested encouraging the State Party to continue with efforts to protect the site, rather than putting it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also suggested including a paragraph in the Decision indicating that a report on progress made should be presented to the next Committee meeting.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** se dit certaine que le rapport présenté par l'Organisation consultative est préoccupant mais rappelle qu'il faut tenir compte de la position de l'Etat partie et des efforts déployés. La Délégation est disposée à ce que le bien demeure une fierté nationale de l'Etat partie et à ne pas précipiter toute prise de décision, mais à lui accorder une année supplémentaire l'encourageant dans l'avancement de ses travaux.

The Delegation of **Korea** said it was prepared to take the State Party's intentions into account and that it concurred with the previous speaker.

The Delegation of **China** noticed that threats to the property were very serious, but that corrective measures had also been taken by the State Party, including the Emergency Action Plan. As a result, it agreed with Australia.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph-by-paragraph. Minor amendments to Paragraphs 3, 4 and 7 were proposed by Australia, China and Kenya. Paragraph 5 was deleted. A new Paragraph 13 was included.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.15** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the preparation of a revised timetable.

The meeting rose at 8 pm.

FOURTH DAY – FRIDAY, 26 JUNE 2009

SEVENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. - 2.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 5 REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

5A Reports of the World Heritage Centre

Documents: WHC-09/33.COM/5A
WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.1
WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.2
WHC-09/33.COM/INF.5A.3
WHC-09/33.COM/5B

Decision: **33 COM.5A**

The **Chairperson** opened the meeting and recalled that the examination of the Draft Decision 5A was still pending. She announced the agenda of the meeting and requested a review of paragraphs 10, which was adopted, 11, adopted, 12, adopted, and 13.

La Délégation du **Maroc** attire l'attention du Comité sur le fait que ce paragraphe (13) concernant l'état du site de Tadrart Acacus en Libye, ne reflète pas la nécessité de travailler en coopération de l'Etat partie pour identifier les causes ayant conduites à ces dommages et voir comment assurer la protection du site. Elle souhaite que la collaboration avec l'Etat partie soit reflétée dans le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification on paragraph 12.

The **Chairperson** noted that the numbering was subject to change and Paragraph 12, 13 and 14 were then adopted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** inquired whether the Centre would be requested to ensure that the Advisory Bodies had sufficient staff.

The **Chairperson** proposed deleting the word "staffing" and inserting the word "resources".

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it would support this in principle but noted that the amendment had originally been presented by another country.

The **Chairperson** stressed that this was an important issue and accepted the amendments.

The Delegation of **Kenya** insisted that staffing be adequate “to ensure adequate resources” and that there be sufficient staff for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 5A** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Chairperson** presented the timetable for the meeting and stated that the Committee would proceed with discussing inscriptions until 7 p.m., with a break from 7 to 8 p.m. She said that many representatives were in attendance and the original schedule needed to be respected. Technical support would be available. At 8 p.m. discussion on Item 7B would start.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether this meant that there was to be no sightseeing, for which the **Chairperson** apologized and noted that there could be other tours of Seville.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: *WHC-09/33.COM/8B*
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.8B1
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.8B1.Add
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.8B2
 WHC-09/33.COM/INF.8B3

Decisions: **33 COM 8B.1 to 33 COM 8B.53**

Name changes

The Chairperson opened discussion of Item 8B and referred to the relevant documents.

The Secretariat informed the Committee about a change to the name of the “Historical Monuments of Thatta” (Pakistan) to ***Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta***

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.1** was adopted.

Withdrawn nominations

There was a total of 12 withdrawn nominations, including two withdrawn before publication prior to the drawing up of the Working Document, and 10 withdrawn before to the session but still figuring in Document 8B. These were:

Nominations withdrawn at the request of the State Party (before publication of the Working Document):

- Cultural Landscape of Buenos Aires (Argentina);
- Sites of Christianity in the Galilee (Israel).

Nominations withdrawn at the request of the State Party (after publication of the Working Document):

- Tangible Spiritual Heritage of St. Euphrosyne of Polotsk (Belarus);
- Sites of Great Moravia: Slavonic Fortified Settlement at Mikulčice – Church of St. Margaret of Antioch at Kopčany (Czech Republic and Slovakia);
- Cultural Property of the Historic Town of Jajce (Bosnia and Herzegovina);
- Lonjsko Polje Nature Park – A Living Landscape and the Floodplain Ecosystem of the Central Sava Basin (Croatia);
- Italia Langobardorum. Places of Power and Worship (568-774 A.D.) (Italy);
- Lena Pillars Nature Park (Russian Federation);
- Schwetzingen – A Prince Elector’s Summer Residence – Garden Design and Freemasonic Allusions (Germany);
- Korean Cretaceous Dinosaur Coast (Republic of Korea);
- The Cultural Landscape of Orheiul Vechi (Republic of Moldova);
- Seruwila Mangala Raja Maha Viharaya (Extension of the Sacred City of Kandy) (Sri Lanka).

The Secretariat explained that the nomination of Pitons, Cirques and Remparts of Reunion Island (France) had been postponed to 2010, at the request of the State Party.

Factual error letters

The Secretariat noted that the following factual error letters had been received, and these were distributed:

- The Architectural and Urban Work of Le Corbusier (Argentina, Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, Switzerland);
- The Triple-Arch Gate at Dan (Israel);
- Royal Tombs of the Joseon Dynasty (Republic of Korea);
- Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal (United Kingdom).

It was also noted that other letters had been received that were not considered dealing with factual error letters and therefore these could not be distributed.

The **Chairperson** recalled the Rules of Procedure, specifically the paragraphs on advocacy, and underlined that clarifications could only be provided on specific points.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that Outstanding Universal Value might not have been clearly demonstrated for all properties. Sweden was not prepared to support nominations for which Outstanding Universal Value had not been clearly demonstrated

or documents only announced at the meeting. The Committee had agreed to comply with the Rules and Operational Guidelines, and “*ad hoc*” decisions could do serious damage to the credibility of the Committee. Some serial sites had been proposed for deferral, which demonstrated that clear guidance was required for States Parties.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

IUCN presented its working procedures, which included giving upstream advice to State Parties, employing clear processes, and maintaining a network of staff in regional offices in order to strengthen work with State Parties and guidance provided.

Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park
Id. N°	653 Bis
State Party	Philippines
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(ix)(x)

IUCN presented the extension to the property of the Tubbattaha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) and its new name, “Tubbattaha Reefs Natural Park”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the extension and commended the State Party.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party for having taken IUCN’s recommendations, made from 1993 onwards, into account and extending the property to 96,000 ha. It noted that illegal fishing was still an issue, and it requested clarification on this and the legal situation.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** (Observer) explained that the national agencies, the provincial government, the private sector, WWF Philippines and Conservation International had supported the extension and would ensure the site’s protection.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the property was also to be examined under the item on State of Conservation. The property was a remarkable reef of exceptional value, and it supported the extension.

The **Chairperson** noted an amendment proposed by Bahrain on sustainable tourism in paragraph 10.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.3** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** (Observer) made the following statement:

“The Philippines as a State Party to the World Heritage Convention continues to uphold its commitment to the safeguarding and conservation of the Tubattaha Reef Natural Park. In extending this property to expand its territorial boundaries from 32,200ha. to the present 96,828ha., the Philippines is most appreciative of the World Heritage Committee’s efforts for inscribing this outstanding Natural Heritage [property], thereby extending invaluable support and assistance in safeguarding its truly Outstanding Universal Values. Thank you.”

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

New Nominations

Property	The Wadden Sea
Id. N°	1314
State Party	Germany / Netherlands
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)(ix)(x)

IUCN presented the nomination and noted that this was one of the largest tidal ecosystems in the world and that it had international importance as a wintering site for birds. Six million birds could appear at any one time on the African Eurasian Flyways. The property had adequate protection status, although threats could also be noted. International cooperation could also be strengthened for the East Atlantic Flyways.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the States Parties for this trans-boundary site and emphasised the issue of the flyways. It asked that the comments on the East African Flyways be noted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that these were important flyways, and that numerous sites were also being prepared in the Rift Valley. It encouraged extension and congratulated the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that Denmark should join in the future and requested clarification about endangered fish species. Sediment movement could be very active in this area. It inquired as to whether there were hydrological movements and sedimentation processes in the area. Finally, the issue of invasive species would require clarification, and it submitted an amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that this nomination had required years of preparation and that it was an excellent example of international and institutional cooperation. It encouraged Denmark to join the nomination in the future.

IUCN answered that the flyway connections were evident and that an increased level of supervision of fisheries would be required. Information was provided about changes in this dynamic system over time. Concerning invasive species, a particular threat came from port activities.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **The Netherlands** (Observers) noted that since they shared so much they would also share the two minutes allocated and gave the floor to the Secretary of the Wadden Sea. The **Secretariat** noted that sediment management was well controlled and that sediment remained in the system. Concerns about invasive species had existed for a number of years, and there were efficient mechanisms in place to control them. No new species had been introduced, and the IMO Framework had been used to ensure balanced water management.

The **Chairperson** said that there seemed to be a consensus, and she asked whether further interventions were required.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** indique que cette problématique est intéressante pour l'Afrique dans le cas des sites d'importance pour les oiseaux migrateurs. Cet exemple de réussite de collaboration entre plusieurs pays est intéressant et un partage d'expériences pour guider de futures propositions devrait être établi.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** conseille l'utilisation du mot « déclaration » plutôt que « attestation ».

The **Chairperson** noted that this only concerned the French version of Paragraph 3. Paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted, and she moved to the amendment of paragraph 5bis, made by Bahrain, inserting an additional paragraph starting with "Acknowledged...".

IUCN noted that "ballistic" waters do not exist. It should be "ballast" waters.

The Delegation of **Israel** introduced into paragraph 6 the phrase, "in the East Atlantic and African Eurasian Flyways particularly with the State Party of Kenya....", and encouraged twinning between sites.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from IUCN, supported by the Delegation of **Bahrain**, which requested the use of the original language.

This was supported by the Delegation of **Egypt**, which requested that the text not be modified.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested amendment and said that there was no need to be specific about sites such as Lake Turkana.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the words, "on the Africa Eurasian Flyways particularly with States Parties of"

The **Chairperson** noted that the States Parties of Spain, Senegal and Mauritania were still mentioned in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that things had become confused and asked that they be restored to their original state.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its disapproval but said it would agree to a compromise on the words, “research with States Parties on the African Eurasian Flyways”.

The **Chairperson** asked whether or not this was agreeable.

The Delegation of **Egypt** again supported Bahrain, requesting that its intervention be taken into consideration. It also wanted to listen to the opinion of IUCN with regard to additions or deletions to the Decision.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that the text was much improved, and the Chairperson concluded by saying that it was now acceptable.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite obtenir l’avis de l’UICN.

La Délégation du **Maroc** rappelle que la formulation initiale faisait référence à la route Est atlantique qui se trouve dans la continuité du site proposé. Si on veut faire référence à d’autres routes il faut mentionner d’autres pays, mais la proposition initiale était bonne.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from IUCN.

IUCN noted that the East Atlantic Flyway was part of the broader Flyway and that the concept of linking World Heritage Sites was an important one.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.4** was adopted as amended.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **The Netherlands** (Observers) made the following joint statement:

"Dear Madam Chair, honoured members of the Committee,

On behalf of the States Parties of the Netherlands and Germany, I would like to express our gratitude to the Committee for inscribing the Wadden Sea on the World Heritage List. We are proud to be part of the global community of World Heritage Sites. At the same time, we are aware of the responsibility that is placed upon us to protect and sustainably manage its Outstanding Universal Values, now and for generations to come.

We would also like to express our gratitude to IUCN for its critical but always constructive dialogue and professionalism throughout the evaluation.

By the decision to include the Wadden Sea on the List, a long and exciting journey ends. While travelling we have gained many companions. It is because of the passion of people from all walks of life that we have finally reached our goal.

We will now start on a new and no less exciting journey, with your invaluable backing and support, to maintain and enhance the values of the area and to address new challenges, and to share our travel experiences with you.

Walking across the Wadden Sea tidal flats, where just a few hours before it was covered by metres of water, surrounded by an endless sky that meets the sea in a distant horizon, is an unforgettable experience. It is a truly magical place – come and enjoy with us a life-changing experience of nature.

Madam Chair, distinguished Committee, Colleagues, welcome to the Wadden Sea World Heritage".

Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	The Dolomites
Id. N°	1237 Rev
State Party	Italy
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)

IUCN noted that the Wadden Sea was the 200th Natural Site inscribed on the World Heritage List and then presented the nomination of the Dolomites.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for the timescale of the Management Plan.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated Italy for the nomination and stressed that the site had Outstanding Universal Value. It also noted that there were requirements for management and asked for clarification.

The Delegation of **Italy** (Observer) noted that site management, presentation and interpretation were in place, and further information had been provided on 28 February 2009. The regional and provincial authorities had provided budgets for the Site and the new foundation, which was already operational. The implementation of the Plan would be reported to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN according to the timetable.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the State Party but noted that there was intensive tourism at the site. It asked whether tourism management was covered, and it emphasized sustainability.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** believed that this was an important site relating to a unique natural phenomenon in Europe, and it echoed concerns about tourism. It queried that nine of the mountains had been selected out of 20, and it asked whether there were plans in place for future extensions.

IUCN noted that the previous series had been postponed. The present series made up a coherent group and would not require extension.

The Delegation of **Italy** (Observer) noted that the explanation had been given by IUCN in its comment on the series. Concerning tourism, the local authorities had decided on a common management system, and the Delegation pointed out that both national and regional laws protected the core and buffer zones of the Site and included restrictions as part of an integrated tourism-management strategy.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** rappelle que le terme "attestation" devrait être remplacé par "déclaration".

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.6** was adopted as amended.

The Italian Minister for the Environment made the following statement:

"Mrs. Chairperson, Mr. Director of the World Heritage Centre, Dear Delegates,

I am really glad to take the floor on behalf of the Italian Government after the Decision adopted by the Committee to inscribe the Dolomites on the World Heritage List.

The recognition of the second natural site for Italy follows the invitation formulated by this Committee to increase the number of natural sites on the List and it is, moreover, the result of a long path started in 2004 to give the right relief to a unique territory in the Alpine framework – it is one of the most suggestive mountain chains in the whole world. The wonderful Dolomitic landscape with its outstanding geological and geo-morphological values represents, actually, a natural context universally known and particularly appreciated by any mountain lover.

For these reasons, today's UNESCO recognition entails a great sense of pride and satisfaction for the Dolomitic community, which has preserved for generations, and continues to preserve, this fascinating coralline archipelago of the Triassic Age as a distinguishing sign of its own identity.

On this topic I wish to express the appreciation of the Italian authorities for the precious assistance and scientific job provided by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, which made possible the creation of a management model able to bring Regions, Provinces, parks and natural reserves, NGOs and stakeholders toward a unique pattern whose protection of universal values it today declared has the priority on administrative divisions.

Furthermore, I want to underline the fundamental contribution given by the "UNESCO system" to the conservation of the ecosystems and the main issues of the global environmental agenda. The recognition of protected areas and preservation policies promoted through the Convention of 1972 offer concrete examples of the sustainable use of natural resources, as urged in the Charter of Syracuse last April.

UNESCO gives us an incomparable source of best practices and models that aim to conciliate and match development instances with environmental protection issues. Italy supports this process and encourages, like in the case of Dolomites, excellence in land management, with financial means addressed to UNESCO national sites and the promotion of cooperation activities abroad.

I want to finish by thanking you, Mrs. President, for allowing me to take the floor, as well as the representatives of State Parties of the Committee, all delegates for their attention, the Spanish Authorities for the admirable event organization and the magnificent city of Seville for its generous sense of hospitality."

MIXED PROPERTIES

ASIA / PACIFIC

New Nominations

Property	Mount Wutai
Id. N°	1279
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)(viii) + CL

IUCN explained that the Site had been nominated as a mixed serial property. It suggested that natural criterion (viii) was appropriate for inscription, given the earth-science value of the property. The area included geographical, stratigraphic and landform examples of national importance. Comparative analysis had shown that these features were important at national and regional levels, but that they were typical of green-stone terrains and could not be compared to terrains worldwide. The boundaries of the Site, as put forward in the nomination file, had been considered primarily in relation to cultural values and not natural ones. IUCN believed that the Site did not meet the natural criteria for it to be inscribed under the mixed category, and recommended that the Committee not inscribe the Site under natural criteria.

ICOMOS presented a cultural evaluation of the Site, arguing that it should be considered as a Cultural Landscape. The Site's five flat peaks constituted one of the four sacred mountain groups in China and attracted numbers of pilgrims. The Site contained an ensemble of 53 monasteries, which had extensive ancient libraries. The construction techniques used in the monasteries, together with their artworks, made them unique. The landscape should be seen as part of the overall value of the property, being a religious and cultural landscape.

Only one concern regarding protection was raised during the delivery of the Report, and this regarded the legal protection of the property. The State Party had indicated in a letter to the World Heritage Centre that due to translation problems, the original document had been misunderstood and no legal framework for the protection of the site existed. ICOMOS considered that the Site met cultural criteria for inscription as a Cultural Landscape.

The Delegation of **Kenya** was happy with this conclusion, and it considered that the Site met criteria for inscription as a Cultural Landscape, as well as requirements for inscription based on the rectified information given by China. Kenya would recommend inscription based on the new information received from the State Party. The Delegation of Kenya asked the State Party if it wanted to inscribe the Site as a Cultural Landscape and if it considered the ICOMOS decision to be the correct one.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party on the nomination. The Delegation appreciated the amendments by ICOMOS and its preparation of a revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** recommended the inscription of the Site as ICOMOS had suggested and congratulated China for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its support for the inscription of Mount Wutai according to cultural criteria and congratulated the State Party on the nomination.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked ICOMOS to clarify whether the file was complete in order for inscription to take place.

ICOMOS responded that the nomination file could be considered complete, given the missing translation and complementary information sent by the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** thanked those present for their support and accepted inscription of the Site as a Cultural Landscape.

La Délégation du **Maroc** exprime son soutien à l'inscription du Mont Wutai et fait remarquer qu'en cas d'inscription comme paysage culturel il faudrait envisager de changer le nom du site proposé.

ICOMOS indicated that the words “cultural landscape” did not appear in the title of other sites inscribed in this category and considered the suggested title acceptable.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the inscription of the property and asked that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value be re-drafted as a result of the new nomination category.

The **Chairperson** indicated that ICOMOS had prepared a Draft Decision after receiving the new information.

La Délégation de la **Jordanie** confirme, comme les Délégations du Kenya et Bahreïn, que le site mérite d'être inscrit comme bien culturel et que la Délégation félicite l'Etat partie.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.7** was adopted as amended

The Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude to the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, and all those who had helped with the nomination. The Delegation also expressed its sincere hope that the World Heritage could be properly preserved in the future, to allow all the world's peoples to understand past civilizations.

ICOMOS made a brief presentation on the evaluation of mixed and cultural sites, presenting figures, statistics and the procedures followed in analyzing nomination files.

The Delegation of **Israel** underscored the highly professional input that the Advisory Bodies provided. However, the Delegation indicated that more transparency in the process was needed and that currently there was a “cat-and-mouse situation” with the States Parties. It would be useful to clarify if information would be required after the first evaluation panel and if guidelines on criteria and attributes related to values. It also

asked ICOMOS if it would be possible to deal with comparative analysis before dealing with authenticity and integrity.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

New Nominations

Property	Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande
Id. N°	1310
State Party	Cape Verde
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** présente le site proposé ainsi que les résultats de l'évaluation et ses recommandations : le renvoi pour permettre à l'Etat partie de fournir les informations complémentaires demandées.

The Delegation of **Spain** thanked the Advisory Body for its very clear presentation. It commented on the referring of the Draft Decision, asking whether this would still adequately reflect the situation, or whether some requests had already been taken care of by the State Party. It stated that according to information it had received, work at the proposed site had significantly advanced. The Delegation suggested asking the State Party for confirmation and further explanation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the efforts made by the State Party, which had used all possible resources to finalize the nomination. The Delegation was committed to not supporting sites from the continent that did not meet the criterion of Outstanding Universal Value, yet this Site met the criteria for inclusion on the World Heritage List. Kenya agreed with Spain that the State Party should be asked to inform the Committee about the issues raised.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** s'exprime également dans le sens de l'Espagne, soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un site important reflétant le mémoire de la traite atlantique et dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle a été démontrée par l'ICOMOS. La Délégation rappelle que l'Etat partie a pris les mesures nécessaires pour la sauvegarde du site et que toutes les conditions sont donc remplies pour l'inscrire.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'Etat partie pour la proposition d'inscription du site et l'ICOMOS pour l'évaluation et ses recommandations. Elle demande que la parole soit donnée à la Délégation du Cap Vert.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that the Committee should speak first and then States Parties and it added that it had a question for ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** explained that it was up the Chair to give the floor if she considered that this would be helpful for the debate. She asked the Delegation of the United States of America to pose its question in the normal order of speakers.

La Délégation du **Cap Vert** (Observateur) explique que lorsque son gouvernement a pris connaissance, -quelques mois auparavant-, des commentaires, observations et recommandations de l'ICOMOS, il a mobilisé toutes les institutions et forces vives de la Nation afin que les mesures soient prises pour corriger les faiblesses et les lacunes signalées. Par conséquent, la Délégation communique au Comité les informations suivantes: le dispositif juridico-légal est établi et dûment publié dans le bulletin officiel de la République, ce dispositif inclut l'extension de la protection à l'ensemble du bien terrestre proposé pour inscription, la création d'un comité de gestion qui a été effectivement installé, et le classement sur le registre des monuments nationaux des 21 monuments composant le bien. La zone tampon, étendue à l'espace maritime, fait objet d'une législation appropriée pour sa protection. L'articulation du comité de gestion avec les autres structures, sa composition et son rôle sont définis. La municipalité de Ribeira Grande se dotera bientôt d'un plan de développement municipal, d'un plan de développement urbain et d'un plan directeur. Grâce à l'inestimable coopération espagnole et luxembourgeoise, la formation de cadres nécessaires aussi bien à la gestion du site qu'à d'autres activités connexes, est entrée dans une phase opérationnelle. La signalétique sera améliorée selon les décisions que prendra, dans les semaines qui suivent, le comité de gestion. Enfin, la relation entre les espaces urbains et ruraux au cœur de la vallée demeurera une préoccupation des autorités comme le reflète le Plan de gestion 2008-2012. Il est prévu également, au sein des musées à créer, de réserver une place particulière à la riche histoire agricole de Cidade Velha.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the State Party on its efforts. It considered that the Site's Outstanding Universal Value had been recognized by ICOMOS. It asked the State Party to make a short statement to the Committee for its consideration.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the State Party on the efforts made and mentioned that no assistance from the World Heritage Fund had been required. The State Party should be congratulated on this. The Delegation detected a discrepancy between the slides shown and those in the document on the marine area. It asked ICOMOS to explain.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** congratulated ICOMOS on the Report and said that the State Party had taken the recommendations into account. As a result, it considered that the Site should be inscribed instead of referred for further consideration.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party on its efforts and emphasized that this was a State Party that thus far did not have a site on the World Heritage List. It said that the Site seemed to meet all the conditions for inscription on the List.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son travail et félicite le Cap Vert. Elle constate qu'il n'y a plus d'obstacles à l'inscription du site sur la Liste.

The Delegation of **Israel** thanked ICOMOS for the answer regarding the marine areas, and asked if it had reviewed material submitted by the State Party regarding legal implementation.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** explique que la question de la zone tampon terrestre et la création de la zone tampon maritime a été un des éléments de dialogue que l'ICOMOS a mené avec l'Etat partie dans un souci de transparence et collaboration. Il souligne que l'Etat partie a proposé un avant-port comme zone limite mais qu'il reste encore des éléments à préciser. Il considère qu'il s'agit d'un processus dynamique qui n'est pas encore terminé et que la clarification des questions légales est encore en cours.

The Delegation of **Barbados** congratulated the State Party on the arduous work done before this point had been reached. The Delegation considered it important that links between the Caribbean and Africa should be recognized. The Delegation believed that the State Party had shown justification of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site and that there should now be moves towards the inscription of the Site. An issue of concern was the terminology on authenticity and urban development that ICOMOS had used, including “mediocre” and “unattractive”. This language should not be used in this kind of report, and the Delegation requested the use of more appropriate vocabulary.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its appreciation of the information presented by the State Party. It stated that this case was a good example of how to evaluate the progress that had been made in the evaluation process of properties of all kinds worldwide. It suggested that further efforts in this direction should be promoted. The Delegation stated that progress had also been made in understanding the associated values of a given site, but that further progress was needed in order to define how to deal with such elements from a technical point of view. It explained that the Site was related to the creation of Creole Culture. Due to its geographical position, the Site was a melting pot of African cultures, and the Americas and the Caribbean had drawn from the many benefits of this. The Delegation underlined the fact that the Site had been the first point from which Creole Culture had spread to the Americas, as had been stated by ICOMOS. The Delegation congratulated ICOMOS for recognizing that this was a key element in the nomination dossier. As a result, the meaning of the Site went far beyond a group of buildings. ICOMOS had acknowledged the intangible value of the Site and recognized that it met criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Outstanding Universal Value of the Site had been fully demonstrated.

The Delegation of Brazil further emphasized that regarding the legal protection and site management plans, ICOMOS believed that legal protections had been drafted and that these now needed to be implemented. At the same time, the Delegation believed that proper site management and legal protection were already being carried out. Substantial progress had been made regarding the conservation of the Site. The management system was adequate. The relevant government ministry had made a commitment to providing financial and human resources for the conservation measures, and this commitment needed to be taken seriously, given the work carried out over the previous 12 years. The Delegation quoted ICOMOS's congratulations to the State Party on its efforts to maintain the authenticity of the Site. The Site's Outstanding Universal Value had been demonstrated, and protective measures had either been undertaken or were in progress. Brazil therefore strongly recommended the immediate inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** was impressed with the State Party's perseverance with this dossier. The Delegation asked ICOMOS a technical question regarding authenticity and integrity, as these things had been included in the 1992 nomination file. At that time many buildings had been remodelled, and the Delegation wanted to know if there were now differences between these buildings' present condition and their condition as described in the 1992 file. It also raised a question for the State Party regarding indicators for urban and architectural management.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** commended the State Party and ICOMOS. It also asked if protective legislation had been put in place. The Delegation supported the Site's inscription on the World Heritage List.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** explique que la définition de l'intégrité n'est pas la même aujourd'hui par rapport à 1992. « L'état d'esprit » en 1992 était un ensemble de monuments disséminés dans une ville dont l'état n'était pas très bon à l'époque. Dans le dossier actuel il s'agit d'un territoire urbain contenant des monuments et les relations entre ces monuments et le territoire sont mieux définies. Il souligne également l'effort de l'Etat partie à mener des travaux sur la restauration des abords, l'utilisation de la pierre et l'authenticité constructive ainsi que les éléments d'architecture vernaculaire avec la définition de la maison Cap-Verdienne qui fait partie de l'authenticité. Le concept de paysage culturel ne s'applique pas mais pourrait être applicable dans le futur. Il ajoute que la question des indicateurs est un certain souci et que l'ICOMOS a fait une recommandation très forte à l'Etat partie de les définir clairement selon des standards internationaux.

La Délégation du **Cap Vert** (Observateur) répond que les indicateurs ont seulement pu être fournis dans le dossier qui a été envoyé récemment. Elle souligne que ceux-ci correspondent à des indicateurs appliqués au niveau international et sont liés au site même comme le nombre de touristes, le taux de satisfaction, et le taux de récupération des édifices et des habitations anciens. Elle confirme que toutes ces informations seront mises à disposition.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated Cape Verde for having brought forward this very important nomination from the African continent, which sooner or later was worthy of inscription. It inquired whether ICOMOS would consider information submitted by the State Party after 28 February 2009 regarding actions taken, and whether in view of this information ICOMOS would be able to modify the Draft Decision.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** indique comprendre l'intérêt d'examiner la documentation qui est soumise tardivement mais que du point de vue professionnel et scientifique il n'est pas souhaitable de travailler trop précipitamment. Il souligne par ailleurs que l'ICOMOS ne le refuse pas catégoriquement et qu'il a parcouru la documentation reçue récemment.

La Délégation du **Pérou** félicite l'Etat partie et soutien l'inscription du site sur la Liste.

La Délégation du **Cuba** se dit satisfaite de l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS et félicite également l'Etat partie pour cette candidature.

La Délégation de la **Jordanie** apporte son soutien à la candidature et félicite l'Etat partie pour ses efforts considérables.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** added its congratulations to those of the earlier speakers and indicated that the State Party had made huge efforts on the new nomination. Bahrain indicated that it also supported Small Island Developing States. It agreed with the point made by Barbados about the wording used to refer to the restoration of authenticity, as well as the adjectives used.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the State Party and supported the inscription. It requested to be informed of the underwater heritage and whether the buffer zone had been extended to the marine area. It also asked whether protective measures had been taken into account.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** précise que les questions de la zone tampon terrestre et de la zone tampon maritime sont en cours de clarification, mais que l'aspect réglementaire reste à mettre en place.

The **Chairperson** indicated that 14 States Parties had expressed their support for the Site's inscription. Therefore, an amendment to the Draft Decision would need to be made and a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value prepared by the Advisory Body. She indicated that Kenya had presented a new Draft Decision and asked Kenya to put forward its amendments in consultation with the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that referral also meant that the property had Outstanding Universal Value, and that it would have been useful if this could have been included in the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** thanked Israel for its suggestion and said that this proposal could be taken into account next year. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. The Chairperson said that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been drafted by Kenya and not by the Secretariat. Approval of the wording of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was therefore postponed until ICOMOS could give its opinion.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.10** was adopted, pending the approval of the wording of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Cap Vert** (Observateur) remercie, avec plaisir et émotion, le Comité pour la décision qu'il a prise. Depuis le début de la semaine, tous les regards du peuple capverdien sont tournés vers Séville, dans l'attente du verdict concernant l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de Cidade Velha, centre historique de Ribeira Grande. Il s'agit du berceau de la Nation, qui a été le témoin vivant et dynamique de l'un des plus grands drames de l'histoire de l'humanité, la Traite négrière, mais aussi un haut lieu de mémoire à partir duquel a éclot la première culture créole. En reconnaissant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, le Comité a fait naître un grand espoir pour la jeune République du Cap Vert, qui n'a pas encore 35 ans de souveraineté, de célébrer cette année l'inscription de son premier bien culturel sur la prestigieuse Liste du patrimoine mondial. Au nom du peuple et du gouvernement cap-verdien, la Délégation a réitéré ses remerciements au Comité.

Property	Historic town of Grand-Bassam
Id. N°	1322
State Party	Côte d'Ivoire
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** présente le site proposé ainsi que les résultats de l'évaluation et les recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked ICOMOS whether in its view, and considering the work that had been done, the Site needed to be deferred or referred. The Delegation also asked the State Party how long it would take to carry out the recommendations made by ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Madagascar** s'exprime également dans le sens du Kenya et affirme qu'il s'agit d'une ville historique à forte identité, avec une âme bien ancrée et une occupation dans le contexte africain. La Délégation souligne que d'après le rapport de l'ICOMOS, beaucoup d'effort sont demandés à l'Etat partie, notamment mettre en place une zone tampon pour en faire un territoire unique, confirmer les mesures juridiques, mettre en place un comité local de gestion, un programme spécial, définir les indicateurs opérationnels, assurer la présence de personnel qualifié, intégrer un plan de conservation. Elle en déduit que le site mérite plutôt d'être renvoyé et non pas différé.

La Délégation du **Maroc** considère que l'Etat partie semble tout à fait disposé à faire des efforts afin de répondre aux questions posées par l'Organisation consultative. La Délégation se prononce pour que le dossier soit renvoyé.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son rapport objectif et promoteur. Elle souligne que l'Etat partie a fait beaucoup d'efforts malgré les problèmes qui persistent dans le pays et que, pour cette raison, au lieu de différer, elle recommande le renvoi du dossier afin d'encourager l'Etat partie.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of **Cote d'Ivoire** (Observer) and reminded the Committee that the State Party could respond to concrete questions posed by the Committee, but that it could not advocate for the Site in general.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) remercie tous les représentants et institutions impliqués mais souligne que de différer le dossier lui semble trop sévère, car tous les points soulevés par ICOMOS connaissent un début de solution ou peuvent être rapidement satisfaits. En effet, les trois quarts des villages, ainsi que la place fédératrice du site sacré, font partie du site proposé pour inscription. Les autres éléments font partie de la zone tampon. Quant à unifier la zone tampon, il n'y a aucun problème et le gouvernement a déjà pris des dispositions pour contrôler la pression urbaine. Au niveau réglementaire, la Loi sur la protection date de 1987. Un arrêté préfectoral portant sur la création d'une commission des permis de construire est signé depuis 2008. Les autres

textes, en conformité avec le plan de conservation, ont été validés et sont en cours de signature. La Maison de patrimoine a été créée en 2002, avec la mise en place d'un Comité local et d'une équipe technique qualifiée. Le plan de gestion peut être rapidement harmonisé avec les normes internationales, pour tenir compte de la remarque de l'ICOMOS. Mairie a prévu un budget pour l'aménagement. La Ministère de la Culture et de la Francophonie et le Conseil général pourvoient au financement de la restauration et la réhabilitation des édifices. La Délégation souhaite attirer l'attention du Comité que tous ces efforts en faveur du patrimoine ont été réalisés malgré la situation de crise militaro-politique. En conséquence, la Délégation exprime son souhait que la Ville historique de Grand-Bassam, premier bien culturel proposé, fasse objet d'un renvoi d'une année. La Délégation s'engage à satisfaire les demandes de l'ICOMOS avant la fin de l'année en cours.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** explique qu'il reste deux choses sérieuses en question qui ne sont pas encore résolues et qu'un an serait insuffisant pour les réaliser. Il indique qu'il s'agit surtout d'un point fondamental concernant que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui n'a pas été pleinement démontrée nécessitant de reprendre le dossier à son origine et d'envoyer une mission sur place. Il est donc plus adéquat de différer le dossier.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its appreciation of the State Party and of ICOMOS. It asked ICOMOS about the serious issues affecting the nomination and mentioned several problems that needed to be resolved. The Delegation indicated that the objective of the Committee should be to help the State Party attain success. It therefore supported the original Decision to defer this property, noting that a referral would put the State Party under considerable pressure to solve the issues that needed to be addressed.

The Delegation of **Sweden** agreed with Canada. Many issues were still developing, and the State Party needed time and assistance in order to complete the nomination file. Sweden believed that deferral was the correct action to take.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed that the nomination was an interesting one with a great deal of history attached to it. However, it said that colonial settlements abroad should also be considered. The Delegation supported deferral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the option of referral, in order to give the State Party a timeframe in which to finalize the nomination. It explained that whereas a referral gave the State Party an opportunity, a deferral would almost mean preparing a new nomination.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** indicated that the goal of the Committee was to encourage and assist a State Party in the inscription process. The Delegation believed that the Site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime son soutien au renvoi du dossier.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its wish to see Cote d'Ivoire represented on the World Heritage List, but it underlined the importance of ensuring that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value be reflected in the Site. Management of the Site should aim

to carry this out. The Delegation asked the State Party when its work at the Site would be completed.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) fait remarquer la bonne coopération et le travail accompli dans le site. Elle souligne que ce travail reste à compléter et que les mesures doivent être renforcées, un travail qui pourrait être achevé fin de l'année 2009 et qui permettra de satisfaire les demandes.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** souligne que de différer un dossier n'est pas une sanction. Le différer permet d'assurer un état de conservation du site. Il réitère le fait que l'**ICOMOS** n'est pas certain qu'un an soit suffisant afin de répondre aux différents points soulevés dans son rapport. Il rappelle par ailleurs le cas du Burkina Faso qu'il voit comme bon exemple.

The Delegation of **China** supported the option of referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the statement made by ICOMOS that neither deferral nor referral were designed as punishments, but instead were part of a process. However, it corrected ICOMOS by reminding it that in the case of Loropéni, although a deferral had been recommended, the Decision taken by the Committee in Vilnius was for a referral. It therefore suggested that in the case of Grand-Bassam, the Committee take a Decision similar to that for Loropéni, i.e. referral. It stated that the Committee should trust the State Party to do good work.

La Délégation du **Maroc** dit qu'il a bien examiné le dossier et constate que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'est pas contestée. La Délégation demande par ailleurs à l'**ICOMOS** si le critère (ii) serait aussi applicable.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** répond qu'il lui est difficile de se prononcer sur un critère qui vient juste d'être proposé par un membre du Comité. Il répète également que d'après l'**ICOMOS** la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site n'est pas encore complètement démontrée.

FOURTH DAY – FRIDAY, 26 JUNE 2009

EIGHTH MEETING

3:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

**ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(Continuation)**

Historic Town of Grand Bassam (Cote d'Ivoire) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** proposed considering the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, following the debate that had taken place in the morning session. She noted that the Delegation of Kenya proposed an amendment to Paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stated that it did not agree to change the Decision from deferral to referral, given that much remained to be done for this Site.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that the Site was very interesting and certainly had potential for being considered of Outstanding Universal Value; however, the Delegation believed that the comparative analysis was not entirely convincing and that some important elements appeared not to have been included in the nominated area. Considering that double standards should not be applied, the Delegation concurred with the previous speaker that the nomination should be deferred.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it understood the intentions of those who had spoken previously, but that it considered the suggestion that its proposed amendment sought the application of double standards to be offensive. Noting that a Decision to defer the nomination would have discouraged the responsible authorities and resulted in ending prospects for inscribing this property, it insisted that referring it back would have been the appropriate solution in the particular context of the State Party and in order also to take into account the views of the persons involved. This was why the Delegation had proposed in its amendment to give the State Party two years to come back with an improved nomination.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** considered deferral to be the appropriate Decision, noting the nature of the work requested in the Draft Decision included further research to document the possible Outstanding Universal Value of the Site.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the Delegations of Sweden and Bahrain. It questioned on what basis the Committee could refer the nomination back to the State

Party and what guidance could be given to the latter to enable it to improve the nomination if no Outstanding Universal Value had yet been established.

The Delegations of **Brazil**, **Mauritius** and **Nigeria** supported the intervention of the Delegation of Kenya.

La Délégation de **Madagascar**, se référant aux propos de la Délégation du Kenya, confirme que des discussions sur le cas de Grand Bassam ont bien eu lieu entre les membres du Comité du Groupe Afrique. Au cours de cette concertation, il a été mentionné que l'exemple du site des ruines de Loropeni (Burkina Faso), aujourd'hui recommandé pour inscription, a démontré qu'un renvoi permettrait à l'Etat partie de Côte d'Ivoire de travailler pendant deux ans et de revenir avec un dossier de nomination satisfaisant. En conséquence, elle appuie la proposition de la Délégation du Kenya.

The Delegation of **Israel** believed that deferral was a better option, possibly complemented by an additional paragraph encouraging the State Party to continue working on the nomination.

The **Chairperson** noted that five Members of the Committee had expressed themselves in favour of deferral and five in favour of referral.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie**, soutenue par les Délégations de **Chine**, d'**Egypte**, de **Cuba**, du **Maroc** et du **Pérou**, exprime sa préférence pour un renvoi de 2 ans pour permettre à l'Etat partie de Côte d'Ivoire de revenir avec une proposition plus satisfaisante.

The Delegation of **Canada** reiterated its support for deferral.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were now 11 Members of the Committee in favour of referral, compared to only six in favour of deferral. She suggested, therefore, that the Committee consider the three amendments that proposed to change the Draft Decision from deferral to referral.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** exprime de nouveau sa préférence pour la proposition faite par la Délégation du Kenya.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** retire son amendement et se range à celle de la Délégation du Kenya.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee consider the heading of paragraph 2, suggesting that the nomination be referred instead of deferred, and suggested that the sub-paragraphs, outlining what the State Party should have done to improve the nomination file, be looked at afterwards.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed modifying sub-paragraph 2a, replacing the words "reconsider whether or not to include" with the word "include", so as to convey to the State Party the appropriate message with regard to the expectations of the Committee.

L'ICOMOS indique ne voir aucun inconvénient à considérer la formulation « inclure le village Nzima en entier ou partiellement dans le périmètre du bien ». Elle ne voit également pas de problème pour que soit supprimé l'expression « bois sacré ».

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that it would agree to a revised wording following the explanations provided by ICOMOS if that would make things more convenient for the State Party.

At the request of the Chairperson, **ICOMOS** offered wording intended to reflect the discussion in sub-paragraph 2a.

The Chairperson also went through all the sub-paragraphs from 2a to 2g and noted that the amendment to paragraph 3 proposed by Madagascar should logically have been deleted, since its intention had already been covered by the Kenyan amendment.

La Délégation du **Canada** demande une clarification quant à la nécessité d' une mission en cas de renvoi.

L'**ICOMOS** précise qu'aucune mission d'évaluation de l'organisation consultative ne sera nécessaire, conformément aux *Orientations*.

The Delegation of **Australia** informed the Chairperson that it was drafting a new amendment that could be included as a sub-paragraph under 2, suggesting that the State Party might invite a mission by ICOMOS to assess the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its proposed boundaries and management system. This was then shown on the screens in English and French.

L'**ICOMOS** précise qu'elle réexaminera la zone tampon dans le contexte du dossier renvoyé. Elle rappelle de nouveau qu'aucune mission n'est possible dans le cas d'un renvoi.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee should discuss whether or not it was possible to request a mission by ICOMOS in case of a referral.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that new wording could be introduced into the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia that would encourage the State Party to invite an advisory mission by ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre, or another professional entity, possibly through a Request for International Assistance, or any other appropriate mechanism, with a view to assisting the State Party in completing the nomination. It read out a proposed new text to that effect, which was incorporated into the Australian amendment.

The **Chairperson** suggested that in such a case the reference to ICOMOS should be deleted.

The **Chairperson** discussed the formulation of the new paragraph, to be numbered later on, proposed by Australia. Seeing no interventions, this was approved. .

The **Chairperson** went back to the question of paragraph 3 proposed by Madagascar. It was recalled that only the Kenyan text had been discussed, which had previously been approved. Seeing no objections from Madagascar, paragraph 3 was deleted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8 B.12** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** proposed consideration of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which concerned the property of Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande (Cape Verde).

L'**ICOMOS** procède à la lecture de la déclaration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien devant être examinée par le Comité.

The Delegation of **Barbados** requested that the reference to “slaves” in the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value be replaced with “enslaved persons”.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remarque une inconsistance dans le texte dans lequel on note différentes façons de nommer le bien ; de plus, une clarification devrait être apportée par l'ICOMOS sur la notion de « traite des peuples africains » utilisée dans la formulation du critère (vi).

L'**ICOMOS** propose de remplacer “traite des peuples Africains” par “histoire de l'esclavage des temps modernes”

L'**ICOMOS** confirme par ailleurs qu'il faut effectivement écrire le nom complet du bien qui consiste en son nom ancien et son nouveau nom.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, referring to the justification provided by ICOMOS for the use of criterion (vi), noted that it was not appropriate to refer simply to “symbols” associated with the slave trade. There was very clear and tangible evidence of this at the property that should have been emphasized. The Delegation proposed new wording for this section of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, referring to “material manifestations” rather than “symbols”.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the request made by the Delegation of Nigeria to delete the wording “modern times” in criterion (vi).

L'**ICOMOS** indique n'avoir aucune objection pour que soit supprimé ce groupe de mots.

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was adopted as amended.

Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	The Ruins of Loropéni
Id. N°	1225 Rev
State Party	Burkina Faso
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

L'**ICOMOS** rappelle que le site avait été renvoyé en 2006 lors de la 30e session à Vilnius (Lituanie) pour complément d'information. Elle note que le nouveau dossier soumis contient les informations permettant une meilleure connaissance du bien, de sa fonction et de ses origines. Elle présente l'évaluation et signale que le bien a été proposé au titre des critères (ii) et (iv). Ces critères n'ont pas été jugés convaincants lors de l'évaluation. Par contre, les nouvelles informations fournies par l'Etat partie permettent de justifier le critère (iii). Elle recommande donc l'inscription du bien au titre du critère (iii).

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party on the successful process that had led to the nomination, following an initial referral. It requested, however, clarification on the reasons why ICOMOS considered that criterion (ii) did not apply in this case. Moreover, the Delegation believed that a report from the State Party in two years would not be necessary, also taking into consideration the workload of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated the State Party for having returned after two years with a satisfactory dossier. It also congratulated ICOMOS for its report and for having proposed the use of criterion (iii) on the basis of the new information provided by the State Party. However, it wanted clarification from ICOMOS on the reason why criterion (ii) had not been considered. It finally concluded by stating that a report on the property's State of Conservation was not immediately necessary.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party for its efforts in successfully reviewing a nomination that had been referred back to it. It concurred with the previous speaker that criterion (ii) could have been used for this property and added that perhaps in the future consideration could be given to a trans-boundary nomination including similar sites in neighbouring countries.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** rappelle qu'elle a participé à la discussion sur l'examen de ce bien en 2006 pendant la 30e session à Vilnius (Lituanie). Elle remarque que cette nouvelle présentation du dossier est la preuve que l'Etat partie a beaucoup travaillé. Elle salue donc cet effort, et surtout la ténacité manifestée.

In response to the questions posed by the Delegation of Bahrain, **ICOMOS** recalled that criterion (ii) was about the interchange of human values. ICOMOS noted that current understanding of this property, based on existing knowledge, would not justify using this criterion; however, it suggested that perhaps further investigations might yield evidence in that direction. Concerning the request for an update in 2011, ICOMOS intended this as a proactive way of engaging with the State Party in order, ultimately, to assist it in dealing with the very complex conservation issues it would have to face for the property. It was not a sanction. Should the Committee not consider this necessary, ICOMOS would be ready to accept removing the reference to a report in 2011.

The Delegation of **Egypt** joined its voice in congratulating the State Party on the efforts deployed to submit the new nomination dossier.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its satisfaction with this nomination. What was less convincing was the response by ICOMOS on the reasons why criterion (ii) did not apply in this case. The Delegation asked that the State Party be given the opportunity to explain why it considered that criterion (ii) might have been used for this property, particularly in regard to mining technology.

Considering that three Members of the Committee had asked for clarifications on this point, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party to answer the specific question posed by the Delegation of Barbados regarding criterion (ii).

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** introduit son explication en rappelant la sagesse populaire qui enseigne « qu'en mettant trop de sel dans la sauce, on gâche la sauce ». Elle poursuit son propos en informant le Comité qu'elle considère avoir fourni dans le nouveau dossier, assez d'informations permettant de justifier selon elle le critère (ii). En effet, elle considère avoir démontré, que l'architecture en pierre a évolué de l'Est vers le Sud de la région du pays Lobi et qu'il a été aussi démontré avec suffisamment de preuve scientifiques, la présence d'exploitations aurifères.

Having heard the State Party, the **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee start the adoption of the proposed Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that since the State Party had made reference to gold mining, it considered it important also to include this aspect as part of the Site's Outstanding Universal Value, as had been done for similar cases in Jordan.

La République de **Corée** ajoute que cette inscription est d'autant plus significative parce que le Comité apporte son soutien à la représentation balancée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** suggested examining the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. With respect to the new paragraph 4, proposed by the Delegation of Australia, the Chairperson proposed replacing the word "re-nomination" with "extension".

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed adding the word "further" before the words "increase integrity and authenticity" in the body of the paragraph under discussion.

The **Chairperson** noted the amendment proposed to paragraph 4 asked the Committee if it agreed to a new paragraph 5, containing a reference to a report to be submitted in 2011.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** reiterated its view that, considering the workload of the Committee, this paragraph could be deleted.

This was agreed to by the Delegation of **Spain**.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.12** was adopted as amended.

Congratulating the State Party of Burkina Faso on its first inscription, the Chairperson gave the floor to its representative for a short intervention.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso**, par la voix de son Ministre de la Culture, du Tourisme et de la Communication, Porte-Parole du Gouvernement, Monsieur Philippe Sawadogo a remercié le Comité et exprimé la reconnaissance de son pays.

ASIA / PACIFIC

New Nominations

Property	Historic monuments of Mount Songshan
Id. N°	1305
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

L'**ICOMOS** présente le bien proposé pour l'inscription. Il s'agit d'une proposition d'inscription en série de huit ensembles d'édifices sur 825 ha, situés autour des pentes du Songshan et limitrophes de la ville de Dengfen. L'ICOMOS considère que ni les conditions d'intégrité, ni l'analyse comparative, et ni les critères (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi) n'ont été démontrés. Elle recommande que l'examen du bien soit différé.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to comment.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** apprécie la rigueur de l'examen fait par l'ICOMOS. Elle est saisie par le lien intime qui existe entre la montagne et ses édifices et plus particulièrement avec le temple de Songyue. Selon elle, il existe là un lien solide entre nature et culture, entre la nature, l'homme et ses expressions. Elle souhaite entendre

l'Etat partie afin d'avoir son point de vue sur la conclusion de l'ICOMOS, avant de formuler son point de vue.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Tunisia to formulate a specific question for the State Party.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** demande à entendre l'Etat partie afin qu'il donne des clarifications sur l'aspect religieux et le caractère sacré de la montagne.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remarque qu'il s'agit d'un ensemble bien cohérent qui révèle que Songshan est le berceau de la civilisation chinoise. Elle félicite l'ICOMOS pour son travail mais estime que la barre a été placée très haute. Elle souhaite poser deux questions suite à la conclusion de l'ICOMOS sur l'absence de démonstration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Dans la première question adressée à l'ICOMOS, elle souhaite savoir si le dossier contient des erreurs liés à la traduction du chinois à l'anglais, du contenu philosophique. Dans la deuxième question qui elle s'adresse à l'Etat partie, elle souhaite savoir si depuis la réponse du 2 mars 2009 envoyée à l'ICOMOS, il y a eu de nouvelles informations concernant le bien.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked ICOMOS for its commendable analysis of the nomination; however, it had some questions that required clarification. One problem was the interrelation between tangible sites and their spiritual and religious dimensions. The Committee had struggled with this question for some time, especially concerning properties in Africa and Asia. This was the reason why the Delegation had stressed in the past the need for strengthening the ties between the World Heritage Convention and other UNESCO Conventions in the area of Cultural Heritage. Did ICOMOS consider there to be potential for identifying Outstanding Universal Value in this property, and, if so, in what respect? The Delegation of Kenya would also like to ask the State Party if it agreed with the report presented by ICOMOS with regard to the way its justification of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site had been presented.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that as one of its members had been involved in the field of archaeology, it could state that there were connections between ancient Egypt and the proposed Site in China, particularly with regard to the relationship between the Site and religious factors. It considered that the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site should be given its deserved space.

The Delegation of **China** at first clarified that it had proposed a change in the name of the property following the initial request for supplementary information from ICOMOS, as it had realized that the original name might have engendered some confusion. The name chosen referred to the beliefs related to the "centre of heaven and earth" and not to the city. All the monuments that were part of the serial nomination were connected with this belief. The specific monument identified by ICOMOS as having Outstanding Universal Value in its own right, i.e. the observatory, was indeed important, but it was not key to representing the intended theme of the nomination, which was focused on the cults and traditions associated with the centre of heaven and earth.

ICOMOS, agreeing with Kenya, stated that the nomination was a fusion of tangible and intangible and cultural and natural heritage, and that was indeed the way that it had looked at it in its evaluation. It stressed that it had tried to find links between the

nominated Sites and the Sites in their settings; however, it acknowledged that it did not consider the fact that the buildings were aligned towards the mountain to be a strong link. ICOMOS further acknowledged the link between the centre of heaven and earth and the area, but it noted the relevance of Mount Sangshan in the area as well. ICOMOS stressed that in recommending a deferral of this property it was not saying that it did not have Outstanding Universal Value. Instead, it was saying that the Outstanding Universal Value had already been justified without the State Party having to provide supplementary information. ICOMOS stated that the area needed more detailed study, in order to see how a serial nomination, perhaps of a lesser number of Sites, could be linked with a strong understanding of the Sites' spiritual and religious links.

The Delegation of **Barbados**, noting that ICOMOS had recognized the presence of Outstanding Universal Value in the property, considered that this was a case that warranted a referral and not a deferral. What was required was to capture the elements that were associated with the spiritual dimension of the property.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the Delegation of Barbados and noted that this was an interesting and complex nomination. It further explained that more details were necessary and that the nomination needed strengthening, so that it could be better presented.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that a fundamental difference had been manifested between the Asiatic and Western models of thinking in the discussion. It explained that when a father came down from heaven, it meant that one people had been occupying the land for eternity. It noted that a structural analysis of the dossier was needed, in order to explain to the non-western mind what was being presented. It added that the nomination should be adopted as the manifestation of a unique and traditional way of thinking.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said that it had the feeling that there was an important relationship between the mountain and the Site, and that this could help in understanding the value of the Site, including its spiritual value. It believed that this was something that had been mentioned by a number of colleagues and that it was something that should be included in the report.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the Committee was faced with a very complex situation. On the one hand, ICOMOS did not see the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site. The Delegation of China had well summarized the situation, and ICOMOS had recognized that Outstanding Universal Value could be there. However, on the other hand, the Delegation was worried about the way ICOMOS was dealing with this serial Site, in which some elements were taken to fulfill the criteria while other elements were not. It wondered whether this way of taking the elements separately into account and not seeing them as a whole was the correct way of dealing with a serial nomination.

La Délégation du **Maroc** note que la proposition présente un cas tout à fait intéressant car en général on est confrontés à la situation inverse. Normalement, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est identifiée mais un système de gestion et les mesures de protection ne sont pas toujours existants ou complets. Ce cas présente une situation complètement inverse : une confusion sur l'identification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle mais un système de gestion appropriée selon l'ICOMOS. La Délégation

du Maroc est donc parfaitement favorable à ce qui a été proposé par le Barbade ; c'est-à-dire le renvoi.

The Delegation of **Korea** expressed its interest in the nomination and noted that capturing the intangible values related to the Site was a difficult task. It noted that ICOMOS had declared that Outstanding Universal Value was present, and it suggested that the nomination should move forward to recognizing the property's outstanding attributes.

ICOMOS clarified that it had not found justification for Outstanding Universal Value in the nomination, but believed that there was potential for Outstanding Universal Value to be manifested in it. It did not believe that the eight Sites making up the nomination had currently demonstrated this value; however, it explained that the serial nomination consisted of a single property that needed to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. The criteria for which the property was being nominated needed to be manifested in all the components of the property. ICOMOS further explained that the justification put forward by the State Party rested on the justification of some criteria in only some parts of the property, whereas ICOMOS felt that this justification should be present within all the components of the nominated property.

The **Chairperson** summarized the discussion and proposed looking at the Draft Decision. It asked if the Committee was moving towards a referral.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to review the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

The delegation of **Kenya** suggested that deferral be replaced by referral.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to make the necessary modifications to the Draft Decision based on the comments made by the Delegation of Kenya.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted the sincerity of the views advanced by the State Party, but it said that it could not agree with the amendment proposed by **Kenya**. It noted that the Committee operated on the understanding of a clear manifestation of Outstanding Universal Value and that according to ICOMOS this had not been established. Therefore, there were no clear grounds on which to recommend a referral.

The Delegation of **Sweden** also supported the Decision for a deferral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its desire not to have a long discussion. It noted that the Advisory Body had accepted that segments of the nomination had Outstanding Universal Value and had suggested that these elements could stand on their own. It had therefore assumed that there were sufficient grounds to proceed to a referral. It requested that the State Party respond to the question of whether, if the Site were referred, it could commit to being able to respond with a better justification of Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** souligne avoir l'impression que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle existe mais qu'on ne le voit pas. Le délégué fait alors une comparaison avec les microbes de Pasteur, qu'il savait qu'existaient mais qui n'arrivait pas à voir au microscope. Il se prononce alors pour le renvoi de la décision.

ICOMOS explained that all the criteria under which the nomination had been presented had been assessed, but that none of them could be clearly justified. Regarding the Observatory, it noted that this deserved further consideration as a single nomination, but that it could not pre-judge the issue. It emphasized that the nomination had the potential for justifying Outstanding Universal Value, but based on present data Outstanding Universal Value had not yet been demonstrated.

The Delegation of **Barbados** thanked ICOMOS for having restated its case. It directed a question to Canada, saying that ICOMOS had correctly stated the case it had originally been asked to analyze. The Delegation's concern was that the State Party had clearly demonstrated that there were other values to consider and that these had been misread by ICOMOS. The Delegation explained that ICOMOS had noted that there was potential in some elements for Outstanding Universal Value. Based on this statement, it suggested that the State Party be given the chance to re-submit the nomination so that it could better express the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property. For this reason, it recommended referral.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** se prononce également pour le renvoi. Elle note que l'essentiel des données se trouve dans le dossier

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que le potentiel de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle venant d'être confirmé par l'ICOMOS, le renvoi permettra à l'état partie de revoir la formulation et l'identification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its regret that there was no valid alternative to deferral, in the absence of a clear Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It noted that a verbal expression of Outstanding Universal Value was not acceptable grounds for the Committee to make a Decision. It reminded the Committee that ICOMOS had stated that it had not found Outstanding Universal Value in the Site.

The Delegation of **Australia** recognized that there was likely to be Outstanding Universal Value at the Site, but that this had not been clearly demonstrated. It referred to the Cote d'Ivoire case reviewed earlier by the Committee, and asked if, as had been the case in the earlier situation, the State Party should be asked to invite a mission to examine the situation more closely. It suggested that if the same logic were used in this case as had been used in the earlier Cote d'Ivoire case, then the logical conclusion was to recommend deferral.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of China if a mission would be helpful in further defining the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **China** answered that a second mission would not be necessary, as the boundary and content of the nomination remained the same.

La Délégation d'**Espagne** exprime son accord avec la Délégation de la Barbade.

La Délégation de **Cuba** se prononce pour le renvoi de la nomination à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** supported referral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its confusion at the procedure under which the nomination was being considered. It suggested that a closer look be taken of criteria (ii), which had received particular attention from ICOMOS, and it pointed out that one part of the nomination in particular, the Observatory, might have Outstanding Universal Value. It indicated that there was therefore evidence that certain parts of the nomination could have Outstanding Universal Value. It continued by raising the question of whether it was possible to refer only a part of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Egypt** considered that there was no need to insist once again on the great importance of Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation said that all that had to be done now was to refer the nomination and not to defer it.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported referral of the nomination.

ICOMOS referred to the Delegation of **Israel**'s suggestion that ICOMOS had assessed parts of the nomination, namely the Observatory and certain intangible aspects, and had found a stronger case for Outstanding Universal Value there. It explained that these features justified recommendation to the State Party, and that further work on them could be done, but that these did not in their current form manifest Outstanding Universal Value. For this reason, referral was not appropriate, as boundaries and rationales could change, which would require significant review by the Advisory Body. It explained that deferrals allowed time for missions and desk assessments, whereas referrals allowed only a few months to do this work and left no time for in-depth review. It added that the referral process aimed to allow minor adjustments to be made to nominations and that the process had its limitations.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that this case had raised questions of how to process nominations. Statements made in the Advisory Body's evaluation that claimed that the nomination might have the capacity to show Outstanding Universal Value had caused confusion. It explained that the Cote d'Ivoire example had taken two years to be brought back to the Committee after the initial referral, and that there was no hard-and-fast rule requiring that a referral be brought back within one year. It added that ICOMOS had done a commendable job, but that there was still a stigma attached to a deferral.

The Delegation of **Canada** referred to the comment from the Delegation of Barbados and emphasized that a State Party should be given ample opportunity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value and that the most appropriate route in this case was through the deferral process. It expressed concern that deferral was perceived to be negative. It stated that the Committee's concern should be that due process was followed in ensuring that Outstanding Universal Value was fully and clearly demonstrated for nominations. It added that the Committee's role was not to debate if Outstanding Universal Value had been demonstrated, as this was the remit of the Advisory Body. It reminded the Committee that in this case ICOMOS had indicated that it had not found it.

The **Chairperson** noted that most Committee Members were in favour of referral and that only four were in favour of deferral. It urged the Committee to come to a decision.

The Delegation of **Cuba** proposed adopting the heading of paragraph 2 before the rest.

The **Chairperson** explained the process for approving paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Maroc** corrige le texte français des écrans : « renvoie » la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Cuba** apologized for its ignorance of “Chinese cosmology” but considered that the nomination had been based more on the monuments than on the mountain. It suggested that the mountain be included in the nomination file.

ICOMOS explained that in making its referral recommendation, it had been trying to be as helpful as possible in highlighting the areas that were most promising for Outstanding Universal Value. It added that there had been concern that if the same Document came back for discussion the next year there would be the same discussion. ICOMOS noted that it had had a strong feeling that the links between the temple and the worship of the mountain were of key importance in further exploring the Site's potential Outstanding Universal Value.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.13** was adopted as amended.

Property	Shushtar Historical Hydraulic System. Bridges, dams, canals, buildings and watermills from ancient time to present
Id. N°	1315
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(v)

L'**ICOMOS** indique que le système de Shustar est un système hydraulique homogène, conçu d'une manière globale et achevée au IIIe siècle après J.-C. Il est riche tant par la diversité de ses structures de génie civil et ses constructions que par la diversité de ses usages (adduction d'eau urbaine, moulins, irrigation, transport fluvial, système défensif). Il témoigne de l'héritage et de la synthèse de savoir-faire plus anciens, élamites et mésopotamiens. Son ensemble et tout particulièrement le Grand déversoir (pont-barrage) de Shâdorvân, a été considéré comme une Merveille du monde non seulement par les Perses, mais aussi par les Arabo-musulmans à l'apogée de leur civilisation. Le canal Gargar est un véritable cours d'eau artificiel, à l'origine de la construction d'une ville nouvelle et de l'irrigation d'une vaste plaine alors semi-désertique. D'ailleurs il se trouve dans un environnement paysager urbain et rural propre à l'expression de sa valeur. Le bien répond aux critères i, ii et v et sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle est suffisamment démontrée. Les éléments du plan de gestion sont satisfaisants, mais ils

devraient être renforcés en ce qui concerne l'interprétation du site et l'implication des populations locales.

The Delegations of **Kenya**, **Bahrain** and **Sweden** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS on the work that had been done.

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated the State Party on the work, as well as the Advisory Body on the study, and said that it was in favour of inscription. It also asked the State Party and/or ICOMOS if it would be possible to restore the traditional agricultural irrigation systems inside the boundaries of the Site and if this was planned.

In response, the Delegation of **Iran** to the question by explaining that it would be possible to restore the hydraulic system, but that the possibility of doing so was still being studied as part of a long-term project.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to review the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** had a comment on paragraph three, particularly with regard to the restoration of authenticity.

L'ICOMOS indique que le terme « restauration » se rapporte aux travaux entrepris sur une route pour préserver le barrage.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** offered a new formulation of paragraph 3.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** considère, par rapport au terme « restauration » dans le paragraphe 3 qu'il vaut mieux laisser la restauration aux spécialistes. Ceux qui ne sont pas des archéologues ne peuvent pas avoir une opinion.

The Delegation of **Kenya** offered to provide some middle ground, proposing additional wording related to restoration and rehabilitation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** accepted the terms “restoration and rehabilitation” instead of “restoration of authenticity”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** offered new wording to paragraph 4b.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked if the State Party had been consulted in the recommended name change of paragraph 5.

L'ICOMOS indique avoir eu de nombreux échanges avec l'Etat partie quant à la gestion du bien et que le changement proposé n'est qu'une recommandation à l'Etat partie qui est libre de choisir.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.14** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Iran** thanked the Spanish Government for its warm hospitality in Seville and the Members of the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for the inscription. It said that the Shustar hydraulic system had shown man's ingenuity in mastering technology, paving the way for the Industrial Revolution. The Committee's Decision would ensure that the Site's integrity and authenticity would

be further protected and preserved. Iran had joined the 1972 Convention at its outset, and it had been very active in capacity-building and in implementation. It concluded by assuring the Committee that it looked forward to working more closely with it and with the World Heritage Centre over the years to come.

Property	Royal Tombs of the Joseon Dynasty
Id. N°	1319
State Party	Republic of Korea
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the nomination, which consisted of 18 Sites and 40 monuments. The Sites consisted of royal tombs constructed on mountain slopes for kings and their consorts that conveyed the monarchy's worldview and demonstrated Confucian principles. Each Site was surrounded by a buffer zone, and some were near built-up areas. The Sites were constructed where energies were most concentrated. The burial area was the realm of the dead, and lower down the slope the ceremonies of the living took place. At a distance from the tombs were reception and service buildings. Royal roads linked the tombs and shrines. While the tombs sometimes followed standard layouts, there were also many variations. The linear layout had been carefully designed for its visual impact. Many tombs were part of the dramatic wider landscape, whose natural features had been enhanced. The shrines and entrance buildings were constructed of timber, while the tombs were built of stone. ICOMOS considered that a serial approach was justified, and it was satisfied on matters of integrity and authenticity. It did not consider criterion (ii) to be justified for the inscription of the Site, but it accepted other criteria. It expressed its satisfaction with the property's boundaries, protection and conservation and with the Management Plan that had been put forward. It concluded that serial nomination should be recommended for the property's inscription according to criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi).

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the State Party on the excellent nomination and supported its inscription. It asked ICOMOS for clarification on its recommendation that site interpretation be more engaging.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the nomination and asked ICOMOS how it saw this serial tomb nomination in the light of the earlier inscription of single tomb sites.

The Delegation of **Peru**, following the Advisory Bodies, fully supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and found the Site and its values to be essential components of Korean history.

The Delegation of **Spain** welcomed the inscription and congratulated the State Party. It also announced that it wanted to reiterate the question already asked by Israel.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party and requested comparison with the Valley of the Kings Royal Tombs in Egypt.

ICOMOS explained that the recommendation on the Site's interpretation had emphasized the need for visitors to the Site to understand the full significance of the tombs. It explained that there was currently little such interpretation for visitors. It added that there was a Royal Tombs Schools Programme, which indicated that something was being done in regard to interpretation, but that there was little interpretation at Site level. Regarding the relationship with the earlier single tomb inscriptions, ICOMOS explained that the tombs in this serial nomination had hardly changed over many centuries and that they were very different from the earlier inscribed tombs, particularly in terms of location. For these reasons, ICOMOS claimed that the tombs could stand on their own as a serial nomination.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

The Delegation of **Barbados** recommended a change from the rather imprecise term of "engaging" in paragraph 4c to something more precise, such as "more accessible".

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that paragraph b and c be joined together and that reference be made to a sustainable tourism management plan and site interpretation.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with the suggestion from the Delegation of Barbados.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.15** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Korea** thanked the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS on behalf of the Government of Korea and the entire nation and expressed its pleasure at the successful inscription of the property. It expressed its pride in having another site included on the World Heritage List and explained that it was fully aware of its duties and responsibilities following inscription, indicating that the Government would spare no effort in implementing them.

Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Sulamain-Too Sacred Mountain
Id. N°	1230 Rev
State Party	Kyrgyzstan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS noted that this property had been referred twice during the 31st and 32nd sessions of the Committee. At the last session, the Committee had referred it for several reasons. The Site was nominated as a Cultural Site and as a Cultural Landscape. ICOMOS had recommended inscription under criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the nomination and asked if the issue of environmental degradation had been addressed.

La Délégation de **Jordanie** félicite l'Etat partie et reconnaît les efforts faits pour protéger cet ensemble patrimonial qui comprend une longue histoire préislamique. La Délégation se prononce en faveur de l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the nomination and encouraged the conservation of the petroglyphs at the Site.

ICOMOS explained that the Site Management Plan brought together the intangible and tangible heritage elements of the property and addressed many issues. It assured the Committee that environmental degradation had been addressed in the Plan, but it said that it nevertheless remained important to emphasize this issue in the Decision.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** exprime son accord et demande à l'ICOMOS si le pétroglyphe se trouvant dans le site fait l'objet de quelque interprétation. La Délégation considère qu'une telle interprétation pourrait augmenter considérablement la signification du bien.

ICOMOS explained that the petroglyphs had been studied and inventoried, but that they were unfortunately illegible.

The Delegation of **Israel** recommended that the word “sustainable” be added to “tourism” in the Decision and recommended the addition of sub-paragraph c, which recommended the inclusion in the Management Plan of measures designed to limit environmental degradation from uncontrolled access.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.16** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** indicated that it had been waiting for this moment for some years, and it expressed its thanks to ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre on behalf of the President and people of Kyrgyzstan. It said that it hoped that on-going cooperation on the trans-boundary Silk Roads and petroglyph nomination files would also be successful.

FOURTH DAY – FRIDAY, 26 JUNE 2009

NINTH MEETING

8.00 p.m. – 11.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N120)

The **Secretariat** underlined that the State Party had not submitted a State of Conservation Report.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked the State Party for updated results on the development of the resort in the property.

The **Chairperson** requested an intervention from the State Party, but there was no Delegate from the State Party present.

Paragraphs 1 to 7 were adopted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.17** was adopted.

East Rennell (Solomon Islands)

The **Secretariat** stated that there was no new information to add and that the State Party had not submitted a State of Conservation Report.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that, based on the information provided, positive progress would be made.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.19** was adopted as amended.

ASIA-PACIFIC

State of Conservation Reports for the Asia-pacific Region to be adopted without discussion.

The **Secretariat** read out the State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

12. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798);
13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337);
16. Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) (1013);
18. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653);
20. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 b).

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

The **Secretariat** noted that a proposal had been made in 2008 to extend the property, but that this had been withdrawn by the State Party despite positive comments from IUCN. It highlighted that there were major problems associated with ski facilities and the extension of tourism zones. These issues would need to be assessed by IUCN as a part of its evaluation mission for the extension of the property. Moreover, a State of Conservation Report had been requested from the State Party on the current extent of the property.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked why the current status could not be assessed, referring to paragraph 2 on page 60 of the Report by IUCN.

In reply, **IUCN** stressed that further development activity was needed and underlined the challenges involved in assessing the property at a distance. IUCN also agreed that a mission should be prepared with a view to evaluating the proposed extension of the property. The Decision was currently paralyzed in the light of other additional threats. It concluded by saying that there was a need for verification on the ground.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that if these threats were preventing a Decision from being made, the Site should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Secretariat** reiterated that an exchange of information had taken place between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party. It believed that an IUCN evaluation of the extension of the property had been proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 21** was adopted as amended

Waterton Glacier International Peace Park (Canada and the United States of America) (N 354 Rev)

The **Secretariat** presented the Report, underlining that new information had been provided by Canada in May 2009. This contained detailed information on the current conservation issues raised in the State of Conservation Report. Canada had said that currently no mining or oil and gas production was taking place in the Canadian part of the property, and hence there had been no impact from this on the property. The Government of British Columbia recognized that the region was a special place, and it was committed to sustainable and environmentally responsible development. Finally, various initiatives had been taken in the property relating to fire management, land management, water quality and the restoration of the ecosystem.

The **Chairperson** asked for the new Draft Decision proposed by Australia to be put on the screen.

The Delegation of **Australia** underlined that the presentation of the Decision was a positive development, and that it included a request that the two States Parties concerned should organize an evaluation mission to the property.

The **Chairperson** called for the modification of the Decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed first evaluating the Decision, and it asked IUCN to confirm that responsible development was taking place in the property.

IUCN clarified that this was proposed development and not actual development. It said that the Committee should ensure that the Decision protected the property from external impacts.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked the Delegations of Canada and the United States of America to comment.

The Delegation of **Canada** underlined the fact that the State of Conservation Report was incomplete and that it had been carried out in the interests of maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It assured the Committee that no coal mining or gas extraction was taking place in the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed to its bilateral relationship with Canada in the protection of the Site's Outstanding Universal Value, and it requested that a mission be organized as an appropriate strategy to assess the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its satisfaction with a possible joint mission, which would help to ensure that the property was well protected.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.22** was adopted as amended.

Laurisilva of Madeira (Portugal) (N 934)

The **Secretariat** presented the Report.

The Delegation of **Spain** wanted to know whether the cable-car work had taken place, since if it had not then Israel's amendment was not relevant.

IUCN said that it was unable to confirm precise dates.

The Delegation of **Portugal** confirmed that the work had not started.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to delete the highlighted text in the light of the comments made by Portugal.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed to the deletion.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.25** was adopted as amended.

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

The **Secretariat** presented the Report.

The Delegation of **Sweden** recommended that a Reactive Monitoring Mission be sent to the property in 2010 instead of 2011.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the proposal made by Sweden. It expressed its concern at varying reports regarding issues of cooperation with the local communities, and it proposed deleting paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

Paragraph 3 was adopted with the amendment by Israel.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the State Party for its efforts to minimize intervention at the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted the disparity between the French and English texts, and underlined that the French text stressed ceasing all illegal activity.

IUCN remarked on illegal activity at the property and associated photographic evidence.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested adding to the amendment to paragraph 4 the words "buffer zone".

The **Chairperson** agreed to delete the words "within or around the property".

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the proposal made by Kenya.

Paragraph 10 was adopted with the Amendments by Sweden, Israel and Kenya were made to Paragraph 10.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 29** was adopted as amended

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N719)

The **Secretariat** presented the Report.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked the State Party if any formal decision has been made regarding gold mining.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that no decision had been made by the Russian Government.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested clarification of the proposal for a Reactive Monitoring Mission to be undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

IUCN pointed out that there were alternative ways of evaluating the property aside from carrying out a mission if elements were still being considered for approval.

The Delegation of **Canada** withdrew its proposed amendment based on the previous comments.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed the addition of the words: "could be taken".

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested the insertion of the words, "might be contemplated".

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed the words, "possibility of creating an enclave" and "requests the State Party not to proceed with development".

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that if the Committee agreed to paragraph 3, then paragraph 4 could not remain as it was. It proposed amendments according to the changes to paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed deleting the second half of paragraph 5 making reference to mining concessions.

Canada withdrew its amendment as a result of the State Party's input.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 31** was adopted as amended.

State of Conservation Reports for the Europe and North America region to be adopted without discussion.

The **Secretariat** read out the State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

23. Ilulissat Icefjord (Denmark) (N 1149)

24. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)

26. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

27. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)

28. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

30. Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)

32. Gough and Inaccessible Islands (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 740)

The Draft Decisions related the sites mentioned above were adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Belize Barrier Reef (N764)

The **Secretariat** said that the property had been proposed for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger last year, following the pressing demand for land due to tourism development. The Secretariat said that the sale and lease of public land was continuing, and that there had been extensive damage to the marine ecosystem. The Secretariat said that the moratorium declared in November 2008 had expired, and that there had been little appropriate coordination between the bodies in charge of the property, these being the Land Department responsible for the lease or sale of property, the Mining Department responsible for dredging permits, the Forestry Department responsible for the management of the national park and mangroves and the Fisheries Department responsible for the management of the marine reserve. The Secretariat added that there was a lack of transparency regarding property ownership and that co-management of protected areas was common practice in Belize, where NGOs were given full authority to manage sites and raise funds through tourism, thus encouraging them to undertake development. Concessions had been awarded for oil, gas and fisheries, and the Site had no clear boundaries. He concluded by saying that there had been an evident loss of Outstanding Universal Value and that corrective measures needed to be taken.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members for their comments.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that this was an ugly case of disregard and that the State Party had not communicated with the World Heritage Centre. It supported putting the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to the comments made by the United States of America on the time scale for evaluating Outstanding Universal Value and the one-and-a-half year cycle. It said that the team had worked on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but that it had sent it too late for it to be evaluated. It considered it impossible to discuss the property in the absence of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and requested comments from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said the Report had caused significant concern and that Barbados had provided the Committee with guarantees in relation to the conservation of properties in the Caribbean. It approved putting the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in order to see how things evolved. In answer to Nigeria, it said that recent changes in the Government in Belize had not helped the conservation of the Site, and that it would not support the State Party if Outstanding Universal Value was lost.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to respond, but no representative was present.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the case illustrated the interaction between development and conservation and argued that high land prices in Belize were due to tourism. It asked the State Party to confirm what had been said. If this turned out to be true, then in its view the political elite in Belize had disregarded the Convention. It wondered if action by the Committee could help with land protection, or if this would accelerate the degradation and sale of land.

The **Secretariat** said that the Mission Report had been sent to the State Party, indicating the possibility of placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and the Report had also been mentioned to the State Party's Delegation to UNESCO in Paris. However, no feedback had been received.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to read out the articles of the Operational Guidelines referring to In-Danger Listing.

The **Secretariat** read out Articles 183 and 186 of the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its agreement with the procedure and said it would propose the following amendment:

“notes the information received and the report of the World Heritage Centre” be added before “decides to inscribe”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for a vote by show of hands.

The **Chairperson** said that the paragraph had first to be redrafted. She would then ask for consensus on a vote.

IUCN said that the information provided in the Report had been provided following a joint IUCN-World Heritage Centre Report.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to add “IUCN” in paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it was not referring to the mission but to the additional information provided by the Secretariat, and it proposed adding the words, “notes the information received from the monitoring mission and the report of the World Heritage Centre and decides...”.

The Draft Decision **33COM 7A.32** was adopted as amended

Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N1083)

The **Secretariat** informed that the State Party had initiated a review and assessment process to evaluate threats to the property

Despite increased control and surveillance, the relocation of some communities and the assessment of the illegal timber trade, impacts had occurred. In view of the lack of funding, high timber prices, the lack of alternative productive activities for local communities and poor institutional coordination, the State Party had asked for the property to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This was intended to help address problems including the timber trade, illegal logging camps and settlements, and the hunting of wildlife species.

By inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the State Party hoped to draw the attention of the international community to the challenges faced by the Site. The Secretariat added that IUCN and the World Heritage Centre had noted that this was an appropriate use of In-Danger Listing and was in the spirit of the Convention. The

State Party had submitted an International Assistance Request, in order to assist it with capacity-building, control and surveillance and the establishment of a field rangers station to monitor the source of illegal logging. The Secretariat announced that the Request had been approved and would be sent to the Chairperson for approval, the amount requested being 30,000 USD.

The **Chairperson** said the State Party had requested that the Site be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and announced that the Ambassador of Columbia was present.

The Delegation of **Canada** commended the State Party's use of In-Danger Listing as a way of receiving assistance and not as a sanction. It announced that it was presenting an amendment to the Decision in order to recognize this.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with Canada, saying that In-Danger Listing was a "carrot" and not a "stick".

The Delegation of **Cuba** thanked IUCN and the World Heritage Centre for their presentations. It reminded the Committee that the Draft Decision and the State of Conservation Report referred to a further Reactive Monitoring Mission that had taken place in 2000 and that the Site had been facing conservation problems since its inscription in 1994. Since the Site was in a conflict zone, the Delegation asked if a mission could be safely carried out.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments made by Canada and the United States of America, and it proposed that harmonization take place between this Site and another one in Panama.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, thanking the Chairperson for her work and the host country for its generous hospitality, said that it wished to make a short statement and to answer Cuba. It said that the Colombian Government had always benefited from the support of the Committee, for which it was grateful, and it stressed that the In-Danger Listing of the Site would help the Government raise awareness in the international community about the difficulties this Site was facing. As the Delegation of the United States had already mentioned, In-Danger Listing should not be interpreted as a sanction. Referring in particular to paragraph 7 of the Convention, the Delegation of Colombia stressed that the Colombian authorities fully shared the spirit of the Convention, and that assistance was needed in order to mitigate threats to the Site. In-Danger Listing would help preserve one of the most important ecosystems in the region, and it would enable the Colombian Government to further develop regional cooperation, as the Los Katios National Park was situated close to Panama and to another national park also inscribed on the World Heritage List. Answering Cuba, it assured the Committee that the security situation had tremendously improved, and that a mission could be carried out safely.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked if the In-Danger Listing was justified

The Delegation of **Israel** asked IUCN to reply.

IUCN proposed to move forward with the discussion on the In-Danger Listing.

An amendment to paragraph 4 was proposed by Canada and Australia that added the words, "and appreciate that the State Party recognizes inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a mechanism to promote international collaboration in support of the property". An amendment to paragraph 6 that removed the words, "including the conditions of integrity" and an amendment to the wording by the United States of America were also proposed.

The Chairperson invited the **Secretariat** to present the Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A. 34** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that a Member of the Committee had asked for this Report to be discussed, but no new information had been received other than that contained in the State of Conservation Report. This was based on the reports submitted by the two States Parties in February and March 2009.

The Delegation of **Spain** reminded the Committee that whereas IUCN Report had stressed the efforts made by Costa Rica to ensure the conservation of the property, this was not reflected in the State of Conservation Report that had been submitted to the Committee. The Delegation of Spain therefore submitted an amendment, together with the Delegation of Cuba, which expressed the efforts made by Costa Rica.

An amendment to paragraph 3 commending the efforts of the State Party of Costa Rica, and an amendment to paragraph 6 removing the words, "including the conditions of integrity" were proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7A. 35** was adopted as amended in light of the debate.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

The **Secretariat** announced that the State Party had not submitted a Report and that no information was available other than that in the State of Conservation Report. However, he said that reports from other sources had been received, indicating that agricultural land was impinging onto the property and that illegal logging had spurred deforestation within the property. The latter process had, however, now been reversed, and a new forestry authority and forestry law were expected (reported by Global Witness in January 2009).

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if there was a case for the Site to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN said that it had no information on which to assess the situation and proposed that a mission be added to the Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that since the property had been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for some time, it proposed inserting the World Heritage Centre's standard text for sites included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Secretariat** wondered if this would be consistent with the rest of the Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it would like a mission to be organized.

The **Chairperson** said that if stronger language were to be used, proposing the Site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, then this would be up to the Committee to draft by adding to paragraph 4 the words, "with the view to considering the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger".

The Delegation of **Australia** supported Israel in view of the absence of a Report from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** asked IUCN and the Secretariat for their opinion on the amendment to paragraph 4.

IUCN replied that more information was needed from the State Party and that once this information had been received the Committee would be in a position to decide if a mission was appropriate.

The Draft Decision **33COM7B.37** was adopted as amended. .

AFRICA

Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya) (N800)

The **Secretariat** said that this item was open for discussion as the State Party had not submitted a Report until very recently and the Decision needed to be changed to reflect this. The Secretariat informed the Committee that a joint UNESCO-IUCN mission had visited the Site in October 2008 and noted that the Site's management authorities were addressing most of the concerns of the World Heritage Committee. As the Site was experiencing the impacts of global climate change, with glaciers receding on Mt. Kenya, he said that the mission had recommended the extension of the property to include as much as possible of the lower-lying undisturbed natural forest, which would increase the resilience of the ecosystem to climate-change impacts. The Secretariat added that the property had been cited in the document on black carbon as a Site threatened by glacial melting.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** commended the efforts of the Kenyan authorities and drew attention to the challenges presented by climate change. It asked that the Decision reflect these.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed an amendment to paragraph 3, inserting the words, "noting the on-going efforts of the State Party to restore the functioning of the wetlands and to support birdlife, and urging the local and global community to assist in the improvement of the sustainable management of the property".

The **Secretariat** noted that Nigeria had confused this Report with the one on the Djoudj National Park discussed previously, which had wetlands, and therefore the Delegation of **Nigeria** withdrew its amendment.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande à l'Etat partie de préciser les prérogatives de la Direction de la Faune et de celle des Forêts. Elle se demande si celles-ci ne pourraient pas se chevaucher, et par là même affecter la protection du bien.

La Délégation de **Madagascar**, se référant au paragraphe 5 et notant qu'il est demandé à l'Etat partie de réaliser un grand nombre de travaux, demande à ce dernier de préciser si ces activités sont réalisables.

The Delegation of **Kenya** apologized for the late submission of the Report, which had been mailed to the wrong address. It explained that with reference to paragraph 5b, a Memorandum of Understanding existed between the Kenya Wildlife Service and the

Kenya Forest Service, both sections of the same ministry, and that the property was both a nature reserve and a wildlife reserve.

An amendment by Barbados and Israel deleting from paragraph 6 the words, “adoption and mitigation” and adding “other environmental phenomena” after “climate change” was proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.3** was adopted as amended

Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N1162)

The **Secretariat** said that the proclamation of the Site as a Heritage Site under the National World Heritage Act of 1999 had not yet been completed, and that the 2007 Integrated Management Plan of the property was under review and was expected to be approved by the minister in April 2009. The Secretariat said that a management team of seven had been put in place and staff appointed and that a multi-stakeholder steering committee had been established. The Secretariat added that the Environment Conservation Act of 1989 governed the property. A recent audit had found that almost all development undertaken at the property had been illegal and that this was having irreversible impacts on the environment and should cease immediately.

The **Secretariat** indicated finally that the non-proclaimed status of the property, and the fact that 99% of the land was privately owned, made it difficult to ensure compliance. The State Party had proposed modifying the boundaries of the buffer zone in order to align it better with cadastral lines, which would require the approval of the Committee. It had also informed landowners in the two provinces that if the situation continued unabated, it could be forced to recommend deletion of the property from the World Heritage List. Even at the time of the Site’s inscription, pollution of the Vaal River (straddled by the Site) was noted as a concern, and the situation continued to be serious, although efforts were being made to address the problem. The stakeholders had requested that the State Party invite a World Heritage Centre-IUCN mission to visit the property in order to assess the impact of the developments on its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its concern over the illegal activities undertaken by the Agriculture Authority and noted that all requirements had been met at the time of inscription. It asked if the State Party considered that placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger would assist it.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that it wished to be given the opportunity to address the issue and to develop legal tools before considering In-Danger Listing and that it was in the process of developing regulations with the involvement of stakeholders.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with Canada in acknowledging the seriousness of the issue and said that the State Party was doing what it could to remedy the situation. It announced an amendment to the Decision that it hoped would assist the State Party in its efforts.

An amendment by **Israel** to paragraph 6 adding the words, “clearly define the legal boundaries” and an amendment by **Kenya**, supported by **Nigeria** and **Egypt**, to postpone the report from the State Party until 2011 in order to allow adequate time for negotiations with landowners on the property were proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.5** was adopted as amended.

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania)

The **Secretariat** reported on the joint World Heritage Centre-IUCN mission of November 2009, noting that while the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was being maintained there were concerns over management. The Secretariat said that a uranium exploration concession on the Site's southern boundary covered some 75 sq. km of the property, which contradicted the policy of forbidding mining within World Heritage Sites.

The **Secretariat** reported on a decision made by the State Party to award two oil and gas exploration concessions covering the entire property, but said that the management authority had not yet given permission to start the exploration activities. He also mentioned the proposal to build the Kidunda Dam to supply water to Dar-es-Salaam, which would permanently flood about 2 sq. km of the property. Finally, the Secretariat said that the lack of funding was the most important challenge facing the property, because of its effects on management, human resources, equipment and infrastructure. The Secretariat said that the revenue retention scheme, in operation from 1994 to 2004 and benefitting from 50% of the revenues of hunting and 100% of the revenues of photographic tourism, had been discontinued, leading to resource shortages at a time when management challenges were growing.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its concern and invited the Committee to consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, given the mining activities and the presence of a dam within the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** also expressed its concern in the light of recent developments and asked the State Party to explain.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** said that mining activities at the Site had been limited to the prospecting phase within the framework of a national project aimed at identifying national resources. No further decision had been taken in this regard, and it said that the World Heritage Committee would be informed should any decision be taken. It said that only a feasibility study had been carried out with regard to the possibility of supplying water from the Site to Dar-es-Salam, and that the dam was envisaged outside the property. Its size was much smaller than what had first been planned, being 25 to 30 sq. km instead of 45 sq. km. Tanzania envisaged establishing a Conservation Authority for the Site like the one that it had established in Ngorongoro, and this would have increased human resources and a strategy to address poaching.

An amendment by **Kenya** to add a new paragraph 11, "Appreciates the State Party's efforts in improving the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value based on the proposal developed by the 2008 Monitoring Mission for its examination by the Committee at its 34th session in 2010", was proposed with the understanding that this was suggested without the previously proposed amendment to paragraph 13 by the Delegation of Canada: "with a possible inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger"; the Delegation of Kenya arguing that it would be better to wait for the State Party's mission report and to avoid using In-Danger Listing as a punishment.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.8** was adopted as amended.

State of Conservation Reports for the Africa region to be adopted without discussion.

The **Secretariat** read out the State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroun) (N 407)
2. Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)
4. Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)
6. Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev)
7. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)
9. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)
10. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)
147. Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

The Draft Decisions related the sites mentioned above were adopted.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY, 27 JUNE 2009

TENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 2.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEMS 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continuation)

8A: Tentative Lists Submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2009, in Conformity with the Operational Guidelines

8B: Nominations to the World Heritage List

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the latest edition of the *International Herald Tribune* was being distributed outside the room and mentioned a partnership agreement with a Swiss watchmaker on Marine World Heritage.

The **Chairperson** made an announcement concerning time management for the session, which would cover Item 8B during the day and Item 7B in the evening session. She also put forward for consideration the proposal that the Committee look carefully at the Draft Decisions in advance and only introduce major amendments, not small, “*ad hoc*” changes.

Extension of Properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Mehrgarh, Rehman Dheri and Harappa as an extension to the Indus Valley Civilization Sites
Id. N°	138 Bis
State Party	Pakistan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)

ICOMOS presented the extension and noted that it was a serial nomination of three Sites that bore witness to the development of the Indus Valley Civilization.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that the Sites proposed for inscription as an extension of the World Heritage property were very important not only at the local level, but also for the Arabian Peninsula, the Indian Subcontinent and Iran. It proposed that the floor be given to the State Party to explain the measures it was taking in order to protect this Site and to establish a Management Plan for it.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested information from ICOMOS on links with other properties.

ICOMOS stated that Harappa could be considered as an extension to the Mohenjodaro Site, if there was consolidation and enhanced management.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether there was coordinated management between the existing Sites and the proposed extension.

ICOMOS noted that the management was not coordinated. Little information had been included in the nomination dossier and what there was was incomplete.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.17** was adopted.

EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

New Nominations

Property	The Architectural and Urban Work of Le Corbusier
Id. N°	1321
State Party	Argentina / Belgium / France / Germany / Japan / Switzerland
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the nomination, which had been made by six States Parties on three continents and was intended to exemplify the work of Le Corbusier and the development of his work over time. Sites ranging from single buildings to larger housing projects and town-planning designs were included.

La Délégation de la **République de Corée** félicite les six Etats parties pour leur initiative de proposer cette inscription d'un bien en série, qui pourrait servir de référence aux autres Etats. La Délégation se dit persuadée que ce bien possède une Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, en tant qu'oeuvre d'art de Le Corbusier, grand maître des temps modernes, et mérite donc d'être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Concernant les biens en série, l'un des points importants à assurer est la mise en place d'un Plan de conservation et de gestion coordonnée par les Etats Parties impliqués. La

Délégation propose de donner la parole à l'un des Etats parties concernés pour entendre des explications sur les mécanismes mis en place.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne qu'il est incontestable que Le Corbusier occupe une place privilégiée, non seulement en tant qu'architecte, mais aussi théoricien, écrivain, créateur qui proclame l'universalité des solutions proposées par le Mouvement moderniste qui a marqué le monde entier. Elle souligne également que cette proposition d'inscription correspond aux recommandations de l'ICOMOS et du Comité concernant les biens en série et transnationaux. La Délégation déclare que la proposition d'inscription est consacrée aux sites, et non pas seulement à une personne. Il s'agit de l'influence d'une œuvre dans son contexte historique, culturel, économique. La proposition d'inscription rend compte du Mouvement Moderniste et de son évolution. La Délégation cite le paragraphe 137 des *Orientations* : «Les biens en série peuvent inclure des éléments constitutifs reliés entre eux [...] à condition que la série dans son ensemble – et non nécessairement ses différentes parties – ait une valeur universelle exceptionnelle». Concernant la gestion, la Délégation se réfère aux paragraphes 114 et 135 des *Orientations*, concernant la gestion de l'ensemble d'un bien par les parties concernées, qui doivent coopérer entre elles et assurer la circulation de l'information. La Délégation propose de reconnaître, dès à présent, la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle en l'inscrivant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et précise que par la suite d'autres pays pourraient, s'ils le souhaitent, proposer leur site dans le cadre de ce bien en série.

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that Le Corbusier had made an outstanding contribution to the development of architecture from many points of view. It therefore disagreed with many of the points made by ICOMOS. Barbados would have preferred to see each Site in the nomination clearly defined with a buffer zone. It was encouraging to see States Parties coming together in making this nomination, but it would like to have seen recognition of the body of work rather than of the individual architect.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that it had been privileged enough to have visited some of the Sites. It was surprised to see the criteria that ICOMOS had used, since although these were justified they did not take all the Sites into account. Some of the work was clearly work of genius that was important for the Convention. Moreover, there was a link between the Sites and the philosophy behind them: things were not as simple as the Report by ICOMOS had indicated. One should not only recognize the architect, but also his work. The Delegation had also been surprised to see issues of integrity raised, as in many cases the Sites were quite sound in terms of integrity. A Decision that could be fully justified was required.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite les pays qui ont préparé cette proposition d'inscription originale. Elle rappelle qu'à sa session précédente le Comité a examiné l'œuvre d'un autre génie, Vauban, et exprime sa reconnaissance à la France d'avoir donné au monde ces deux génies. La Délégation compare le bien en série proposé à un collier confectionné par un bijoutier talentueux, qui a conçu des éléments qui se complètent dans leur différence. L'œuvre de l'architecte relève à la fois du profane et du sacré, et chaque édifice possède sa personnalité. En conclusion, la Délégation propose le renvoi à l'Etat partie pour lui permettre de répondre aux questions matérielles et techniques.

The Delegation of **Spain** recalled the strategy to encourage serial nominations and drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the proposed nomination was not only

serial, but also transnational and even transcontinental in character. While the Delegation wished to pay tribute to the work of ICOMOS, it requested that ICOMOS provide clarifications on whether different experts from the organization had been involved in the evaluation process and whether all elements had been subject to review. It further regretted that ICOMOS had used the same parameters to evaluate various types of properties. Finally, it recalled that the World Heritage List also included the works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain).

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of France (Observer) to answer on behalf of the group of States Parties in two minutes.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) indique s'exprimer au nom des six Etats parties signataires de la proposition d'inscription. En réponse à la question concernant le Plan de gestion, elle précise qu'un mécanisme de gestion transnational a déjà été adopté par les six Etats parties, sous le nom de « Conférence internationale ». Par ailleurs, la Fondation Le Corbusier, qui existe depuis plus de quarante ans, assure le suivi des tous les édifices de Le Corbusier dans le monde, qu'ils soient protégés ou non par une législation nationale, et apporte appui et conseil en vue de leur conservation. Par ailleurs, dans chaque pays la gestion des biens est assurée et fait l'objet de plans et de systèmes adéquats, avec la participation des institutions et des communautés locales. En réponse à la question concernant la sélection des sites, la Délégation précise que la sélection suit les grandes catégories du Mouvement moderne : la résidence-atelier, la maison individuelle, la maison standardisée, l'immeuble collectif, l'architecture sacrée, l'urbanisme et les grands équipements. Dans chaque catégorie, la sélection a retenu les réalisations pionnières, les prototypes ou les édifices les plus représentatifs. Le bien constitue un ensemble, conformément au paragraphe 137 des *Orientations* et représente l'expression d'un contexte historico-culturel.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the intervention by the Delegation of Morocco.

La Délégation du **Madagascar** s'associe à l'intervention du Maroc Maroc. Elle indique qu'il s'agit ici d'une inscription en série avec des biens multiétatiques, géographiquement dispersés. C'est ici le génie humain du bâti qui doit guider, et non pas l'architecte lui-même.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that this nomination had adopted a global approach, which was very important. However, the nomination could be better defined and justified, which would bring out its global significance. Three Sites could not be taken to represent the entire architect's work. It explained that it had compared the case of Le Corbusier to that of Frank Lloyd Wright. It disagreed with ICOMOS in particular on issues of geo-cultural context not being defined for serial properties in the Operational Guidelines – sites could be linked together as a historical cultural grouping regardless of where they were. It stressed that the series as a whole must have Outstanding Universal Value, but the sites brought together in the series need not have the same integrity. Extensions were permitted and were in many cases specifically encouraged by the Committee. The Delegation supported deferral and proposed a more limited series.

The Delegation of **Cuba** congratulated the States Parties on their preparation of this nomination. The proposed Sites demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value and paid tribute to the work of Le Corbusier. It recognized that ICOMOS had been faced with

major challenges in assessing this nomination. However, there were precedents for nominations linked to the work of architects whose work was of outstanding importance to humanity as a whole. The Delegation requested ICOMOS to clarify its recommendations as the evaluation had first indicated that the nomination was based on the Sites' importance for urban planning and for value of the buildings within them, but it continued by saying that Sites should be selected in terms of individual buildings. The Delegation asked for clarification.

ICOMOS noted that five experts had visited all the Sites and 10 desk reviews had been carried out in four regions of the world. In terms of integrity, it should be noted that this should be appraised in terms of how far site attributes reflected Outstanding Universal Value. In its view, not enough of the architect's urban work had been included to justify the title proposed.

The Delegation of **China** said that it was an interesting nomination, but it was one that should be referred. An in-depth comparative analysis of the four modern architectural schools was required.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that this was one of four serial nominations this year, and it reiterated its request for detailed guidelines to be obtained for States Parties. Sweden congratulated the States Parties on their work on the nomination, and it wanted to see this nomination join the World Heritage List. The nomination showed how the work of the architect had developed, but it had less to say on the movement of which he had been a part. Outstanding Universal Value had not been demonstrated for the whole series, but Outstanding Universal Value was nevertheless present. The nomination would take time to evaluate and required deferral.

The Delegation of **Egypt** had carefully studied ICOMOS's evaluation and indicated its agreement with the majority of the views that had been expressed, notably those of Barbados and Spain.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that it was committed to the protection of modern heritage. There was a series of major issues here, including serial nominations and work that was spread out across the world. It was a slippery road that the Committee was going down in considering the work of architects such as Gaudi, Wright and others. The issue required greater reflection. Israel supported the nomination, but it had two questions. Would the States Parties agree to only three works being listed, and if not, would they agree to more works? Finally, the Delegation raised the issues of *typos*, *topos* and *chronos*, or typology, place and period. How could these things be included in a serial nomination? The Delegation supported the spirit of the nomination and thanked ICOMOS for its detailed evaluation.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) rappelle que la série proposée reflète la complexité du mouvement moderne qui n'est que l'expression de la mondialisation qui par la suite s'étend dans d'autres expressions culturelles artistiques. Ce mouvement moderne cherche à répondre de façon intégrée au besoin de l'homme du XXe siècle : notamment travailler, habiter, se déplacer, prier. L'apport de Le Corbusier ne peut pas se réduire à des monuments individuels - aussi exceptionnels qu'ils soient - car c'est la série seule qui rend compte de ces tentatives du mouvement moderne d'intégrer une série de nouvelles préoccupations de la société moderne.

The Delegation of **Spain** questioned the fact that five people had been involved in the evaluation of the 22 Sites, as this had made it more difficult to get an overview of the nomination and capture its overall spirit. The authors of the five reports were not present. It said that there was a need to establish a clear process for assessing and presenting serial nominations.

The Delegation of **Canada** considered this to be a high-quality nomination, and it thanked ICOMOS for its work. It supported comments made by Sweden and the United States of America. Did the Sites speak for themselves, it asked, or was Le Corbusier the essential link? There were serious issues around serial nominations that should be resolved for the benefit of all States Parties.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the ICOMOS evaluation had been well done. It supported comments made by the United States of America, Canada, Barbados and others, but asked what the Outstanding Universal Value of the Sites was, and whether this should be seen in terms of the architect's influence, rather than in terms of the work itself. It supported deferral.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the States Parties on the excellent work that had been done, and shared the view expressed by other speakers that nominations were about properties and not individuals. It proposed referral and said that the link between the individual buildings and the town-planning of which they were a part should be emphasized.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were differing opinions and asked whether the Committee could come to an agreement.

The Delegation of **Barbados** proposed the holding of a secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that this was premature, as there were four points in the Draft Decision, which it asked to see.

The **Chairperson** clarified procedures and said that the last proposal was to inscribe the Sites.

The Delegation of **Peru** asked whether the Rapporteur had a proposal.

The **Chairperson** clarified that there had been a request to come to a vote, which needed a second request before it could be acted upon, and that there were also several amendments.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that if there were to be a vote, it would support a secret ballot, as had been proposed by Barbados.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested clarification as to whether the debate was open, or whether there would be a vote.

The **Chairperson** referred to the Rules of Procedure and said that the Committee needed to come to a vote, which it would also need to do for each proposal, whether inscription, referral, or deferral.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether there were any amendments. The Chairperson said that there were amendments for each of the three options mentioned. The Delegation asked to see the text on the screen.

The **Chairperson** noted that this was possible, but pointed out that if the Committee voted for inscription it could not then support referral or deferral. She requested that the Rapporteur read the amendments, so that they could be translated onto the screen.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by Morocco in French, which was to inscribe the Site.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were other speakers and mentioned that the Committee was divided. Five Members supported inscription, five supported referral, and five supported deferral.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** appuie la proposition du vote.

The **Chairperson** noted that there had been two requests for a vote, and Barbados agreed with Cuba on the desirability of a secret ballot.

The discussion on this Item was suspended in order to prepare the ballots for the vote.

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

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

The **Chairperson** indicated that there was a consensus on the Decision 33COM7A.18 and proposed to adopt it without discussion.

The Draft Decision **33COM7A.18** was adopted.

ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF 15 APRIL 2009, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

The Committee took note of the Tentative Lists as contained in Annex 2 and 3 of the Working Document.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

The Architectural and Urban Work of Le Corbusier (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the ballots were ready for voting to take place and requested two proposals for tellers, which were then proposed by Madagascar and Australia.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the procedure continue.

The **Chairperson** called for the vote on the first item, inscription, and asked the Secretariat to call the Delegations.

The **Secretariat** called the Delegations in English and in alphabetical order.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee of the results of the vote. There were 21 valid votes. The majority required was 14, and there were six votes in favour and 15 against. The amendment had therefore been rejected. She asked the Committee whether there was a consensus for referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed that the nomination be referred.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the proposal from Kenya and proposed referral.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** appuie le renvoi du dossier de nomination.

The Delegation of **China**, seconded by the Delegations of **Morocco**, **Madagascar**, the **Republic of Korea**, **Brazil**, **Egypt** and **Cuba**, stated that it supported referral for this nomination.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that if referral was going to take place, then a revised Draft Decision was necessary.

The **Chairperson** proposed examining the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 was adopted. An amendment was proposed by the Delegation of Peru to Paragraph 1 to refer the property back to the State Party, using the standard language for such cases.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed two new paragraphs that would imply minor editing to the main heading of the current paragraph 2.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Australia if it could redraft its two new paragraphs, in order to make them sub-paragraphs of paragraph 2 and adapt the language according to the way Decisions to refer properties back to States Parties were usually worded. She then asked the Committee if it could agree to the main heading of paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 was adopted. With regard to the new additions to paragraph 2 proposed by the Delegation of Australia, and with the intention of ensuring consistency,

the Chairperson wondered if the text previously suggested by the Delegation of Peru should not have been deleted at this point.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for the proposal by the Delegation of Australia to be read out first.

The **Rapporteur** read out the first of the new paragraphs proposed by the Delegation of Australia, together with its two sub-paragraphs suggesting that the State Party be invited to reconsider the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, improve the delineation of its boundaries and put in place an adequate management system.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if this new material was intended to replace the previous sub-paragraphs of paragraph 2, and this was confirmed by the Delegation of **Australia**.

ICOMOS explained that referral would leave little time to consider what in essence was a new nomination and that a mission would not be possible. In particular, it would be impossible to consider possible additions to the proposed serial property. However, a revised nomination that contained fewer sites would be possible to evaluate.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the last of its proposed amendments addressed ICOMOS's concern.

The **Rapporteur** read out the new paragraph 5, according to which the Committee would consider that a revised nomination need not include all 22 component parts of the original proposal, but that any additional component part would require a new nomination.

The Delegation of **Israel**, seconded by the Delegation of **Barbados**, supported the proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Australia if it agreed to turn its two proposed amendments into sub-paragraphs of paragraph 2, which would require some adjustment to their wording, and asked for the deletion of the original sub-paragraphs.

La Délégation du **Maroc** comprend les soucis de la Délégation de l'Australie mais pense que le réexamen de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle demanderait un temps excessif. La Délégation explique qu'il s'agit bien de démontrer l'influence de l'œuvre de Le Corbusier sur l'architecture du 20e siècle.

In response to the comment made by the Delegation of Morocco, the **Chairperson** suggested that instead of using the words "examining the Outstanding Universal Value", the paragraph could speak of "strengthening the justification to demonstrate the influence", which was agreed to by the Delegation of **Australia**.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that it would be better to leave in a reference to the Outstanding Universal Value. It further noted that it might be useful to remind the State Party that it could wait three years before again presenting this nomination and that it was important to take the time necessary to address the concerns expressed by ICOMOS.

The **Rapporteur** read out the next amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Bahrain** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that the new paragraph 3, as amended by the Delegation of Morocco, might create confusion. It suggested deleting the words “including by focusing” until the end of the paragraph, and possibly including what was left in the current paragraph 4.

La Délégation du **Maroc** exprime son accord avec la proposition de la Délégation de l’Israel.

The **Chairperson** said that paragraph 4 should be allowed to stand on its own.

The Delegation of **Israel** then proposed adding words to paragraph 3 from text that had previously been deleted.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.19** was adopted as amended.

Property	Stoclet House
Id. N°	1298
State Party	Belgium
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)

ICOMOS presented the nomination file and recommended inscription under criteria (i) and (ii).

The Delegation of **Israel** noted how pleased it was to be presented with another important nomination concerning a property from the 20th century, following that on the work of Le Corbusier. The Delegation was very supportive of the nomination, but had two questions to ask. The first concerned the fact that the property was a private house. Would the public be able to access and appreciate it? The second referred to the management arrangements that were in place, given that the Stoclet House was in private hands.

The Delegation of **Barbados** shared the concerns of the Delegation of Israel. As an art historian, the representative of the Delegation could appreciate the significance of the interior decoration and movable heritage contained in the property, which were part and parcel of its Outstanding Universal Value. However, he wondered how the public would be able to access these. The Delegation further noted that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should have given adequate consideration to the interrelationship of the property with the Secession Movement in Vienna.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'État partie pour cette proposition intéressante. Quant aux craintes exprimées par l'État partie d'Israël, la Délégation rappelle que le problème de l'accès se présente aussi sur d'autres sites du patrimoine mondial--par exemple dans le cas des bâtiments privés dans les centres historiques - et conclue que la question ne se pose donc pas.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the State Party on this strong nomination. It supported the views expressed by previous speakers that public access was very important and asked for clarifications on an alleged court case concerning the interiors of the property.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** welcomed the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List but regretted that the comparative analysis presented was to some extent incomplete and left out some important architectural works of the same period. On the question of public access, the Delegation noted that this was not a requirement under the Convention, whose goal was to protect heritage.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stressed the importance of involving communities in the conservation of cultural heritage and considered it desirable to ensure some degree of public access to the property.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) précise que le Palais était une maison privée depuis toujours, et ouverte au public de façon très limitée. L'Observateur explique que le Palais est un joyau et que son ouverture au à un large public aurait des lourdes conséquences pour sa conservation. Le propriétaire s'est engagé légalement à sa conservation depuis longtemps, et tous travaux de restauration respectaient les normes professionnelles. Il est classé depuis 1977 comme monument historique et depuis le décès de son propriétaire en 2002, il avait été classé encore parmi d'autres programmes protégeant aussi le mobilier, assurant ainsi sa conservation en perpétuité.

L'ICOMOS indique que le bien est fragile, contenant de nombreux objets de mobilier de propriété privée qui ne sont pas protégés dans le cadre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial. Une convention formelle entre la ville de Bruxelles et la fondation propriétaire du bien exige un engagement pour la conservation de l'intégrité et de l'authenticité du bien et de son contenu, par exemple, les travaux pour assurer l'étanchéité seront faits dans le respect des normes de conservation.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked for further clarifications on two points. According to the State Party, the last heir of the Stoclet family had passed away in 2002. At the same time, the State Party was apparently in charge of the management of the property. Could this apparent contradiction be explained? Secondly, and reacting to a statement made by ICOMOS that movable heritage was outside the scope of the World Heritage Convention, the Delegation pointed out that in this particular case the furniture and interiors of the Stoclet House were not separable from the whole, and that if there was no assurance that these elements were to be adequately protected, the Delegation would be hesitant to support inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

Se référant aux journées du patrimoine, courantes dans plusieurs pays de l'Europe, durant laquelle le patrimoine immobilier est ouvert au grand public, la Délégation du **Maroc** demande si cela se pratique en Belgique et si le bien pourrait être visité par le public durant ces journées spéciales.

The Delegation of **Canada** believed that ensuring public access to a cultural property was essential, since this was the way in which a constituency for conservation could be built.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to provide clarifications on the questions posed by the Delegation of Barbados.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) explique que les propriétaires actuels sont toujours les héritiers, mais qu'ils s'étaient fédérés en société. Le bien est géré en gardiennage, et même si l'idée est d'en élargir son accessibilité, cela ne passe pas nécessairement par son ouverture à un large public, soulignant que l'ensemble du bâtiment est protégé, pour les aspects mobiliers et immobiliers.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stressed again that public access to the property was not a requirement under the Convention, and it cited several examples of properties inscribed on the List as recently as at the previous session of the Committee, including in Spain itself, that were not accessible to the public.

The Delegation of **Spain** considered that the fundamental concerns expressed by Members of the Committee had been adequately addressed, noting that several properties on the World Heritage List were indeed not accessible to the public. It expressed its satisfaction with the nomination and requested that the Committee move to the Decision on the matter.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.21** was adopted.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur), au nom de tout le pays, du Gouvernement de la Région de Bruxelles Capitale et particulièrement de son Secrétaire d'Etat en charge des Monuments et Sites, Emir Kir qui a initié et appuyé la candidature du Palais Stoclet, remercie vivement le Comité, d'avoir accueilli favorablement le Palais Stoclet, œuvre majeure de l'architecte autrichien Joseph Hoffmann, parmi les biens inscrits sur la très convoitée liste du Patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO. En sa qualité d'institution responsable de la protection du bien devant la communauté internationale, la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale s'engage devant le Comité à mettre tout en œuvre pour maintenir l'intégrité de ce bien et veillera particulièrement à la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Comité.

La Délégation poursuit en expliquant que Le Palais Stoclet s'impose dans le paysage de l'architecture moderne comme une véritable icône de l'Art nouveau viennois. Il illustre à merveille le concept du « gesamtkunstwerk » ou l'intégration des arts à l'architecture, indissociable de l'Art nouveau dont le mouvement se développe à l'aube du 20^e siècle partout en Europe, et à Bruxelles en particulier sous l'influence de Victor Horta dont les habitations majeures figurent sur la liste du Patrimoine mondial depuis 2000. Œuvre témoignant d'un véritable échange de culture, le Palais Stoclet étonne tant par sa richesse, que par la qualité de sa mise en œuvre et ses formes géométriques qui annoncent le mouvement moderniste et reste encore aujourd'hui d'une frappante actualité. Si ce bien est arrivé jusqu'à nous pratiquement dans son état d'origine, c'est avant tout grâce à l'attention et au soin que lui ont conféré ses propriétaires, descendants de son commanditaire Adolphe Stoclet qui doit en être remercié.

Depuis plusieurs années, la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale s'est à son tour fortement engagée dans la préservation de ce bien. Les dernières années ont été cruciales dans ce travail, puisqu'en 2007, enfin, à l'initiative du Secrétaire d'Etat Emir Kir, le Palais a reçu la protection qui lui sied: une protection totale, jardin et meubles compris. La Délégation se déclare convaincue que la reconnaissance de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du Palais Stoclet par le Comité et son inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO contribueront également à garantir la préservation et la mise en valeur de ce joyau pour qu'il parvienne indemne aux générations futures.

La Délégation conclu en adressant ses plus sincères remerciements au Gouvernement Espagnol et à la ville de Séville qui accueillent le Comité et en particulier à Madame Mme María Jesús San Segundo, Présidente du Comité, à Monsieur Francesco Bandarin, Directeur du Centre du Patrimoine mondial et ses collaborateurs ainsi qu'à l'équipe de l'ICOMOS, qui a su évaluer avec justesse la situation du bien et réalise un excellent travail.

The **Chairperson** asked the vice-president of the Delegation of **Australia** to replace her in chairing the session.

Property	The Mercury and Silver Binomial on the <i>Intercontinental Camino Real</i>. Almadén, Idrija and San Luis Potosí
Id. N°	1313
State Party	Mexico / Slovenia / Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS presented the nomination and recommended that it be deferred.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated ICOMOS on its evaluation. It agreed that the nomination could be extended in the future, as ICOMOS had suggested, but considered that what had been proposed had Outstanding Universal value in its own right and should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation asked that the floor be given to the State Party of Mexico to provide clarifications on why the components that ICOMOS had suggested for inclusion in the nomination had been left out.

The **Chairperson** invited other Members of the Committee to intervene before the State Party of Mexico was asked to answer the question.

La Délégation du **Maroc** salue les États parties pour la nomination ainsi que l'ICOMOS pour le rapport, et pense que la proposition transcontinentale est digne d'intérêt, surtout en ce qui concerne les défis de gestion qui se présente dans un dossier transcontinental et transocéanique, expliquant que ce sera un thème de plus en plus important pour le

Comité. La Délégation demande l'avis des états parties qui ont soumis le dossier sur la question du changement de nom proposé par l'ICOMOS, et indique qu'elle appuierait son inscription.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked the Delegation of Mexico if it could envisage including the mines within the scope of the nomination. The Delegation also asked ICOMOS whether it believed that the Site of Potosi could be interpreted as representing another element within the larger phenomenon of silver and mercury mining, including the related administrative buildings.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site seemed apparent, according to the presentation made by ICOMOS. It wondered whether this nomination could not be accepted as a first inscription, with the possibility of future extensions at a later stage.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** strongly commended the States Parties on their initiative in presenting a trans-boundary and even transcontinental nomination. It requested a clarification from the State Party of Mexico, which, if the Delegation had understood it correctly, had included in its Tentative List a site named "Silver Road", recently submitted as a nomination for examination by the Committee at its next session in 2010. What was the relationship between this "Silver Road" nomination and the present proposal? Could the State Party also clarify whether Potosi was part of the nomination submitted for 2010?

The **Chairperson** noted that three types of questions had been asked: those concerning the nomination in general; those addressed to the State Party of Mexico; and those addressed to ICOMOS. It then asked which of the three States Parties concerned would like to answer the general questions.

The Delegation of **Spain** responded to the general questions. With regard to the proposed name change, it recognized that this was in line with the underlying intention of the nomination dossier, in other words with the three elements that it embraced, and it therefore had no objections. It explained that the three States Parties had created a coordination committee, both at the political and institutional level and at the technical level, adding that this technical committee had drawn up the nomination dossier. The committee had met four times and had signed memorandums of understanding with regard to the development of research and interpretation facilities for the nominated areas.

The Delegation of **Mexico** responded to the questions by indicating that the Operational Guidelines did not specify a clear procedure for the gradual inscription of a serial nomination over time and that therefore professional judgment was called for in this situation. It added that the City of San Luis Potosi incarnated, in its architectural heritage, the same mining activities that were referred to in the nomination, and that this was the only city on the Real de Minas Road that focused exclusively on mining. It explained that the option of proposing actual mines as part of the nomination file had been considered, but that this had been rejected as it would have resulted in too many components.

L'ICOMOS indique répond que la question de l'ambiguïté de la Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle est pleinement traitée dans son rapport. L'ICOMOS explique que malgré une certaine valeur urbaine et architecturale du 16^e au 18^e siècle évidente dans la ville de San Luis Potosi, ces attributs ne se rapportaient pas de façon très claire aux valeurs avancées par les États parties présentant la nomination. L'ICOMOS ajoute que les résultats sont insuffisants en tant que témoignage matériel de la proposition de Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle exprimée dans le dossier – et que pour cette ville, les attributs de valeur étaient surtout un témoignage historique sans connexion évidente. La pollution des sols en tant qu'effet secondaire de l'activité minière est aussi un point important à considérer après l'utilisation des mines, le mercure étant un métal dangereux et toxique.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the States Parties on their tremendous effort in putting together this nomination, taking into account the complexity of a transnational proposal. The Delegation had two questions. The first concerned the way in which ICOMOS had dealt with the problem of ensuring coordination between two evaluation missions dispatched to two different continents. This was a concern that the Delegation of China also had in relation to a serial transnational nomination it was preparing with other countries in Central Asia. The second question, addressed to the State Party of Spain, was about the way in which it had coordinated with the other States Parties in preparing the nomination.

The Delegation of **Cuba** explained that the City of San Luis Potosi was an indispensable element of the nomination, and it asked about the means being considered for the management of contaminated soil.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted the presence of Outstanding Universal Value in the property and, as suggested by the Delegation of Brazil, supported its inscription.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** appuie les Délégations du Brésil et du Kenya, ajoutant qu'il s'agissait bien d'un dossier pour 3 villes, sur 2 continents, qui se répercutaient sur des espaces urbains. La Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle est était bien attestée, mais la Délégation se demande si le nom du bien n'est pas trop lié au concept de route royale espagnole.

The Delegation of **Spain** repeated that the three States Parties concerned had created a coordination committee both at the political and institutional level and at the technical level, adding that the technical committee had drawn up the nomination dossier. The Committee had met four times and had signed memorandums of understanding with regard to the development of research and interpretation facilities for the nominated areas. Concerning the mercury contamination issue, it explained that for over 15 years, the mine owners had been focusing their efforts on environmental management, including specific rules for mine closure. Attention had been given to wastewater and air and soil contamination issues. It concluded that it had no objections to the name change proposed by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that it would be presenting another nomination on the Camino Real in the coming year, and that this would have a similar structure to the Route of Santiago of Compostela.

With regard to the issue of coordinating more than one mission, **ICOMOS** recalled that the evaluators had received standard guidance and a written brief. Moreover, the missions had been part of a broader process that had included careful peer review. The results had been discussed by a panel, providing an overall view.

The **Chairperson** noted that four Members of the Committee had expressed their support for inscription, while six others had requested the floor.

The Delegation of **Peru** indicated its interest in participating in this nomination, and it could list the Sites proposed for inclusion within the nomination. It added that these Sites were not exclusively mining or industrial in nature, and that the issue of mercury touched on more profound cultural and social phenomena. It indicated that the presentation of a nomination focusing exclusively on mining would have been simpler, but said that it had wanted efforts for inscription to be developed to the fullest extent possible.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe aux Délégations précédentes pour féliciter les trois Etats parties pour cette l'initiative et se déclare est favorable à son inscription. Elle demande si ce binôme mercure-argent a généré un « folklore immatériel », et donne à titre d'exemple, des chansons.

The Delegation of **Barbados** congratulated ICOMOS on its assessment and on the way it had dealt with the complexity of a serial transnational nomination. With respect to the toxic nature of mercury referred to by previous speakers, the Delegation noted that it was not the first time that the Committee had inscribed properties associated with difficult issues, such as, for example, slavery, on the World Heritage List. For this reason, the Delegation did not see a problem in including this property on the List.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated for the record that it supported inscription of the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it had been requesting the floor for some time, while the States Parties proposing the nomination had been given the floor for at least 15 minutes. This was a departure from standard practice. It would have been more appropriate, in its view, to let Members of the Committee intervene so that their collective questions could be posed to the States Parties as a whole, thus saving time. The Delegation then requested clarification on the possibility of inscribing a serial property on the World Heritage List as a result of an extension of previously listed Sites.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its agreement with the Delegations of Spain and Barbados and indicated that it supported the inscription of the property.

Noting that there were now five Members of the Committee in favour of inscription, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to clarify the point raised by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that it was indeed possible to inscribe a serial property on the World Heritage List as a result of an extension of previously listed Sites, and that this had happened at the previous session of the Committee in 2008, when the Hadrian's

Wall Site had been included as part of the serial transnational property in the Frontiers of the Roman Empire Site.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported referral and not inscription. The comparative analysis had left the Delegation unclear regarding the rationale for the selection of the different component parts of the nomination and the possible addition of new sites in the future. The Delegation was not opposed to recognizing the presence of Outstanding Universal Value in the property, but it considered that more work was necessary to refine the nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with this proposal, which appeared to be a good compromise.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed inscribing the property on the World Heritage List as a unique example of the relationship between man and the environment.

In view of the fact that Mexico was preparing a separate nomination that would also include Potosi, the Delegation of **Bahrain** asked ICOMOS if the two remaining components of the nomination could be inscribed as the first part of a serial property.

L'ICOMOS explique que la question pose typiquement le problème de la valeur de la série. Il est indiqué que si San Luis Potosi était retiré du dossier, un aspect central du dossier serait perdu, et que le dossier serait réduit à exprimer des valeurs minières tout simplement.

The **Chairperson** moved to considering the Draft Decision and, noting no objections, declared its first paragraph adopted. She further noted that there were now six Members of the Committee in favour of inscription and two in favour of referral. Did the Committee have any suggestions for moving forward?

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarification on how the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would be put together in case of inscription, given that no such Statement had been prepared by ICOMOS in its Report.

The **Secretariat** conceded that this was a difficult question, since at present there was no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Taking into account the fact that ICOMOS had not been able to identify the Outstanding Universal Value of the nomination in its evaluation, the Statement should have been prepared by the Committee, possibly in consultation with the States Parties proposing the nomination.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted the complexity of the nomination. It could not see a clear rationale for justifying Outstanding Universal Value, and it recommended deferral, since more investigation was needed.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que la Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle est bien présente et que le Comité devrait demander à un des Etats de présenter leur compréhension de la Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle de la proposition d'inscription.

The **Chairperson** explained that this was not possible under the current rules of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Maroc** insiste pour que l'un des l'État parties soumettant la proposition ait la chance de présenter leur compréhension de la Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle de la nomination.

The **Chairperson** noted that allowing States Parties to elaborate on the Outstanding Universal Value of proposed nominations would require that they take on an advocacy role, which was not possible according to the practice of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Maroc** insiste sur cette proposition.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Morocco to formulate a specific question.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande à l'un des États partie d'expliquer leur avis sur la présence de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

The **Chairperson** observed that since the States Parties concerned had put forward the nomination, it was to be assumed that they had considered that the nominated property had Outstanding Universal Value. They had made arguments to that effect within the nomination document, which was available to the Members of the Committee for consultation.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its concern at the credibility of the procedure, and requested that the States Parties proposing the nomination accept a referral.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were now six Members of the Committee in favour of inscription, three in favour of referral and one in favour of deferral.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the States Parties be asked to provide information on the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property, and stated that it could not see any reason why this question could not be asked.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Egypt to formulate a specific question.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it would like to ask the States Parties what was, in their view, the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed property.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that the arguments of the States Parties concerned regarding justification of Outstanding Universal Value were already contained in the nomination file. It suggested that the Delegation of Egypt ask a question that had not already been answered.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it supported deferral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it would be ready to accept two outcomes: either immediate inscription of two Sites, excluding Potosi, or a referral of the nomination as a whole.

Noting the explanation provided by ICOMOS, according to which the nomination would not be able to express the values to be associated with the property in the absence of

Potosi, the **Chairperson** wondered if the second option suggested by the Delegation of Bahrain might be the object of consensus.

La Délégation de **Cuba** propose que le Comité définisse un texte pour la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

The **Chairperson** noted that the first thing the Committee had to do was to decide whether it wished to inscribe, refer or defer the nomination. There were at present six Members of the Committee in favour of inscription, three in favour of referral and two in favour of deferral. In a similar situation during a previous debate, the Committee had opted for referral, as suggested by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, noting that it was lunch time, suggested that the debate be adjourned.

The **Chairperson** suspended the session until 15:30, saying that the break would provide opportunity for reflection.

The meeting rose at 2 pm.

FIFTH DAY – SATURDAY, 27 JUNE 2009

ELEVENTH MEETING

3.30 p.m. – 8.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Greg Terrill/Mrs San Segundo

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

The Mercury and Silver Binomial on the Intercontinental Camino Real. Almadén, Idrija and San Luis Potosí (Mexico, Slovenia and Spain) (continuation)

The **Chairperson** said that the Delegations of Mexico and Spain had avoided advocacy in their interventions and invited Spain to answer Morocco.

The Delegation of **Spain** noted that the questions raised by the Delegation of Morocco and others had had to do with whether the Site had Outstanding Universal Value. The answer was that it did have such value, but that the Site was also a complex one. Mining of mercury and silver at the property meant that there was cultural interaction between the three Sites. The property was an example of how cities founded on mining could provide testimony of such exchanges. The associated communities had their own significance. The Delegation also indicated that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was available in English, and that it had been given to the Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to give direction to the debate since six Members had recommended inscription, three had opted for referral and two supported deferral.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Chair for its flexibility and expressed its preference for a vote.

The **Chairperson** said he needed a second voice in favour of voting.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** appuie la proposition du Brésil de passer au vote.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to read the proposed amendment in favour of the inscription of the Site proposed by Brazil, Cuba, Tunisia, Peru, Madagascar and Morocco.

The Amendment consisted in inscribed “the Mercury and Silver Binomial on the Intercontinental Camino Real. Almadén, Idrija and San Luis Potosi

(Argentina/Belgium/Switzerland) on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).”

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the question could be sharpened.

The Delegation of **Korea** signaled an error in the names of the countries given, which was corrected by the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Jordan** and the Delegation of **Canada** were in favour of a vote.

The Delegation of **Cuba** made a correction to the amendment, noting that the proposal was for criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), not criterion (vi).

The **Chairperson** proposed a vote by show of hands and asked the UNESCO Legal Advisor to explain the procedure.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** cited Rule 40 on voting by a show of hands.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** propose un vote secret.

The **Chairperson** asked which other Members supported the vote.

La Délégation du **Maroc** appuie également la proposition d'un vote secret.

The **Chairperson** announced that a vote would be taken by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the use of a secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** asked for a teller from Nigeria and another from the United States of America.

The United States of America asked whether the States Parties presenting the nomination were entitled to vote.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that Rule 35 stated that each member of the Committee was entitled to vote, and that there was no rule preventing the vote of a State Party.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to call the Members of the Committee to a vote by alphabetical order and then to call the two tellers to the podium.

After voting was completed, the **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote: one blank, 13 in favour and seven against. He concluded that the amendment had been rejected because it had not been supported by a two-thirds majority.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked for a point of clarification on the calculation of the two-thirds majority.

The **UNESCO Legal Advisor** said that the two-thirds were calculated out of the total number of votes, excluding blank votes. The total number was then divided by three and

multiplied by two. If the resulting number included decimal places, then a two-thirds majority was the next round number.

The **Chairperson** said there was no text for referral and asked if any Member of the Committee had considered this option.

The Delegation of **Kenya** approved referral following the result of the vote.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said that it had proposed deferral, but that it accepted referral in the current situation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** approved referral, but asked whether it was possible to inscribe the property with the exception of one component. It recalled that there had been a precedent for this in the case of the "Babar" Site, and it argued that Outstanding Universal Value was justified for two out of the three nominated Sites, while it was lacking for the third.

The **Chairperson** said that this option had been proposed earlier and asked ICOMOS for its opinion.

La Délégation du **Maroc** reprend la proposition de la Délégation de Bahreïn, s'interrogeant sur la possibilité d'inscrire seulement deux sites sur trois.

The Delegation of **Spain** recognized that it would indeed be easier to inscribe only two of the Sites, but that this would need a commitment from the Committee. It stated that the Mexican Sites should not be treated differently from the others to be inscribed and expressed its regret regarding the situation.

The **Chairperson** said the question was indeed complicated, and that it was not clear whether a nomination could still be considered valid if part of it was deleted.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** accepte le résultat du vote mais exprime son souhait de voir le site être renvoyé aux Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the positions of Kenya and Sweden and agreed with Spain that the nomination should be considered as a whole. It also argued against sending a mission.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS if the nomination would still have Outstanding Universal Value, were it to be considered without San Luis Potosi.

L'**ICOMOS** explique que si St Louis de Potosi n'a pas toutes les caractéristiques de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, cela a des implications sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle de toute la série. Si seuls les deux autres sites sont gardés, leurs attributs de VUE sont fortement diminués, mais conservent gardent toutefois suffisamment de valeur pour approcher de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its confusion, since if this took place the nomination would no longer be a serial one. The two remaining Sites were mercury exploitation ones, and this would change the nomination's Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne que, compte tenu des clarifications de l'ICOMOS, la meilleure solution reste le renvoi.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, considering the need to move to other items, suggested that the Committee refer the Site and complete its consideration of the matter.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was an emerging consensus on this and asked if there were further comments.

The **Chairperson** asked for objections to referral and received none. He noted that in Paragraphs 1 and 2 where referral was substituted for deferral, and that paragraph 2a was deleted, as requested by Morocco.

La Délégation du **Maroc** précise qu'elle avait proposé la suppression de ce paragraphe dans l'esprit d'une inscription, mais qu'il pouvait désormais être gardé.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for confirmation of the deletion of paragraph 2a.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'elle souhaite garder le paragraphe 2. a)

The Delegation of **Kenya** argued for retaining the words, "and so to demonstrate its Outstanding Universal Value", as the Outstanding Universal Value could change.

The **Rapporteur** replaced the word "demonstrate" with "strengthen the justification of" in paragraph 2a.

La Délégation du **Maroc** suggère de remplacer le verbe « apporter » par le verbe « étayer ».

The **Chairperson** noted the French version of paragraph 2a and asked the Secretariat to find an appropriate translation later. Paragraph 2b was then adopted

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique que la traduction française n'est pas encore adéquate et se demande si le Comité n'approuve que la version française.

The **Rapporteur** proposed either the word "demonstrate" or "establish".

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose le terme « establish ».

The **Chairperson** reiterated that translation could be dealt with later by the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to adopt French as the reference language.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed the term "to emphasize", which encompassed the various meanings.

The **Chairperson** asked for the Rapporteur to be entrusted with this Decision and paragraphs 2b and 3 were adopted. He then moved to paragraph 3a and gave the floor to the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that it would not be appropriate to add new sites to a referred nomination. Then realizing that the sites were already inscribed, it withdrew its comment.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any further comments on paragraph 3a. Seeing none, it was adopted. He then moved to b and asked the Rapporteur whether the wording in English under b was a proposal to replace or amend it, or whether this was separate.

The **Rapporteur** answered that it was part of the initial proposal that had been voted on. He stated that it would be a matter for the Committee to decide whether the wording still stood, or whether it had been withdrawn.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that it was confused, since two elements had been combined in one paragraph. In its view, it now seemed that the silver mines in Bolivia and the Andes were inscribed, while the ones in Peru were not. Therefore, it said the last part of the sentence in 3a was not appropriate for a referred nomination.

The **Chairperson** asked to look at paragraph 3a on the screen again, in order to examine the point made by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed using the same wording as in paragraph 4, considered that any extension would not require a mission to the Site. It proposed to leave the encouragement to the State Parties to put the nomination together, but leave the referral as it was, together with the option of moving ahead with a new nomination including new sites.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to confirm the wording used in paragraph 4 referring to the Le Corbusier nomination, in order that the Committee could consider whether it wished to use the same wording here. While this was being done, he gave the floor to **Bahrain**.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that with the addition of wording from the Le Corbusier nomination, the last part of the sentence referring to “the Site in Peru in” could be left and the addition “according to Le Corbusier” would need to be modified. It said that any new site not yet inscribed on the World Heritage List required a new mission, though if it was a case of an extension with sites already inscribed, this might not be necessary.

The **Chairperson** asked if paragraph 3 could be presented on the screens in English for examination.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested adding words to the last part of the paragraph, which referenced the 22 Sites in the Le Corbusier nomination: “inclusion of any additional component parts in the series which are not yet inscribed on the World Heritage List would require a new nomination”.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee could now move back to paragraph 3a. He recalled that in paragraph 3a an element had been deleted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** clarified that the idea had been to add an additional paragraph, thus retaining this element, since the recommendation was still present.

However, there was also the additional idea that if the recommendation were followed, the procedure would be different.

The **Chairperson** stated that since the acceptance paragraph was contingent on the following paragraph, it would be dealt with when the Decision was adopted as the whole. She stated that, as proposed by the Rapporteur, in order to ensure that the link was well understood, the new addition should be inserted between paragraphs a and b, thus becoming the new paragraph b. He then asked whether there were any comments.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that they were not sure if this fitted well with the “Chapeau” text. It recalled that the “Chapeau” text had included the word “recommends”, and the Delegation was not sure whether the condition was indeed a recommendation.

The **Chairperson** stated that it was the Committee’s choice whether to consider it a recommendation or a Decision. He recalled that in the case of the Le Corbusier nomination, it was a Decision, and in the case of the “Chapeau” recommendation the meaning had been changed. He proposed that since the Committee’s Decision would need to be consistent with the Decision taken in the case of the Le Corbusier nomination, this should be a separate paragraph and have the force of a Decision. He asked if there were any comments. Seeing none, paragraph b was made a separate paragraph.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to add to paragraph 3b the words, “there might arise human problems” and to replace the words, “International Institute projected” with “International Institute planned” and to delete “enthusiastically”.

Paragraphs 3a and 3b were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that paragraph 5 (former paragraph 4), dealing with a mission to the Site, should be deleted because the nomination had been referred and not deferred.

The Delegation of **Peru** returned to paragraph 3a and asked for clarification over the references to Bolivia and the Andes.

L’**ICOMOS** précise (à propos du para. 5) qu’il s’agit des pays possédant des mines d’argent dans la Cordillère des Andes.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for the recommendation on research, public awareness and pollution to be deleted, since it was a repetition.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any voices in favour of retention. Seeing none, it was deleted.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the directions the Committee had given to the State Party were unclear.

The **Chairperson** suggested examining the Decision paragraph by paragraph, in order that all present could be reminded of its contents.

The **Chairperson** recalled that paragraphs 1, 2 had been adopted and read out paragraph 2a, 2b, 3, 3a and 4.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.26** was adopted as amended.

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

New Nominations

Property	Tower of Hercules
Id. N°	1312
State Party	Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

L'**ICOMOS** présente le bien proposé pour inscription. Il s'agit d'un phare construit à l'époque romaine, destiné à faciliter la circulation maritime au large de la Galice, et qui est encore en fonction de nos jours, ce qui est assez exceptionnel. Il a été restauré à la fin du XVIIIe siècle, mais les modifications architecturales ont respecté la stéréotomie romaine. Le système d'éclairage a été modifié à plusieurs reprises afin de suivre les évolutions techniques. On peut considérer que l'intégrité fonctionnelle a été maintenue au cours des siècles. Le critère (iii) s'applique parfaitement, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle a été démontrée. En revanche, il n'y a pas d'intégrité architecturale ; l'ICOMOS estime donc que le critère (iv) n'a pas été clairement démontré. La gestion du site, dont la taille a été étendue à 233 ha, avec 1.936 ha de zone tampon, est satisfaisante. Le plan de gestion doit néanmoins être complété et davantage détaillé.

The **Chairperson** invited comments from the Committee.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the nomination and congratulated ICOMOS on its detailed and positive Report.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** se déclare très heureuse de pouvoir féliciter l'Etat partie pour ce bien qui est d'une certaine manière méditerranéen. Elle rappelle que la civilisation phénicienne a longuement imprégné la péninsule ibérique et qu'Hercule a en Espagne un ancêtre phénicien, le dieu de la navigation, Melkart. Par conséquent la Délégation de Tunisie est heureuse de voir ce souvenir phénicien transmis par Hercule proposé pour inscription. La Délégation de **Tunisie** soutient donc cette inscription avec joie.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party and supported the proposal for inscription, since this was the only fully preserved Roman lighthouse in the world.

La Délégation de la **République de Corée** félicite l'Etat partie d'avoir fait d'une pierre deux coups, d'une part en organisant avec succès cette session, d'autre part avec l'inscription toute proche de ce bien merveilleux sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by the Delegations of **Peru, Morocco, Nigeria and Australia**, also expressed congratulations.

La Délégation du **Maroc** soutient cette excellente proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred and asked ICOMOS if the text of the nomination, describing the Site as a fully preserved lighthouse, was correct, given the later modifications.

L'**ICOMOS** explique que la plate-forme du phare romain et le noyau central romain existent toujours. Les outrages des hommes et des ans concernent les parements extérieurs et les rampes d'accès. Les éléments techniques ont également été profondément modifiés au cours des siècles, ce qui est normal.

Returning to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested changing the first word of paragraph 4d to "installation" in English.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.27** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Spain** presented its best wishes to all participants at the session on behalf of the Spanish Government. The Tower of Hercules belonged to the whole of humanity, it said, and recognition of it would not have been possible without the collaboration of various bodies, which had worked together to make the project a success. The Delegation of Spain wanted to emphasize the work undertaken by the Municipality of La Coruña, the Council of Galicia, the harbour-authorities of La Coruña and the Spanish Government. It underlined the hard work of the World Heritage Centre. This inscription brought a deep joy to Spain, which now had 41 properties on the World Heritage List. This achievement was a source of great satisfaction, but at the same time it confronted Spain with the responsibility of protecting and conserving this heritage. The spirit of the Convention was a reminder that heritage was something from the past that allowed us to benefit from civilizations that had existed before ours. The Tower of Hercules was a building from the Roman period. It had functioned for many centuries, and the Delegation of Spain hoped it could maintain its functions, in order to illuminate us all.

Property	Farms and Villages in Hälsingland
Id. N°	1282
State Party	Sweden
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iv)(v) + CL

ICOMOS presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Australia**, supported by the Delegation of the **United States of America**, while acknowledging the need to increase the representation of vernacular architecture on the World Heritage List, expressed its agreement with the recommendation of ICOMOS for deferral and expressed its hope that the State Party of Sweden would be able to resubmit a strengthened nomination file.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party of Sweden on the work accomplished and asked the Delegation whether it would need a referral to complete the nomination file, or whether a referral would be sufficient.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que la remarque du Kenya est Ces paysages agraires et pastoraux élaborés sur de longues périodes historiques devraient être reconnus Elle se demande donc si l'Etat partie souhaiterait différer ou seulement renvoyer l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Sweden** responded that it had noted the evaluation by ICOMOS, and that it agreed with its recommendation, which was consistent with the view on deferrals that it had previously expressed.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, taking note of this reply, expressed its support for the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** noted that there seemed to be a consensus among Members of the Committee.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.28** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, supported by the **Chairperson** and the Delegation of **Canada**, expressed its appreciation for the consistency with which the Delegation of Sweden had applied the criteria for deferral, including for its own nomination proposals.

Property	La Chaux-de-Fonds / Le Locle, Clock-making town planning
Id. N°	1302
State Party	Switzerland
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(vi)

L'ICOMOS présente le bien proposé pour inscription, qui illustre un développement urbain original lié à la construction horlogère. Il s'agit d'un ensemble de 2 villes situées à quelques kilomètres l'une de l'autre dans la même vallée de montagne, à 1000 mètres d'altitude, et qui ont connu un développement historique parallèle depuis au moins le XVIIIe siècle. Les limites du bien sont claires, la zone tampon est continue. L'urbanisme est ouvert, avec un parcellaire en lanières. C'est un exemple précoce d'architecture fonctionnaliste. L'authenticité et l'intégrité sont bonnes. Avoir ainsi 2 villes-manufactures entièrement dédiées à une mono-industrie est un ensemble rare ; le critère (iv) s'applique donc sans problème. Enfin la gestion du bien est bonne.

The Delegation of **Korea** congratulated the State Party and said that this outstanding example of heritage deserved inscription on the World Heritage List.

This was supported by the Delegations of **Israel, Nigeria, Egypt, Jordan and Kenya**.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son rapport précis et important. Elle félicite l'Etat partie pour le travail d'horloger que représente cette proposition d'inscription, et se déclare tout à fait favorable à l'inscription. Elle demande cependant à l'ICOMOS si le critère (vi) ne mériterait pas d'être examiné plus profondément. Le savoir-faire horloger et la ponctualité suisses étant mondialement reconnus, la Délégation du **Maroc** s'interroge donc sur la non-application de ce critère.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** se déclare favorable à l'inscription. Elle félicite l'Etat partie pour son travail, ainsi que l'ICOMOS pour son rapport circonstancié et exhaustif. Elle souhaite cependant demander à l'ICOMOS, à propos de l'architecture fonctionnaliste, ce qui se reflète dans l'urbanisme et l'habitation, à part l'atelier qui se juxtapose à l'habitation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** also expressed its support for the nomination and commended the State Party on the excellent comparative analysis in the nomination file.

L'ICOMOS répond aux questions posées précédemment : on peut parler d'architecture fonctionnaliste en raison de l'usage de la lumière, de la distribution des ateliers et de la proximité des logements ; et le critère (vi) était parfaitement justifié en termes historiques, mais ses liens avec l'architecture n'étaient pas suffisamment perceptibles.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription, mais demande à l'Etat partie, à propos de la menace représentée par la construction de garages

individuels dans les jardins, s'il a réfléchi à une politique pour gérer le Plan d'Occupation du Sol et donc le futur du périmètre inscrit.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que la construction de garages individuels dans les jardins est désormais interdite par la réglementation des constructions.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** proposed a minor change in the wording in paragraph 3, replacing “factory town” with “manufacturing town” and adding “organic” before “urban ensembles.”

L'**ICOMOS** explique que le terme « villes-manufactures » appartient à la terminologie propre à ces villes et qu'il a été utilisé pour la première fois par Karl Marx. Remplacer « factory town » par le terme « manufactory towns » est acceptable. En ce qui concerne l'ajout du mot “organique”, elle indique qu'il n'apporte pas grand-chose mais on peut le conserver.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that the wording “manufacturing town” should also be changed in the text under criterion (iv).

La Délégation du **Canada** fait remarquer que dans le paragraphe précédent (« Brève synthèse »), la dernière phrase devrait être entièrement supprimée car elle justifie le critère (vi) rejeté par l'ICOMOS.

L'**ICOMOS** indique que cet apport de la tradition horlogère est important et qu'il s'agit juste ici d'un rappel historique.

The **Chairperson** requested agreement from the Delegation of Canada.

La Délégation du **Canada** accepte de conserver la phrase.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested “clock-making town” as an alternative.

The **Chairperson**, noting that the wording “manufacturing town” had already been agreed to by the Committee, requested the Delegation of Kenya to withdraw its proposal. This was agreed by the Delegation of **Kenya**.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.29** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, au nom des populations des 2 villes, du canton de Neuchâtel et de toute la Suisse, remercie le Comité, l'ICOMOS et le Secrétariat du Centre du patrimoine mondial et tous ceux qui ont contribué à cette nomination. Elle se déclare heureuse et fière de cette inscription. Les clichés caractérisant la Suisse (fromage, chocolat et montres) sont connus de tous, mais grâce à la décision du Comité, on peut voir qu'au-delà des clichés, il y a des femmes et des hommes derrière la fabrication des montres et il y a leur système d'habitat exprimé dans l'urbanisme horloger des 2 villes de La Chaux-de-Fond et du Locle. Une forme de construction avec sa division du travail qui, au XIXe siècle, a inspiré Karl Marx pour la caractérisation de "villes-manufactures". Comme de coutume, les sites suisses sont portés par les communautés locales.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** donne donc la parole au maire de La Chaux-de-Fonds. Ce dernier remercie tous les délégués pour cette inscription des villes du Locle et de La Chaux-de-Fond. Il déclare que c'est un grand honneur qui leur est fait. Cette candidature a été soutenue par toute la population des 2 villes (50.000 habitants cumulés) qui en ce moment même se réjouissent de la décision du Comité. Il rappelle cependant que c'est non seulement une joie, mais aussi une responsabilité, parce que le fait d'être reconnu patrimoine mondial impose de préserver ce patrimoine. Il indique termine en disant que toutes les personnes présentes sont les bienvenues au Locle et à La Chaux-de-Fond pour visiter les entreprises horlogères.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – SATURDAY, 27 JUNE 2009

TWELTH MEETING

20.00 p.m. – 23.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

Property	Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal
Id. N°	1303
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

The **Chairperson** invited the participants to start the evening session, resuming with Item 8B.

L'**ICOMOS** présente le canal de Pontcysyllte, un exemple de construction d'une voie d'eau artificielle dans un environnement géographique difficile, à la fin du XVIIIe siècle et au début du XIXe siècle. Il s'agit d'un chef-d'œuvre pionnier d'ingénierie et d'architecture monumentale qui a été réalisé par des arches métalliques sur de fines et hautes piles maçonnées. Le pont-canal et le canal de Pontcysyllte sont des exemples précoces et exceptionnels des innovations apportées par la révolution industrielle en Angleterre. Ils témoignent des échanges internationaux et d'influences très importants dans la navigation intérieure, dans le génie civil, dans l'aménagement du territoire et dans l'application du fer à la conception des structures. L'**ICOMOS** trouve que les critères i, ii et iv se trouvent dans le bien et qu'il possède tous les éléments d'intégrité nécessaires à l'expression de sa valeur comme grand canal historique de la révolution industrielle.

La gestion technique et monumentale par British Waterways est satisfaisante et le plan de gestion est convenable. L'**ICOMOS** propose alors le site pour inscription tout en faisant quelques recommandations à l'Etat partie, notamment en matière de planification de sols, de développement touristique et par rapport à la reconversion d'une usine chimique en lien avec l'aqueduc.

The Delegation of **Canada** considered that this was a very strong nomination, which it supported entirely. It also wished to raise an important point, which was the tremendous degree of interest and dedication that the local people had shown with respect to the Site's management and protection. This was well worth highlighting. The Delegation of Canada supported the inscription without reservation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wished also strongly to support this excellent nomination and expressed its congratulations to the State Party. It said that the State Party was one of the few that regularly followed all procedures when submitting nominations. It asked whether the State Party had envisaged revising the name of the property, in order to make it easier for foreign visitors.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** manifeste sa volonté d'aller dans le sens exprimé par les délégués précédents et elle pose une question à l'Etat partie sur les menaces qui pèsent sur le canal, notamment la reconversion de l'usine chimique. Ils demandent alors si l'Etat partie a déjà une politique, un plan ou un projet concernant cette question de reconversion de l'usine.

La Délégation de **Maroc** félicite l'Etat partie pour cette nomination, tout a fait intéressante tant du point de vue de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle que pour sa gestion, et elle demande pourquoi ce monument n'a pas été classé au niveau national. La Délégation fait référence a point a) du premier paragraphe que recommande a l'état « inscrire le bien en totalité sur la Liste des monuments anciens du Royaume-Uni

The Delegation of **Barbados** was delighted to welcome the property onto the World Heritage List and said that it was particularly interested in the technological aspects of the Site. In this regard, it wanted to receive clarification from the State Party on the kind of comparative analysis that might be extended to similar Sites in the Americas, reminding those present that aqueducts also existed in the Caribbean. Among these was that at St. Catherine in Jamaica, which was built in 1760, though not specifically in metal. The Delegation of Barbados said that it hoped that in future nominations of Sites of this type in other areas of similar importance could be taken into account in the comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **Australia** considered that the nomination was a model of its kind and wished to congratulate the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to answer the questions raised.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** (Observer) explained that from the point of view of threats linked to developmental pressures, in particular from chemical plants, it was well aware of how significant these were to the Site. For this reason, the entire historic Site had been put under protection, and there was a Management Plan that fully protected the property. The implementation of local planning policies also took the Site's protection into account. It added that integrated planning policies to cover the whole property had been agreed with the relevant local authorities, in order to ensure a consistent and thorough approach. From the point of view of the closure of the chemical plants, which were near the aqueduct but not within the nominated Site, the Delegation of the United Kingdom (Observer) explained that this would undoubtedly have a positive impact on the setting of the property and that the local authority was working with the company to ensure that such benefits were realized. These included decontamination

and enhancement of the aesthetics of the Site, as well as its use for sustainable leisure and access. From the point of view of statutory protection, the Delegation said that it had submitted a letter on this, making the point that the entire length of the aqueduct and canal, together with their associated historic features, had received the strictest form of statutory protection in the UK.

L'**ICOMOS** explique que la lettre envoyée par l'état partie a été prise en considération mais qu'ils considèrent qu'il y a une différence d'interprétation : dans la lettre, l'Etat a soumis un classement du canal et de ses œuvres d'art alors que ça ne correspond pas à l'intégralité du bien puisqu'il y a trois zones territoriales autour du canal qui ne semblent pas avoir été prises en compte. Pour l'ICOMOS la question reste alors de la protection légale du canal et des trois zones du paysage qui sont associées à la valeur exceptionnelle et universelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to join in the congratulations of the earlier speakers and support the inscription.

La Délégation de la **Jordanie** félicite le Royaume Uni pour la nomination et pour les efforts déployés pour la préparation de ce dossier

The Delegation of **Israel** supported Kenya's recommendation regarding a possible change of name of the property, in order to ensure its worldwide recognition. It also wished to return to one of the points raised regarding comparative analysis and the importance given in the Convention to twinning. It said that while it did not want to propose a further Draft Decision, twinning could increase awareness and create a networking of canals through which people would become much more aware not only of waterways but also of world heritage. The Delegation of **Israel** underlined that this was an excellent nomination.

La Délégation d'**Egypte** félicite l'Etat partie pour ce site unique proposé et l'ICOMOS pour cet excellent rapport.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to answer the specific question regarding comparative analysis.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** (Observer) explained that it had been part of the international team for the ICOMOS study of canals, and that it had examined masonry aqueducts. However, it wanted to point out that the particular importance of this Site lay in its innovative use of cast metal to produce a trough that was only 25 millimetres thick. It also explained that this material was of international importance, since there were later similar aqueducts around the world that used this technology.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.30** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** (Observer) expressed its sincere thanks to the World Heritage Committee for inscribing the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal on the World Heritage List. It said that this was a very significant World Heritage Site for the UK, since it crossed the borders of two countries, Wales and England, being primarily in Wales. It also explained that it had been a nomination that had been prepared in an excellent spirit of partnership and collaboration. It also thanked ICOMOS for its professional approach and expertise in handling the nomination. It thanked the

Committee, ICOMOS and its advisors on behalf of all the partners involved in the preparation of the nomination, including the local communities both in England and Wales and the local authority that had undertaken the preparation of the nomination, for their recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal and of the creative genius and technological innovation of two men, Thomas Telford and William Jessop, some 200 hundred years ago.

Property	City of Graz – Historic Centre and Schloss Eggenberg
Id. N°	931 Bis
State Party	Austria
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(vi)

L'**ICOMOS** présente le site « Ville de Graz - Centre historique », un ensemble urbain autrichien marqué par la présence des Habsbourg. La vieille ville héberge différents styles architecturaux et exemples des courants artistiques qui s'y sont succédé depuis le Moyen Âge, ainsi que des influences culturelles variées venant des régions voisines. L'ICOMOS propose de différer l'examen de la proposition de l'Etat partie de l'extension du bien pour inclure le château d'Eggenberg pour que l'État partie puisse étendre la zone tampon à la route reliant le centre historique au château sur tout son tracé, à travers la zone intermédiaire urbanisée au XXe siècle. De cette façon le lien historique qui existait entre les deux éléments pourra être préservé. L'ICOMOS demande à l'Etat aussi de renforcer le niveau d'autorité et élargir les compétences du Bureau de coordination du patrimoine mondial Ville de Graz – Centre historique en charge du Plan de gestion.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked ICOMOS to explain how the buffer zone would serve to preserve the link between the historic centre and the castle. It said that if it was essential to the integrity of the ensemble that the physical and visual link referred to on page 229 of the nomination file be preserved, then this should be included within the inscribed property and not simply within the buffer zone. It therefore requested clarification on this point.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that when studying the file it had been surprised by the explanation given by the State Party of why this link could not be included in the buffer zone. Since this was such an essential element in the view of ICOMOS, there was a question as to why inclusion had been rejected. In addition, since Graz was a Site also considered under the State of Conservation Reports, there was also some concern about the background to the Decision.

The **Chairperson** noticed that no other requests for interventions had been made by Members of the Committee and gave the floor to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Austria** (Observer) declared that the local authorities in Graz were willing to collaborate as far as possible with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. It said that they were not fully aware of the importance of including the road in the buffer zone, but that in order to clarify the issue; they were ready to organize a workshop next autumn. Concerning the office in charge of the Management Plan, the State Party said that it would do its best to try to convince the Graz local authorities to ensure that there was sufficient independence for this office from the Graz World Heritage Office. It said that this could be done over the coming months.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that this was a surprising case because when the dossier was deferred what had been requested by the Committee was quite straightforward. It noted that the State Party had not been able to comply, and that it had faced difficulties and that there were still matters outstanding. It was clear that while some of the conditions had been met, not all of them had been. The Delegation noted that it seemed that the State Party would be able to deal with these issues over the coming months, according to its statement. It wanted to ask the State Party what it meant by “a few months,” because on this depended a recommendation either of referral or deferral in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

La Délégation du **Maroc** explique qu'après avoir écouté les membres du Comité et l'Etat partie, elle a constaté que ce site est tout a fait intéressant mais que des questions se posent concernant la mise en œuvre de la Convention du Patrimoine Mondial. Ils reviennent sur le commentaire du délégué de Kenya, qui a rappelé qu'à Vilnius le Comité avait décidé le renvoi de ce dossier pour inclure justement les éléments qui manquaient. La Délégation se demande alors, maintenant que le Comité a le dossier entre ses mains, si ce chemin qui relie la ville de Graz gars au château ne peut pas être inclus, si c'est techniquement impossible.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to answer the questions of Morocco and Kenya.

The Delegation of **Austria** (Observer) explained that the historic road was still in use, even though it had changed in form. It said that the Graz authorities were not certain about placing the road within the buffer zone, and that this was the main point at issue. As yet, a solution had not been found, but one would certainly be found when the planned workshop took place. The Delegation indicated that it proposed referral, because if the proposed workshop found a solution then this could be undertaken in a few months' time, given the Graz authorities' willingness to solve the problem.

L'**ICOMOS** explique que la question de la route en tant qu'élément historique reliant le château à la ville est très importante parce que c'est un lien organique qui a toujours été présent. Une petite partie de la route historique près du château a des valeurs universelles et exceptionnelles importantes mais dans cette extrémité et la ville, la route a été profondément modifiée et aujourd'hui cette aire est devenue un quartier industriel important avec des universités. C'est pour ça que l'ICOMOS ne propose pas ce tram comme partie du bien. Par rapport à la possibilité de décrire le site en tant que site en série avec deux parties différentes, l'ICOMOS explique qu'ils rejettent cette possibilité parce que le lien organique est trop fort et qu'il faut garder une proposition unique, ne pas un bien en série. C'est l'Etat partie qui doit maintenant définir ce morceau.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** juge le rapport de l'ICOMOS et de l'Etat partie excellent et propose le renvoi de la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the opinion expressed by the Delegation of Tunisia.

Referring to the statements made by ICOMOS and the State Party, the Delegation of **Spain** asked whether the suggestions made in the recommendation were not too many for a deferral, and it supported the suggestion of Tunisia and Egypt.

The Delegation of **China** declared that having listened to the response of the State Party, it thought that the Graz authorities were taking action and had a good approach. It therefore supported referral.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked ICOMOS to give further details as to why it considered the road link between the castle and the city to be so crucial.

L'**ICOMOS** explique que la décision prise à Vilnius a été conservée car il a été considéré que la situation était bloquée.

The Delegation of **Kenya** considered that there was a case for referral. Having heard the statements of those involved, it did not consider that the issues still pending would need three years to be resolved. It nevertheless asked the State Party to respond by giving the requested information.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the referral and was confident that the Graz authorities would be able to overcome the difficulties mentioned in the ICOMOS Report.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it would support referral. However, it wanted a note to appear in the Decision to the effect that a progress report on the development of the work on the buffer zone would be submitted at the next session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that several interventions had supported deferral and, seeing no other request for intervention, requested the text of the Draft Decision to be projected onto the screen.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to add a paragraph 3 including the words, "requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by February 2010, on progress on the matters in the paragraph hereabove".

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to know more about the reasoning behind the amendment proposed by Australia, which sounded like an amendment for inscription and did not clearly relate to a referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with Bahrain. It considered that the nomination was a work in progress, and that the Committee was waiting for results, its main interest, and that these would lead to further questions. The Delegation of Kenya asked Australia if it would consider withdrawing its amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** declared that it withdrew its proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** thanked Australia and underlined the fact that the intention was to give flexibility to the State Party, in order to allow it to come back with a referral when it felt ready.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.31** was adopted as amended.

Property	The Causes and the Cévennes
Id. N°	1153 Rev
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)

La Délégation de **Madagascar** se souvient très bien du fait que le Comité a consacré beaucoup de temps à Vilnius à cette inscription ainsi qu'au rapport de l'homme avec l'animal et avec le milieu naturel. La Délégation mentionne qu'à Vilnius la décision était de renvoyer le dossier et note que maintenant l'ICOMOS propose de différer, elle se demande donc si l'Etat partie n'a rien apporté au dossier de nomination. La Délégation souhaite également que l'Etat partie confirme qu'il peut garantir la pérennité des paysages culturels du bien. ?

La Délégation de **Tunisie** partage l'inquiétude de la Délégation de Madagascar Madagascar et elle estime qu'à Vilnius il avait été décidé un renvoi qui n'avait été suivi d'aucun commentaire et pour lequel le Comité n'avait pas fait de recommandations. La Délégation considère qu'avec la suggestion de différer la nomination, on fait maintenant un pas en arrière. La Délégation demande alors à l'ICOMOS si on peut proposer un renvoi et différer la nomination trois ou quatre années après. La Délégation souhaite également que l'Etat partie clarifie ce qui a été fait entre les réunions de Vilnius et de Séville pour cette nomination.

The Delegation of **Sweden** declared that it had the same questions. It said that it had noted that the Site was proposed for deferral in Vilnius, and it wondered what had happened since then. It reminded those present that the Decision at that time had had clear reasons attached to it, despite the fact that Outstanding Universal Value had not been demonstrated at that time. It went on to say that although ICOMOS had presented the Site using a slightly different focus, the Outstanding Universal Value and criteria for inscription had not been clearly demonstrated at this stage, and nor had the Site's boundaries and buffer zone been clearly defined. On this basis, the Delegation of Sweden said that it felt deferral would be appropriate, but it wished to hear from the other Members of the Committee and the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that this was another unfortunate situation, and that there had indeed been a long debate in Vilnius on this case. It noticed that ICOMOS had said that the Site had been referred without recommendations from the Committee to the State Party. The first question it wished to raise for the attention of ICOMOS was

whether ICOMOS had in fact suggested to the Committee that the latter make recommendations for the attention of the State Party. Secondly, it acknowledged the fact that ICOMOS had declared the Site to have many material and immaterial values and to be the kind of site that the Committee had difficulty understanding. It said that there was a tendency to confine such a site within set boundaries, when pastoral activity implied flexibility. It considered that the Committee was not taking this into sufficient consideration, and that there should be collective responsibility in defining management systems. The Committee, on the other hand, was trying to set up a standard management plan for the Site. It considered that in order for the Committee to be able to make a decision on the Site, the Committee might also have to move outside usual ways of thinking and accept that the existing communities had been managing the Site and would continue to do so. The Delegation of Kenya concluded by saying that the Committee should not be looking just at written texts, but that it should also be considering existing management systems that involved both collective and individual responsibilities for sites and aimed to guarantee the well-being of the people that lived in them. It wondered if ICOMOS had taken such points into consideration.

La Délégation de **Maroc** indique que la proposition de différer après le fait d'avoir renvoyé est un motif d'inquiétude. La Délégation souligne aussi la question de la sous-représentativité des systèmes agropastoraux sur la liste du Patrimoine Mondial. La Délégation souligne également la question du dépeuplement et de l'abandon et le fait que parfois on est réduits à protéger une réalité matérielle disparue. Ils se demandent alors si tous ces éléments : transhumance, routes, chemins creux... ne sont pas des attributs qui apportent une valeur exceptionnelle et universelle, surtout que ces attributs ne sont pas présents seulement en France mais dans plusieurs pays du bassin méditerranéen.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with the points made by the Delegations of Sweden, Tunisia, Kenya and Morocco.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.

La Délégation de **France** (Observateur) répond à la question concernant les actions entreprises par l'Etat partie depuis la session du Comité à Vilnius. Elle précise que 3 actions ont été réalisées. Premièrement, la vérification de l'unité et de la cohérence du bien. Ensuite, vérification de la viabilité du système agropastoral grâce à la collaboration des paysagistes, des ethnologues, des spécialistes de l'agropastoralisme. Ensuite, un réseau d'experts a été constitué, avec la première réunion en 2007 regroupant 9 pays. Une nouvelle réunion aura lieu en Albanie au mois de novembre 2009, et la réunion suivante en 2010 au Maghreb. Ce travail a permis de renforcer la mobilisation des acteurs concernés en faveur du paysage agro-culturel, une catégorie sous-représentée dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Un programme ambitieux de restauration et de gestion a été mis en place en 2006, avec des financements accrus. Il concerne des inventaires spécifiques, une réhabilitation du patrimoine, le soutien aux éleveurs et à leur production. Ce programme a été réalisé à 85%. En réponse à la question posée concernant la pérennité de la gestion, l'expert de la Délégation de la France explique que le mode de gestion met le berger et son troupeau au cœur du dispositif. Depuis des siècles, et particulièrement depuis le dernier demi-siècle, les éleveurs ont démontré leur savoir-faire agro- et eco-pastoral, respectueux des paysages. Ce travail conjugue à la fois la tradition et la modernité. Les effectifs des cheptels ont progressé, l'âge moyen des bergers a rajeuni et les productions progressent en qualité reconnue par des labels

prestigieux. Ces territoires de tradition sont porteurs d'avenir. L'inscription du site permettra à d'autres pays de s'en inspirer pour conserver les usages traditionnels de leurs territoires ruraux, ces territoires que la France souhaite faire partager très largement aux populations de la planète.

ICOMOS wished first to return to the meeting in Vilnius at which it had recommended deferral. ICOMOS explained that on that occasion it had recommended that the State Party focus on agro-pastoralism, since at that time the original nomination had put forward a whole series of quite complex values, connected with chestnut gathering and the Protestant religion, as well as grazing. ICOMOS explained that it had not found any coherent Outstanding Universal Value that could bring these things together, and it had therefore recommended that the focus should be on agro-pastoralism, which seemed to be what bound the region together. ICOMOS explained that this was still its view in the document it had presented at this session. It explained that for various reasons the Committee had not made any recommendations, but that the State Party had nevertheless taken on board some of the recommendations made by ICOMOS and focused on agro-pastoralism. ICOMOS explained that it supported this approach, as signalled in the documents, and that it considered agro-pastoralism to be what bound together the different mountain areas. However, at the same time ICOMOS said that it was concerned at the fact that the dossier dealt with an extremely large area (4,700 km²), which included 125 grazing grounds. It said that the delineation of the Site's boundaries had been for other reasons besides those connected to agro-pastoralism.

Regarding the point raised by Kenya, ICOMOS said that it strongly believed in the need to have a Management Plan for the area that functioned properly, particularly since this was an extremely large area that included many other things beside grazing routes and grazing lands. It also included large settlements and areas not connected to agro-pastoralism. ICOMOS considered that this would make site management complex and difficult. It explained that what was needed was a much more tightly focused area, in which the attributes linked to agro-pastoralism were much stronger and better demonstrated. This would also make management of the area easier, as a result of a focus on traditional farming practices. ICOMOS concluded by saying that what had happened had not entirely been a matter for disappointment, and it commended the State Party for the actions it had taken to focus the nomination. However, it said, this was a difficult thing to achieve, and further steps were needed in order to redefine the Site's boundaries, such that there would be a clear focus on the attributes that had Outstanding Universal Value and that the area could be managed effectively.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wished to ask another question of ICOMOS based on its last statement. It had understood that there was now just one further step to be taken, which consisted in redefining the Site's boundaries. If this were the case, this would imply a referral.

ICOMOS said that in its recommendation it had suggested that what was needed was an inventory of the attributes of agro-pastoralism, which would function as a way of defining the Site's boundaries and justifying them. ICOMOS considered that this would need a new nomination, or a revised one, and that it would certainly need a mission in order to justify the revised boundaries and how they reflected the Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** explained that there were two Draft Decisions for this nomination, one proposing deferral and the other proposing inscription, this having been put forward by Tunisia.

The Delegation of **Australia** recognized the efforts made by the State Party and thanked ICOMOS for having clarified the issues. It said that in the light of the statements that had been made, it was not possible to support inscription if the boundaries had not been redefined. This would imply a mission by ICOMOS to the Site in order to assess the redefined boundaries. The Delegation of Australia said that it would recommend deferral.

ICOMOS emphasized the need for a management system at the Site that would include large settlements and tighter cooperation in relation to traditional practices. It commended the State Party for its actions and focus and acknowledged the difficulties and challenges associated with redefining boundary delineation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested ICOMOS to elaborate on its comment “specific steps”.

ICOMOS clarified the need for an inventory to be made of agro-pastoralism, in order to substantiate the Site’s boundaries in relation to its Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** appealed to Committee Members for precision in supporting either a deferral or a referral.

The Delegation of **Australia** confirmed its position of supporting a deferral.

The Delegation of **Canada** referred to the document produced by ICOMOS that argued that the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity had not been demonstrated. It also referred to ICOMOS’s previous mention of agro-pastoralism, and expressed its support for exploring this theme.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her request to the Committee for greater transparency in support of either a deferral or a referral.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for Australia’s position for a deferral.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its support for the position of Australia and Canada, which argued for a deferral due to the lack of a clear boundary definition.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, se basant sur les explications de l’Etat partie et de l’ICOMOS, se prononce en faveur d’un renvoi de la proposition d’inscription. En effet, eu égard à la décision prise par le Comité à Vilnius qui l’avait renvoyée, le fait de la différer à cette session représenterait un retour en arrière.

According to the Delegation of **Egypt**, the situation was clear, since the majority of Committee Members were in favour of referring the nomination, rather than deferring it.

Prenant en compte le fait que la majorité des membres du Comité s’exprime est en faveur du renvoi de la proposition d’inscription, la Délégation de la **Tunisie** décide de

retirer son amendement au projet de décision, et s'associe à ceux qui demandent le renvoi.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its support for the comments made by Australia, as well as its concern at the lack of progress since the Committee meeting in Vilnius. It underlined issues relating to the size of the property and boundary management and proposed a referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that ICOMOS make recommendations on the capacity and time required for the implementation of these actions before a Decision was made.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) indique souhaiter recevoir des recommandations de la part du Comité, car elle estime que c'est précisément ce qui faisait défaut à la décision prise à Vilnius. Il rappelle cependant que les délimitations du bien sont fixées en premier lieu par la géologie, et non pas par les responsables du dossier d'inscription.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that there have been five interventions each in favour of referral and deferral.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its support for a referral.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** se prononce également en faveur du renvoi.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed its support for a referral.

The Delegation of **Cuba** also supported the referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed a referral and requested the State Party to evaluate the documentation and the on-going work at the property.

The **Chairperson** appealed to the Committee for a consensus.

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** ne souhaite pas que la proposition d'inscription soit différée, mais renvoyée.

Paragraph 2a and b was adopted with the amendment, "refers... back to the State Party".

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that paragraph 3 remain unchanged, as it referred to boundary delineation.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS for comments on the possibility of a mission.

ICOMOS outlined the challenges involved in working with a State Party in the nomination process.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated its proposal for a mission to identify the Site's boundaries and its Outstanding Universal Value and to agree upon related results.

ICOMOS underlined the challenges associated with a referred nomination, as well as the associated time constraints involved in carrying out a mission and subsequent evaluation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reminded those present that the Committee could defer the nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** warned against presenting the State Party with the additional challenges of time constraints should a referral be approved.

The **Chairperson** asked Committee Members to come to a Decision on paragraph 3. The text should be either deleted or retained, or alternatively new text should be introduced.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested comments from the State Party on whether it deemed a mission necessary, while noting that the Advisory Bodies could not carry out a mission in the event of a referral.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) déclare que les autorités de son pays seraient heureuses d'inviter l'ICOMOS sur place, et ce à sa convenance. L'Etat partie aurait en effet besoin de recommandations précises de la part de l'Organisation consultative, et souhaiterait lui montrer différents éléments sur place.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Kenya for a proposed rewording of paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Kenya** presented a text revision asking the State Party to invite a mission and to re-submit the nomination in due course, taking into consideration the limitations of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarification on the objectives of the mission.

ICOMOS reiterated the difficulties involved in the proposal and reminded the Committee that the nomination could not be evaluated by ICOMOS until it had been processed by the World Heritage Centre. ICOMOS reminded Committee Members that nominations were received by the Centre on 1 February, adding that a deferred nomination would give more time.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested Kenya to withdraw its amendment in favour of deferral.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that it did not support the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 due to a lack of clarity between referral and deferral.

The Delegation of **Spain** agreed with the Delegation of Bahrain that the State Party should decide whether it preferred a referral or a deferral.

The **Chairperson** requested the omission of paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Korea** agreed with the statement made by Bahrain regarding the lack of transparency between referral and deferral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its intention of putting forward solutions in “good faith” and withdrew its proposed amendment after the three preceding interventions.

The **Chairperson** appealed for a consensus on adopting the Decision in its current form.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.32** was adopted as amended.

EXTENSION OF PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Property	From the Great Saltworks of Salins-les-Bains to the Royal Saltworks of Arc-et-Senans, the production of open-pan salt
Id. N°	203 Bis
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(iv)

L’**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de la proposition d’extension du bien.

The Delegation of **Canada** articulated its support for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, yet questioned the inclusion of the pipeline as part of the nomination. It requested the removal of the mention of the pipeline if it was not part of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its support for the extension and requested a simplification of the name.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, en accord avec celle des Etats-Unis, pense que le nom proposé pour l’extension du bien est en effet trop long; il suffirait peut-être de citer seulement les deux sites.

ICOMOS outlined that fragments of the pipeline remained and that their significance was both physical and symbolic. ICOMOS emphasized the route followed by the pipeline and its importance to the nomination, in addition to stressing the need for its protection.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested clarification that the pipeline was in accordance with the Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS expressed its conviction that the pipeline should be retained as part of the nomination, and it welcomed an amendment to the wording of the paragraph from the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in relation to the pipeline and the conclusion of the previous statements.

ICOMOS stressed its support for linking the two Sites together and said that this was an integral part of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Canada** put forward the possibility of retaining the statement in the initial summary and omitting it from criteria (iv).

ICOMOS underlined the intention of there being a “process” rather than a “pipeline” in clarifying the full significance of the property.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its acceptance of the proposed rewording to paragraph 3 by ICOMOS and the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** agreed to the proposal by Canada if there were no objections from Committee Members.

ICOMOS agreed to omit the final sentence of paragraph 3 and to maintain the statement regarding the pipeline in the summary text.

Paragraph 3 was adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) remercie le Comité, qui dès 1982 a reconnu l'idéal de progrès que traduit l'architecture de Claude Nicolas Ledoux, ce bien étant l'une des premières grandes réalisations d'architecture industrielle. La parole est donnée au maire de Salins-les-Bains, qui exprime sa joie et sa gratitude auprès du Comité pour cette inscription et le travail fait sur le site. Il invite tous les participants à venir visiter la ville et sa saline dans le Jura.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.34** was adopted as amended.

Property	Church of the Resurrection of Sucevița Monastery
Id. N°	598 Bis
State Party	Romania
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(iv)

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de la proposition d'extension du bien.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite l'Etat partie pour le caractère complet de cette inscription. Elle souhaiterait cependant avoir plus d'information sur l'état d'avancement du plan de gestion et de sa mise en œuvre de la part de l'Etat partie.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** se dit émerveillée par les fresques de l'Eglise et serait heureuse de voir ce bien rejoindre la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Cependant, en référence au rapport de l'ICOMOS, elle souhaite s'associer à la demande de la Délégation du Maroc et donner la parole à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that it had been impressed by the nomination and asked ICOMOS to give additional details to its statement with regard to the existing values of the property.

La Délégation de la **Roumanie** (Observateur), remercie le Comité de lui donner la parole. Selon elle, le rapport de l'ICOMOS conforte les autorités roumaines dans leurs efforts de sauvegarde de l'Eglise. Elle souhaite ensuite répondre aux questions des membres du Comité, en précisant que si l'Église de la Résurrection du monastère de Sucevița n'a pas été inscrite en même temps que les autres églises déjà inscrites, cela est seulement dû à une faute de précision lors de l'élaboration du dossier de proposition d'inscription. En outre, elle souligne le fait que l'ICOMOS, tout comme le Comité, sont d'ores et déjà convaincus de la valeur universelle de cette Eglise, et que le seul problème semble être l'absence d'un plan de gestion. L'Etat partie demande au Comité de bien vouloir approuver l'extension, et garantit que les autorités roumaines fourniront dans les meilleurs délais le plan de gestion demandé, en précisant que celui-ci existe déjà et qu'un Comité de coordination a été créé pour le mettre en œuvre.

L'**ICOMOS** rappelle que l'Église de la Résurrection du monastère de Sucevița a été construite 30 années après celles déjà inscrites, et qu'elle représente une sorte d'aboutissement.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** reiterated its request to ICOMOS.

L'**ICOMOS** rappelle que, comme déjà indiqué dans les recommandations de son rapport, ce qui importe est avant tout l'homogénéisation du plan de gestion.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.35** was adopted

Property	Levoča and the Work of Master Paul in Spiš
Id. N°	620 Bis
State Party	Slovakia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iv)

L'ICOMOS présente son évaluation de la proposition d'extension du bien et demande à ce que l'extension soit prise en compte.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.36** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Slovakia** expressed its gratitude to ICOMOS and the Committee Members for the adoption of the extension. It underlined the importance of the Site, primarily for its military, political and religious functions.

Property	Gold Route in Paraty and its landscape
Id. N°	1308
State Party	Brazil
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v) + CL

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated ICOMOS on its Report. However, it asked whether the proposed extension was not too ambitious, as Brazil had already put forward another nomination regarding the Gold Route, and the present proposal could contradict Brazil's World Heritage Tentative List.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stated that the nominated extension did not justify inscription and favoured a deferral.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for the extension and asked for details from the State Party regarding its decision to include only a part of the Route.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the Draft Decision needed to be revised in order to present the Site as a mixed site and to reflect the complexity of the natural and cultural

values of the property. It announced its intention of submitting a separate nomination for the Gold Route.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that having heard the State Party's comments it wished to present an amendment to the Draft Decision with a view to converting the nominated Site into a mixed site.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested clarification on the nomination of a mixed site, as there was no report from IUCN in the file.

ICOMOS stated that comments from IUCN were included in the conclusions to the Report, and that these indicated that the landscape around the Gold Route could be considered for its natural values.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested confirmation as to whether the State Party intended to nominate the property again according to natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Brazil** confirmed its intention for the property to be inscribed as a mixed site and said that the Gold Route would be submitted as a separate nomination at a later date.

The Delegation of **Spain** was confident that the State Party would be able to submit a new nomination of the Site as a mixed site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked the State Party if, in the case that it was willing to change it to a mixed-site nomination, this would constitute a new nomination of the Site.

The **Chairperson** recalled the response made by the Delegation of Brazil concerning its intention to inscribe the Site as a mixed site.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for the proposed inscription of the Site as a mixed site and for the intervention from Spain.

The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed with the proposal from Spain and stressed the importance of identifying features that could exemplify the Site's Outstanding Universal Value. It also indicated that different approaches could introduce challenges for the State Party in moving forward.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its support for the draft amendment to paragraph 2, inscribing the Site as a mixed site as proposed by Spain.

The Delegation of **Israel** approved the draft amendment to paragraph 2.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.37** was adopted as amended.

SIXTH DAY – SUNDAY, 28 JUNE 2009

THIRTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 2.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

Property	Sacred City of Caral-Supe
Id. N°	1269
State Party	Peru
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS described the property as being the birthplace of civilizations in the Americas and listed its archaeological components. It recommended inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) and recommended that appropriate conservation measures be taken, as well as appropriate visitor management.

The Delegation of **Barbados** indicated that The site of Caral with its pyramid temples, sunken plazas, housing complexes and an amphitheatre, is one of 18 to 20 sites attributed to the ancient Caral-Supe Culture that run almost linearly from Peru's central coast inland up the Andes. They are tremendously important because together they represent the earliest known urban settlements in the Americas—over 4,500 years before the present.

By contrast, the Inca state rose during the 15th century AD, the Nasca Empire about 0 AD, the Teotihuacan first flowered c. 200 BC, Monte Albán about 500 BC, Chavín society around 1,000 BC and Olmec society around 1,200 BC. The Culture represented by the Supe Valley sites dates back as early as 2,600 BC, when Khufu was building the Pyramids at Giza. Extensive archaeological investigations and radio-carbon dating have served to confirm the extraordinary longevity of the civilization embodied by this Site.

This Site has changed history with the proof that a complex urban centre in the Americas thrived as a contemporary to ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt — 1,500 years earlier than previously believed. Indeed, Caral was clearly a thriving metropolis at roughly the same time that Egypt's Great Pyramids were being built. Much remains to be discovered about Caral and the Caral-Supe Culture that flourished here for more than a thousand years. Building monumental architecture such as pyramids and irrigation canals and cities takes planning, rather sophisticated planning, in fact.

Although we cannot know the political structure of the people who built Caral, we do know that they did not have ceramics or metallurgy or writing. The investigations at Caral and the other Supe Valley Sites promise to teach us how people choose to become urban dwellers, and indeed Caral may answer our questions about the origins of Andean civilizations and the development of the first cities in the Americas.

The Delegation of Barbados indicated to be pleased to support the nomination of this extraordinary Site of the Sacred City of Caral Supe.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that the Site had the Outstanding Universal Value required and that it fulfilled all the necessary requirements. It supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party and said that this Site provided important understanding of how religion had been part of the founding of the political order. It said that the Site showed the complexity of human development through its magnificent architectural spaces, pointing out that Peru also possessed other magnificent Sites, such as Cuzco and Machu Pichu.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party of Peru and thanked all the institutions involved in the Site's nomination and evaluation. It commended ICOMOS for its excellent evaluation and recommended that the property be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS and asked for clarification regarding the name of the property and its relation to sacredness. It said that the Site's sacred characteristics were not obvious in the evaluation.

The **Chairperson** asked the Members of the Committee to refrain from expressing further support, as this had already clearly been agreed upon. They should only intervene if they had amendments.

ICOMOS noted that it supported the use of the word "sacred" in the name of the Site, because there was evidence of the Site's having had ceremonial functions. Nevertheless, it said that this evidence was not strong enough for these functions to be included in the justification.

The Delegation of **Egypt** extended its congratulations to the State Party on the presentation of the Site and its appreciation of ICOMOS's efforts. It pointed out that the Pyramids at Giza were funeral monuments, whereas those in Latin America seemed to have been places of worship. It added that this might be a partial reply to the question asked by Bahrain.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'Etat partie pour cette belle réalisation et pose deux questions à l'Etat partie et à l'ICOMOS, d'abord concernant les critères utilisés pour l'établissement de la chronologie puisque, d'après la Mésopotamie et l'Egypte, il s'agit également du troisième millénaire, ensuite quels espaces seraient dédiés aux morts dans la ville.

ICOMOS said that excavations had revealed a large number of discoveries, but it did not consider the question from Tunisia to be relevant to the discussion

The **Chairperson** asked the Members of the Committee to consult the dossier and to avoid questions on matters that were not related to the Decision. She declared paragraphs 1 and 2 adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed an amendment to paragraph 3, after consultation with the State Party, which reflected the rise of the Americas as part of criteria (iii). It asked that the word “earliest” replace “cradle” as a way of describing the “earliest known manifestation”.

The Draft Decision **33COM.8B.38** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Pérou** prononce le discours de remerciement suivant:

« Le Pérou accueille avec une émotion sincère le soutien des membres du Comité, tout comme celui du Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Organisations consultatives, ainsi que tous ceux qui ont contribué à me mener à terme cette proposition d'inscription à la signification si particulière non pas uniquement pour le Pérou, mais pour l'humanité.

Nous profitons de cette opportunité pour réaffirmer l'engagement du Pérou dans la poursuite des efforts nécessaires à la sauvegarde des sites du Patrimoine mondial.

La ville sacrée de Caral illustre de façon exemplaire un ensemble de techniques architecturales et de paysage culturel datant d'une période historique significative.

Toute l'équipe ayant travaillé pendant toutes ces années sur ce site, présentes aujourd'hui dans la salle pour ce moment historique, réaffirme leur intention de protéger et de préserver ce bien doté d'une valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Nous vous remercions grandement. »

The **Chairperson** announced that Item 8B concerning New Nominations remained open, as one site under this item still needed to be discussed.

Examination of minor boundary modifications of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the world Heritage List

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

Property	Manú National Park
Id. N°	402 Bis
State Party	Peru

IUCN said that it had been asked to shorten its presentation. It explained that it recommended the proposed minor modification to the Site's boundaries, considering that this would enhance its integrity and protection as well as facilitate management.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 3B.39** was adopted.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	Natural and Cultural Heritage of Ohrid Region
Id. N°	99 Bis
State Party	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

IUCN explained that the proposed extension to this property added value to the Site.

ICOMOS took the floor since mixed sites are reviewed separately by both Advisory Bodies. It announced its positive recommendation for the minor modification of the property.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.40** was adopted

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Property	Tipasa
Id. N°	193 Bis
State Party	Algeria

ICOMOS recommended the referral of the boundary modifications to the property, pending clarification on the elements included within it.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.8B.41** was adopted.

Property	Amphitheatre of El Jem
Id. N°	38 Bis
State Party	Tunisia

ICOMOS said it proposed the referral of this minor modification in order to allow the State Party to revise the Site's boundaries and clarify the elements contained in it.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.8B.42** was adopted

Property	Kairouan
Id. N°	499 Bis
State Party	Tunisia

ICOMOS proposed the referral of this minor modification and asked the State Party to review the existing proposal, in order to ensure the Site's proper conservation and protection and to integrate the three components of the property.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'ICOMOS pour les rapports extrêmement bien faits et souligne que la Tunisie se conformera dans les meilleurs délais aux recommandations faites par l'Organisation consultative. La Délégation ajoute que cela ne s'applique pas seulement au cas de l'Amphithéâtre d'El Jem mais également à tous les autres sites pour lesquelles la Tunisie fera le nécessaire le plus tôt possible.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.8B.43** was adopted.

Property	Medina of Sousse
Id. N°	498 Bis
State Party	Tunisia

ICOMOS said it proposed the referral of this minor modification for the enlargement of the Site's buffer zone and recommended the identification of regulatory measures to conserve and protect the property.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.44** was adopted.

The Draft Decision 33 COM8B.44 was adopted. Property	Medina of Tunis
Id. N°	36 Bis
State Party	Tunisia

ICOMOS said it proposed the referral of this minor modification to enlarge the Site's buffer zone until regulatory measures had been identified to conserve and protect the property.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.45** was adopted.

Property	Punic Town of Kerkuane and its Necropolis
Id. N°	332 Ter
State Party	Tunisia

ICOMOS said it proposed the referral of this minor modification to allow for a clearer delimitation of the Site's buffer zone. This would allow for the integration of the components of this serial Site and the consideration of property and cadastral data. It asked for clear regulatory measures to be identified for the buffer zone.

The Draft Decision **33 COM8B.46** was adopted.

ASIA / PACIFIC

Property	Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa
Id. N°	707 Quater
State Party	China

ICOMOS said that the State Party had proposed a reduction in the protected area, whereas the buffer zone coincided with the original limits of the property. It said that the limits of the property should be respected. ICOMOS asked for the proposed buffer zone to be in line with that in the nomination file and asked for a map and a copy of the Site Master Plan.

The Delegation of **China** said it approved the Draft Decision and explained that an overall urban plan had been completed with height regulations clearly set out. This would be submitted soon.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.47** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its concern over the procedure used by the Committee to address this item, since the issues involved were very important for the property. It proposed that the Advisory Bodies guide, and not judge, States Parties in their efforts. The aim should be to work together in coordinating activities and then come to an agreed proposal. It added that its remarks also applied to revisions to Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported Israel in underlining the need for collaboration between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** said that there was a need to work on a Draft Decision and proposed that Committee Members draft it.

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	Old Rauma
Id. N°	582 Bis
State Party	Finland

ICOMOS said that it approved the proposed changes to the Site's buffer zone, which were linked to the management of the property and allowed view corridors from the harbour to be protected.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked for clarifications on paragraph 3 and asked for the floor to be given to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Finland** (Observer) concurred with the analysis put forward by ICOMOS but underlined a factual error. It said that there had never been a canal system at the Site, and that the shoreline had originally been located further to the west because of rising land levels.

The Delegation of **Sweden** asked for the deletion of paragraph 3 in the light of this error.

ICOMOS agreed with the deletion of paragraph 3.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.48** was adopted as amended.

Property	Chartres Cathedral
Id. N°	81 Bis
State Party	France

ICOMOS recommended the approval of the buffer zone surrounding the property.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.49** was adopted.

Property	Aachen Cathedral
Id. N°	3 Bis
State Party	Germany

ICOMOS said that its Report was very detailed and argued that the extension of the Site's boundaries would change the contents of the property, and that it therefore did not approve it.

The Draft Decision **33 COM8B.50** was adopted.

Property	Hanseatic City of Lübeck
Id. N°	272 Bis
State Party	Germany

ICOMOS recommended approval of the State Party's minor modification and recommended that a Management Plan be drawn up for the Site. It also recommended that information be provided on the archaeological remains.

The Draft Decision **33 COM8B.51** was adopted.

Property	Old Town of Ávila with its Extra-Muros Churches
Id. N°	348 Ter
State Party	Spain

ICOMOS said it recommended the referral of the buffer zone. It also noted that a Management Plan for the Site was being prepared, considering this to be a prerequisite to any changes in the Site's boundaries.

The **Chairperson** said that examination of Item 8B52 had not taken place, but that she understood that it had been withdrawn.

ICOMOS said that Decision 33 COM 8B52 mentioned referral, but that ICOMOS had recommended deferral.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat and ICOMOS to check Item 8B52. She added that Israel's intervention over the procedure used for minor modifications should also be postponed until a proposal for a Decision had been made.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked if it could comment on the procedure at this point in the discussion, or whether it should wait until later.

The **Chairperson** said she would give it the floor if its intervention was related to the proposals made by Israel and Kenya.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said it had submitted an amendment.

The **Chairperson** asked it to work on a joint amendment with Israel and Kenya.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked for the Decision with the amendment by Israel to be displayed.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her request for Bahrain to work directly with Israel and Kenya.

**ITEM 8E ADOPTION OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF SIGNIFICANCE
AND OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE**

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/8E

Decision: 33 COM 8E

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the revised Draft Decision had been distributed during the meeting and asked for it to be read. It was proposed for adoption without debate.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.8E** was adopted

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8E of the Agenda.

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

The **Chairperson** said that the list of State of Conservation Reports under this item was very long, with 29 being open for discussion. She encouraged Members of the Committee to limit debate to the minimum. She said that Committee Members had provided written amendments, and that the debate needed to focus on these. She recalled the information session, where it had been said that the discussion would focus on Sites under the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as on properties that had not been the subject of a report from the relevant State Party. She also said that States Parties had asked for discussion of other reports, which was their right.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed that only States Parties that had proposed amendments should take the floor.

The **Chairperson** said she could not prevent Members of the Committee from taking the floor and could only recommend greater focus.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if States Parties that had proposed amendments could withdraw their requests.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee needed to examine their requests, and that it could not postpone review. She then asked the Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Greg Terill, to replace her at the podium because the site to be discussed concerned Spain.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked the Vice-Chairperson to repeat the working methods to be used during the day with regards to time management.

The **Chairperson** said that the order would be: Europe and North America, then Latin America and the Caribbean, then Africa, then the Arab States, and finally Asia and the Pacific.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it had been referring to time management.

The Vice-**Chairperson** said that the focus would be on the remaining State of Conservation Reports.

La Délégation du **Maroc** signale, avant d'entrer dans le débat, qu'elle souhaite faire un commentaire d'ordre général. La Délégation explique qu'elle a été étonnée des erreurs factuelles contenues dans les rapports d'examen d'état de conservation de sites soumis par les Etats Parties et qu'elle souhaite porter ce fait à l'attention des membres du Comité.

The Vice-**Chairperson** answered that what should be discussed were the open State of Conservation Reports only.

Pyrenees – Mont Perdu (France/ Spain) (CN 773 bis)

The **Secretariat** explained that major issues affecting the property included the annual Gavarnie Festival that took place within the property and transboundary management.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was concerned about the property and had considered proposing its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It asked for clarification about the values of the property and about whether or not the Festival was permanent. It requested that major improvements be made on a joint basis to the Site's management, and it said that the property should be examined again by the Committee in 2010. It asked IUCN if the boundaries of the property could be changed, and if the States Parties had considered canceling the Festival as they had committed to do in the past.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** also expressed its concern and found it difficult to judge the situation on the basis of at least three "Cs" – credibility, community and communication – pointing out that the requirement for community was not necessarily in line with economic needs. It wondered whether the Site's Outstanding Universal Value was in danger and asked if the States Parties wished to see the Site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also asked Spain about its position and for clarification on possible relocation and mitigation measures.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that it was concerned at the situation and in particular at the information provided by the Advisory Bodies. It pointed out the need for coordination by both States Parties and asked how and whether the Committee's recommendations had been followed and transboundary cooperation carried out.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said it reiterated Israel's and Bahrain's questions to the States Parties.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of France (Observer).

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) répond aux 3 questions posées par le Comité, soulignant d'abord le caractère provisoire (une dizaine de jours) du festival de Gavarnie qui se tiendra encore cette année (2009) mais avec des améliorations. Elle explique que des efforts ont été déployés pour mieux intégrer l'événement dans le bien notamment par la suppression des sièges et des gradins, la diminution du volume et de la visibilité des équipements techniques. Mettant en question le fait que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle puisse être affectée par un tel événement, elle assure que l'Etat partie a fait et continuera à faire des efforts afin de satisfaire les demandes du Comité. Deuxièmement, elle informe qu'un comité de suivi et de gestion du bien a été mis en place en février 2009, que les autorités espagnoles ont été invitées et que le gouverneur de la région d'Aragon a répondu favorablement sur le principe. Enfin, elle explique que la proposition d'exclure le lieu du festival du bien inscrit lui semble impossible vu que le cirque de Gavarnie représente une partie intégrante du bien.

The Delegation of **Spain** clarified that the questions had been put to both States Parties, but that the State Party where the management committee and the Festival were located, France, would be the most appropriate one to answer. It recalled that the main issue of concern was the current location of the Gavarnie Festival on the French side of the property, and it said that Spain shared such concerns. However, it emphasized that the State Party of France was a sovereign state. Regarding management coordination, the Delegation of Spain explained that the National Park of Monte Perdido and the Autonomous Region of Aragon were now represented on the Coordination Committee, and it also referred to the Coordination Charter signed in 1998 and the provisions made under this. Concerning the Provisional Management Plan, the Delegation pointed out that for the Spanish part of the site, covered by the National Park of Monte Perdido and Ordesa, progress had been made in addressing the issues of agro-pastoralism pointed to by the Committee in its last Decision, and that 21% of the allocated budget had been dedicated to these issues.

IUCN said that ICOMOS also might want to comment. It said that the change of boundaries proposed by Israel was not possible, as France had explained, and that the temporary activity at the Site had had an impact on the property as a result of its scale, duration and frequency. It added that mitigation measures were indeed possible, and that relocating the activity was a way out, but that mediation would be necessary.

ICOMOS supported IUCN's position and welcomed the States Parties' proposal for agro-pastoralism. It said that the Festival was not connected to the values and Outstanding Universal Value of the Site and that there was a need for its overall management. The property benefited from funds to support the community, but a more transparent procedure was needed in giving this support. It called for a workshop to be held to address the issue of the Site's management in relation to the attribution of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Paragraphs 1 to 6 were adopted with an amendment by Israel to paragraph 3 that substituted "State Party" with "Managing Body" and changed the date in paragraph 7 from 2011 to 2010, as proposed by Bahrain.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked that the usual wording on Outstanding Universal Value be added to paragraph 8 and asked once again for the substitution of "State Party" by "Managing Body".

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked for the word “mitigation” to be replaced with “relocation”.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the Festival had been relocated and that therefore paragraph 8 was irrelevant.

The **Chairperson** answered that the Festival had not been relocated.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed deleting the words “to start the process” and leaving the Decision until after the conclusions of the 2010 mission had been received.

The **Chairperson** said that Israel did not agree with the amendment by Bahrain.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment concerning the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value: “finally requests the State Party to develop in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as well as to submit...”. The Rapporteur said that the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would not necessarily be reviewed in 2010.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said the paragraph on Outstanding Universal Value was a standard one, and it withdrew its amendment to paragraph 8 concerning the date. It asked for paragraph 7 to remain unchanged.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the Site’s inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not clearly justified and that communities and heritage were not necessarily incompatible.

The Delegation of **Kenya** underlined the importance of the compatibility between human beings and the landscape and said that the State Party was doing its best to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was retained. It drew the attention of those present to the community’s awareness of and ties to the Site and called for the community to be part of the Site’s management system.

The **Chairperson** asked for the discussion to focus on paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the amendment made by Canada on the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value, asking for the words, “with the joint management and monitoring body” to be added.

The **Rapporteur** inserted the words, “with the joint management and monitoring body” after the word “develop”. Paragraph 7 of the Decision was adopted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souligne qu’elle voudrait poser une question plutôt d’ordre général puisque plusieurs biens sont affectés par le même problème – y compris au Maroc - en l’occurrence des animations de type festival dont un inventaire donnerait une très longue liste, y compris au Maroc. La Délégation demande si le Comité a des directives ou des orientations claires qui pourraient le guider sur les animations qui se déroulent sur des sites du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** asked if the question raised by Morocco could be postponed and if focus could instead be given to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **33COM 7B.40** was adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** announced that the Draft Decision **33 COM 7B41** (Ibiza) was not open for discussion.

Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 666)

The **Secretariat** said that on 22 April 2009 the World Heritage Centre had received an email from Europa Nostra expressing its concern at the construction of the Blanka Tunnel Complex. On 14 May 2009, the Centre had received a review of the site's Management Plan from ICOMOS and had sent this to the State Party on the same day. On 22 May 2009, the Centre had received a letter dated 14 May 2009 from the State Party providing additional information (including on CD-ROMs) on the State of Conservation of the Site, this information regarding the Pankrac Plain area and the construction of the urban ring.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.96** was adopted.

Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of Vezere Valley (France) (C85)

The **Secretariat** said that reports had noted progress made since last year, included the holding of a scientific symposium, the Reactive Monitoring Mission undertaken by two ICOMOS experts on 17-18 March 2009, and the greater transparency of information for the public. She said that the proceedings of the symposium were under preparation, and that a summary of the conclusions had been provided by the Chair. She also announced that on 28 May 2009 the Reactive Monitoring Mission Report had been sent to the State Party for comment, but that no comment had thus far been received. A number of concerns raised by NGOs had also been sent to the State Party for comment.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the issue was a complex one even for a committee of experts, and that not all the information had been received. It outlined the importance of strengthening the scientific committee and said it had amendments to propose.

Paragraphs 1 to 5 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked how many paintings were affected.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of France (Observer).

The Delegation of **France** (Observer) said that only 1% of the paintings had been affected and that the condition of the cave was stable.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada, adding the words, "that currently only a small number of paintings has been affected" to paragraph 6.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** signale qu'elle a reçu un rapport scientifique extrêmement alarmant sur l'état de conservation de l'église.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked for review of the paragraph on the Site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said that although only some paintings had been affected, the situation remained alarming and that the Committee should not be negligent. It agreed with the addition by Australia and proposed to add the words, "and further notes with concern", even though only 1% of the artwork had been affected.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the Committee did not have the expertise to judge the condition of the cave.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** considère que la description de ces peintures n'est pas du tout appropriée et qu'il faut la revoir. Elle indique cependant que si le texte convient au Comité, elle sera d'accord pour le retenir. Aussi explique-t-elle avoir reçu une lettre d'un spécialiste en peintures rupestres d'après laquelle elle peut affirmer que certaines peintures ont été modifiées et retouchées. Il sera absolument nécessaire alors de prévoir la formation d'un comité scientifique d'experts en art rupestre qui puisse informer vraiment de l'état des peintures du site.

The Delegation of **Israel** raised a problem regarding the distribution of the text. It further noted that the Committee did not have enough time to examine previous statements.

The Delegation of **Australia** recommended a reference to an amendment rather than an omission.

The Delegation of **Barbados**, supported by the Delegation of Egypt, did not agree with the position expressed by the Delegation of Israel. It recalled that the Committee, as proposed in the text of the Decision, had only noted its concern. While the Site's Outstanding Universal Value had not yet been threatened, there was still the possibility that it could be in danger in the future. This possibility should be monitored closely over the coming years, notably in the context of Periodic Reporting.

The **Chairperson** called for new wording.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, in support of the Delegation of Barbados, asked how the issues at stake were to be measured. It drew the attention of others to the fact that even a small problem could sometimes lead to great difficulties, and in this case it might be hard to assess the importance of the threats the Site could face. It called for better coordination and management of information, since this was currently being gathered from too many sources, causing difficulties in the decision-making process.

The **Chairperson** summarized the debate.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the discussion on Reinforced Monitoring Missions had taken many of the current aspects into consideration and that it should not be lost in the debate. It asked that the Committee add the words, "further notes the Report as a whole" and not pick up on certain elements and leave other important aspects out.

The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of paragraph 6. The second part of paragraph 6 was set aside for further consideration.

La Délégation de la **Jordanie** indique être d'accord avec les suggestions des Délégations du **Kenya** et de la **Barbade** et suggère d'expliquer clairement qu'uniquement certaines peintures ont été retouchées.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose alors d'amender le paragraphe 6 et d'ajouter la phrase : « diverses éclosions de moisissures sur les peintures constituent une menace pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien ». La Délégation insiste sur le fait que l'état de ces peintures constitue une menace qui pèse sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, ce qui veut dire que peut être aujourd'hui ce n'est pas une menace mais que ceci pèse sur l'intégrité du site.

The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of paragraph 6, including amendments as a paragraph 6b.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested retaining the information in 6b, together with some information from paragraph 7.

The **Chairperson** called for new wording.

Building on points made by the Delegations of Tunisia and Barbados, the Delegation of **Canada** suggested new wording: "notes that while currently only some of the paintings have been directly affected and the situation remains serious..."

The Delegation of **Spain** said that according to the Report by ICOMOS, the current situation did not constitute a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site as a whole, and that only 14 animal paintings or engravings had been affected. The cave was currently closed, and intensive work was underway by an international committee of experts. The Delegation of Spain repeated what it had said in Quebec: the conservation of this Site must be an example to be followed by all countries with rock-art sites, whether or not they are inscribed on the World Heritage List. Work was underway at the property, and this could have a very positive outcome. The Delegation congratulated the State Party on this work and asked Members of the Committee to be patient and not to be alarmist.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarification.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked ICOMOS to give the specific chapter and paragraph of the report stating that the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site had not been affected. It said that it was very concerned.

ICOMOS referred to information in the Expert Mission Report that clearly established that certain paintings had been affected but had underlined that this did not constitute a loss of Outstanding Universal Value for the time being. ICOMOS also said that Lascaux was only a portion, though of course a very prominent one, of the Site as a whole. This was quite large and included many other parts. ICOMOS reminded the Committee that there was a crisis and said that the State Party needed to act with prudence, given the context, the present situation in the cave and external climatic factors. It should also act without resorting to the use of chemicals. It also drew attention to the fact that there

could be another crisis in the future and said that a mitigation strategy should be designed to deal with such an event that made use of new research. ICOMOS said that this would take time. The many interventions that had taken place at the Site over the last few decades precluded any chance of restoring the cave's original state. Instead, it was now time to move forward. ICOMOS underlined that monitoring what had happened and what was happening was essential, in order to make sure that things were going in the right direction.

The **Chairperson** again referred to the Report and confirmed that all the relevant information was in it.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the words, "the situation remains serious" should be placed at the end of the paragraph.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee was examining paragraphs 6b and 7.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said that the statement made by ICOMOS confirmed what had been said previously.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested adding the words, "acknowledges the good work that has been done already and continue with research and monitoring".

The Delegation of **Spain** suggested changing the word "serious" to "worrisome" in the Decision. It agreed to the addition of another paragraph and the amendment proposed by Kenya.

Paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 were adopted

The Delegation of **Spain** said that in the light of the ICOMOS Expert Report and the need to reduce expenses it was not necessary to ask for the adoption of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism if the authorities were already working with an international committee. It considered that the Report and the need to save money should be allowed to guide the decision not to introduce the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed its concern and asked why the Committee was now considering invoking the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, since it had earlier rejected its use at World Heritage Sites because of a lack of funds.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether this had been discussed with the State Party.

La Délégation du **Maroc** trouve la situation très difficile aussi bien pour l'Etat partie que pour les Organisations Consultatives et pour le Comité, et demande aussi que le mécanisme de suivi renforcé ne soit pas appliqué.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 100** was adopted as amended

The representative from the NGO **International Committee on the Preservation of Lascaux** (Observateur) stated that it was not too late to intervene. 14 paintings had been affected and irreversibly damaged. There was an analogy to be made between a work of art and the canvas on which it was painted and the paintings in the caves and the caves themselves: neither a painting nor a work of rock-art could be separated from

their supports. According to the NGO, there was a significant threat to the Site's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity. There were growing patches of black stains, and there was a lack of qualified staff overseeing the work. The NGO concluded by asking how it was possible to consider that this level of contamination at the Site did not impact on its Outstanding Universal Value.

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

The **Secretariat** presented the situation at the Site of Bordeaux, explaining the various issues arising. A joint mission by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre had been undertaken in 2009, in order to evaluate the impact of building a new bridge on the Site's visual integrity and Outstanding Universal Value. The report of this mission was sent to the State Party in June 2009. New information had then been received by the Centre in the form of two letters from the Mayor of Bordeaux, who had written that the height of the bridge had been reduced to 77 metres.

ICOMOS made no comment for the sake of time.

The **Chairperson** said that all the information was in the document.

The Delegation of **Barbados** drew the Committee's attention to the Working Document and the Information Document, which contained important information. It emphasized the issue of the cruise ships that were planned to pass through this area of the Garonne, adding that the height of the bridge was necessary for their passage. It noted that it was the prerogative of the State Party to proceed with its plans, but the question before the Committee was whether these plans affected the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site. Monitoring of the Site was required, and proposals for successful intervention needed to be studied. It further noted that changes at the Site might also be compatible with its Outstanding Universal Value and that this case could be used as a pilot project. It suggested that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be continued in order to explore the case further and identify creative solutions.

La Délégation du **Maroc** explique que, même si le rapport indique que le projet n'a pas été officiellement présenté, elle a reçu des informations selon lesquelles il a été présenté en novembre 2006, l'ensemble des informations a été remis au Centre du Patrimoine mondial, et des experts se sont rendus sur place. La Délégation estime, entre autre, que la ville a réduit la taille du pilon et que le pont culminant de la partie historique est beaucoup plus élevé. Ils ne sont pas sûrs alors qu'il existe une co-visibilité du pilon avec les autres points culminants. Concernant le tunnel, la Délégation du Maroc considère qu'il faut démystifier les impacts d'une telle option, puisque la construction d'un pont ne met pas toujours en péril l'esthétique du paysage et que les tunnels n'assurent pas la même fluidité. Concernant le coût d'une telle opération, elle estime que si la ville en a les moyens elle peut suivre les indications du Centre mais qu'elle ne peut peut-être pas en assumer les retombés économiques. Elle demande alors au Centre du Patrimoine Mondial s'il a mené une étude sérieuse démontrant que ces propositions sont économiquement viables. On est confronté de nouveau à la difficulté de conjuguer les progrès de la vie moderne et la préservation nécessaire du patrimoine. Bordeaux a fait de grands efforts pour préserver le patrimoine et pour faire attention aux observations du Centre du Patrimoine Mondial. Elle demande enfin à l'Etat partie de s'exprimer sur ces observations.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** signale que la construction d'un pont sur un site du Patrimoine mondial ne constitue pas un cas nouveau pour le Comité. Elle estime qu'un tunnel va également détruire un environnement et elle propose une autre solution : reconsidérer les limites du bien et placer le pont au dehors des limites de l'inscription, dans la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supporting the Delegation of Morocco, stressed the need to consider the case very carefully, to work with the municipality of Bordeaux, and to take into account all stakeholder interests.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked whether alternatives were possible or desirable. It expressed its concern and called for further clarification from ICOMOS, especially as there were varying opinions expressed in the Document.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to respond to questions.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) s'exprime alors sur l'impact du pont sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site. Elle explique que Bordeaux est un port depuis sa fondation par les romains, et que le trafic maritime y est donc important. Il s'agit alors de pouvoir continuer à accueillir des voiliers et des petits et moyens bateaux en centre ville, mais le passage nécessitant une certaine hauteur et il faut donc que le pont soit adapté. La Délégation ajoute qu'il n'y aura pas d'impact visuel puisque le pont a été conçu en fonction de la topographie du fleuve, et qu'il ne sera pas visible de l'ancienne partie du port. La ville est un port maritime et la priver de cette caractéristique signifierait la priver de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et pourrait alors porter atteinte à un des deux éléments constitutifs de la nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarification on the proposed intervention and its status at the time of the inscription of the Site. It also requested information from the State Party about the possibility of further reducing the height of the bridge.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that one bridge had already been demolished at the Site. It asked for a discussion on the limits of acceptable change in the context of development. Planning was required, it emphasized, at a very early stage and where possible ahead of listing.

The Delegation of **Israel** drew attention to the fact that the Committee was discussing two separate bridges. It referred to a bridge that had been demolished by the State Party and had been rebuilt but said that this could not replace the bridge that was now being proposed.

The **Secretariat** clarified that there were in fact two bridges. A heritage bridge, the Pont de Pertuis, had been demolished and a new bridge had been constructed to replace it. A different bridge over the Garonne was now under development. The two bridges raised different concerns.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated its concern about development in urban contexts. It called for more reflection on the subject.

The **Chairperson** considered that there was a need for clarification.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** estime que le Comité ne veut pas accorder la plus grande importance à une ville aussi importante que Bordeaux. Elle regrette que le Comité s'intéresse à un pont qui a été détruit, et estime qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de revenir là-dessus. Elle demande à l'Etat partie d'expliquer si la décision a été définitivement prise ou si elle est soumise aux recommandations du Centre du Patrimoine Mondial. Elle croyait que la décision avait été déjà prise et que les travaux allaient commencer au mois de septembre.

The Delegation of **Kenya** raised a point of order and asked for clarification on procedure, in order that the discussion could focus on one bridge and one issue at a time.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reminded those present of the main question at hand and asked whether the new bridge affected the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site. It said that it felt that it did not.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the Delegation of the United States of America. Having examined the information provided by ICOMOS, it felt confident that the construction did not negatively affect the Site and that it could be considered an integral part of it.

The **Secretariat** intervened again to clarify that the discussion was primarily about the bridge over the Garonne, for which a construction project had been proposed.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its concern about the principal issue: was the Site's Outstanding Universal Value being maintained? It called for an assessment of the new bridge to be undertaken. This had not been done, and yet it was important.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegations to provide amendments.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** demande à voir le plan du site et explique qu'elle n'avait pas proposé de déplacer le pont mais de reconsidérer les limites du périmètre véritablement inscrit, de manière à ce que l'on puisse inclure le pont dans la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** raised an issue about disparity in the Reports and called for an explanation.

The **Secretariat** stated that on the key issue of changes in an urban context, when these were compatible with heritage-protection policy it was in full agreement with ICOMOS. In this case, the World Heritage Centre generally supported the construction of a bridge. However, it noted that the proposed design raised certain issues and that it could constitute a precedent that could be referred to as an example in the future. It also referred to the principal issue of integrity and the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. In this context, it felt that the bridge could be considered to be a break with the past, but it emphasized the need for an appropriate compromise to be found to meet development needs and for adequate consultation with the community to take place. In this case, it noted that there was a high cost attached to the construction of the bridge, and while it was up to the local community to decide whether it felt comfortable about spending the budget required, in the Secretariat's view it was not a cost-effective proposal and there were alternatives. It cited other cases in the past in which projects

had been started, and had then been halted or re-designed. This had taken place in Vienna, Cologne and St. Petersburg, for example. It further noted that, as had been suggested by the Delegation of Madagascar, discussion on the boundaries of the Site and their possible revision could be an appropriate solution.

ICOMOS reiterated the need to focus on the issue of the impact of the bridge on the Site's Outstanding Universal Value. It said that there was a need to compare the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value referred to in Report with those mentioned in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. The analysis of ICOMOS had shown that the visual impact of the bridge did not threaten the Site's Outstanding Universal Value. The location of the bridge was 2.5 km from the centre of the Site, and the bridge would not be able to be seen from the centre. This was a part of the Site, and Bordeaux needed both the port and the attributes for which it had been inscribed.

La Délégation du **Maroc** explique que le premier pont qui a été détruit était très différent de celui qui est en construction et que le nouveau ne constitue pas pour autant un remplacement de l'autre. Le projet actuel est donc nécessaire pour l'accessibilité des quartiers inscrits sur la liste du patrimoine mondial aujourd'hui.

The Delegation of **Canada** called for a response from the State Party to earlier questions.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) répond à la question du Canada en expliquant que le projet date de 1990, que la proposition d'inscription a été présentée en 2000 et qu'un dossier a été préparé pour l'expert de l'ICOMOS en mission sur le site. Le pont se trouve à l'extrémité nord du bien inscrit, aujourd'hui un quartier industriel. Elle insiste sur le fait que la construction de ce pont va contribuer à l'amélioration de la ville et à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien puisque, comme ils ont déjà exprimé, Bordeaux est un port depuis son origine. Sur la question des possibilités techniques de réduire encore le pilon, le délégué estime que ce n'est pas possible, et qu'il a été déjà réduit de 12 %.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

Regarding paragraph 3, the Delegation of **Canada** called for the word "begun" to be used instead of "reinstated".

The Delegation of **Australia** made an addition to the end of the paragraph: "that are attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose de rajouter la mention « Enjambe le bassin » au paragraphe 3.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** se dit étonnée par la proposition de réalisation d'un inventaire des vestiges du port telle que cela est prévu dans le paragraphe 3. Elle se demande si cela n'aurait pas du être fait avant l'inscription du site sur la liste du Patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested moving the words "the place where it crosses the basin".

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose de modifier au paragraphe 3 commence par « a commencé »

The **Chairperson** called for the adoption of paragraph 3.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4 and the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Australia** called for consistency in the use of the term “planning regulations”.

The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 5 submitted by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its confusion and asked for clarification. It withdrew its proposed amendment on the “replacement bridge” after clarification from ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with paragraph 5 proposed by Australia.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment submitted by the Delegation of Australia: “regrets that potential impacts of the replacement bridge for the Pont de Pertuis on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property were not assessed prior to construction and further requests that consideration be given to restoring the now narrowed passage channel to its original dimensions”.

Paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision was adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for confirmation from Sweden that it still wanted to withdraw its amendment.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said it was ready to withdraw the amendment, unless the Committee wished to retain it.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked for a clarification from the State Party on whether a decision had already been taken on the proposed bridge.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that rivers with significant traffic have the same kind of impact on historic cities as highways with large amounts of traffic. The scale of the harbour was critical, as were issues of management and sustainability. There was a potential for finding an alternative design in terms of scale and in terms of the sections of the proposed bridge. It said that part of the paragraph submitted by the Delegation of Sweden should remain.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked for clarification about the effects of large cruise ships on the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Secretariat** recalled the special nature of the bridge, which would allow ships to pass through by the use of a system of lifts. A decision had been made to allow the passage of such ships, and this decision would create impacts. However, this decision had been made by the City of Bordeaux. It was a decision that had not aimed to affect the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value. Instead, the bridge was the logical consequence of a decision to allow the passage of 30 large cruise ships per year.

The Delegation of **Kenya** considered that the construction of the bridge was the real problem. The passage of smaller boats would also increase if the Centre's views on the construction of the bridge were not followed up on and reflected in the Decision.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested that the word "vessels" replace "large-scale cruise ships" in the proposed amendment 6 submitted by Sweden, since this would include other types of boats and their potential impacts.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** propose de garder le paragraphe 6.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported the Delegation of Tunisia and the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Sweden. It called for the latter to be retained after the explanation given by the Secretariat.

The **Chairperson** retained paragraph 6 as amended by the Delegation of Barbados.

La Délégation du **Maroc** se demande pourquoi, selon l'intervention de l'Etat partie, les grands bateaux sont censés ne pas passer, alors que le Secrétariat a déclaré le contraire.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) confirme que les grands navires de croisière ne vont pas accéder à Bordeaux. D'ailleurs, la profondeur de la Garonne ne le permet pas puisqu'elle fait 9m, profondeur insuffisante pour des bateaux de croisière. La Délégation insiste sur le fait que le port de Bordeaux représente un élément constitutif de la ville et de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Par ailleurs, il faut prévoir le passage des bateaux de plus de 50 mètres, bien que la hauteur du pont soit liée à la hauteur des voiliers et non des bateaux de croisière.

The **Chairperson** turned to paragraph 7 on provisions relating to the College Cassagnol and declared it adopted. She then returned to the proposed amendment submitted by the Delegation of Morocco, read out by the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment in French.

La Délégation du **Maroc** souhaite ajouter l'amendement suivant au paragraphe 6 : « prie l'état partie de poursuivre les études visant à limiter l'impact visuel sur le bien, ainsi que de considérer le transfert de la zone de mouillage des grands bateaux de croisière en aval de l'emplacement du pont proposé ». Elle indique que l'amendement proposé pourrait remplacer la première partie du paragraphe 6.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked the Delegation of Morocco whether its amendment could be considered a separate paragraph relating to visual impact.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked for reference to be made to "large vessels" instead of "large-scale cruise ships", as it had requested previously.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique que c'est parce que le paragraphe 6 n'avait pas été encore adopté qu'un amendement a été proposé.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee was in agreement on the reference to large vessels proposed by the Delegation of Barbados and asked the Delegation of Morocco about its amendment being considered as a new paragraph.

Pour la Délégation du **Maroc** c'est la référence à la taille des navires qui n'est pas assez claire au paragraphe 6. Elle recommande donc une référence plus générale.

La Délégation du **Maroc** est d'accord pour maintenir son paragraphe et elle appelle l'attention du Comité sur le fait d'éviter la répétition du paragraphe 6 de la taille des navires. Elle propose d'intégrer la taille des bateaux dans le paragraphe 6 et d'ajouter un nouveau paragraphe sur l'impact visuel, le paragraphe 7 : « prie l'état partie de poursuivre les études visant à limiter l'impact visuel sur le bien ».

The **Chairperson** proposed to delete the reference to “large vessels” after the words “visual impact on the property” in the new paragraph 7 originally proposed by the Delegation of Morocco and declared it adopted. She also declared adopted the new paragraph 9 on the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. The Chairperson then declared the new paragraph 10 adopted, adjourning the session for resumption on the new amendment submitted by the Delegation of Kenya to the following paragraph.

The meeting rose at 2 pm.

SIXTH DAY – SUNDAY, 28 JUNE 2009

FOURTEENTH MEETING

3:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C1256) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** summarized the amendments proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.17** was adopted as amended.

Une **ONG** française (Observateur) salue la sagesse de la décision du Comité au début du paragraphe 6 car elle estime que cela laisse l'avenir ouvert. Citant ce paragraphe, elle souligne que ce pont gigantesque, avec ses 4 piles de 80 m et son tablier de 44 m de large qui en font l'un des plus larges du monde, aurait un impact visuel certain sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien ; la Décision du Comité en 2008 le soulignait déjà. Elle rappelle que si on regarde une carte, on constate que ce pont est en visibilité avec les 2/3 de la façade des XVIIe, XVIIIe et XIXe siècles. En outre, réaliser le pont proposé en aval du port de la Lune aurait constitué une contrainte non plus naturelle mais artificielle en créant une sorte de barrière avant le port. Les croisiéristes ont indiqué que leurs navires ne franchiront pas un tel pont, comme c'est déjà le cas à Rouen. Ils désertent le port de la Lune. Quant aux navires de plaisance et de tourisme fluvial, le pont ne sera pas levé pour eux. Les potentialités actuelles et futures de ce patrimoine vivant constituées par le fleuve et le port seraient compromises de manière irréversible. L'ONG tient à rassurer le Comité : Bordeaux ne sera jamais envahi par d'énormes bateaux de croisière comme on peut en voir à Venise ou ailleurs, car les caractéristiques physiques du fleuve limitent leur taille à 250 m et leur tirant d'eau à 8 m. En revanche, ceux qui viennent constituent une source d'animation et de vie des quais de la ville. L'ONG ne souhaite donc pas la mort de ce port. Une autre solution existe, à savoir le tunnel, dont la faisabilité est établie. Si au nom de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle le Comité n'a pas voulu du pont de Dresde, comment pourrait-il accepter celui de Bordeaux ? Elle remercie enfin le Comité de lui avoir donné le statut d'observateur.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST(Continuation)

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

New Nominations

Property	The Triple-arch Gate at Dan
Id. N°	1105 Rev
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

The **Chairperson** opened the item on this nomination and indicated that the Draft Decision would be adopted without debate.

L'**ICOMOS** présente le dossier, qui avait déjà été examiné par la 32e session du Comité. L'**ICOMOS** indique que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien est indiscutable et correspond au critère (ii). L'Etat partie a fourni les données juridiques et techniques complémentaires qui avaient été demandées. L'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien sont correctes, mais les dégradations alentours font peser une menace sur elles.

The **Chairperson** once again requested that the Draft Decision be adopted without debate.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8B.33** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** thanked the Director-General of ICCROM, who had helped reach agreement on complicated decisions.

ITEM 7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

The **Secretariat** reported that the property might be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, based on the fact that the information requested by the Committee at its 32nd session (32 COM 7B.90) had not been supplied by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked if the State Party would welcome the Site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chair** invited the Delegation of Georgia to respond.

The Delegation of **Georgia** (Observer) expressed its interest in hosting a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission in 2010, at which time it assured the Committee that the progress achieved would satisfy its concerns. It added that the country had faced particularly difficult political and economic challenges since the last meeting of the World Heritage Committee. It explained that the Georgian Government had established a dedicated cultural agency in 2009 with a mandate to deal with the property and its challenges.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique comprendre l'inquiétude du Comité, mais compte tenu des informations données par l'Etat partie, elle suggère d'adopter le projet soumis en l'état.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked who had introduced the amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** responded that it had prepared the amendment regarding inscribing the property onto the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis that this was consistent with the Decision of the Committee at its last session (32 COM 7B.90), in which it had called for such listing should there be no substantial progress in dealing with the threats to the property. In the absence of any further information, the Delegation of Bahrain had felt compelled to propose this amendment.

The Delegation of **Canada** wondered if ICOMOS had a view on the suggested corrective measures in the amended Draft Decision.

ICOMOS was satisfied that the necessary corrective measures would be addressed during the Reactive Monitoring Mission and that the corrective measures currently suggested in the amended Draft Decision were premature in this regard.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** withdrew its amendment with regard to the corrective measures.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested consistency in the language used in the Decision, particularly in regard to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.102** was adopted as amended.

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) C 710

The **Secretariat** explained that it had received an email from the State Party informing it of the near completion of restoration work to the property.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted some confusion over the terms “rehabilitation” and “reconstruction” and asked that these terms be used appropriately and consistently.

ICOMOS indicated that “reconstruction” was the proper term, but that the little information provided to date by the State Party had not allowed it to decide conclusively on this matter.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.103** was adopted as amended.

Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)

The **Secretariat** reported that information provided by the State Party for this property had been received well after the 1 February deadline, requiring that the Secretariat's State of Conservation Report include the 7B.Add Document. The State Party had only provided a summary of an environmental impact study on the bridge, and the full report was provided in German only in June. The Secretariat had also received a letter informing it of the results of the design competition for the bridge. The State Party argued that intrusion into the landscape by the bridge would be minor. The Secretariat also reported having received many letters from NGOs on the matter, along with an analysis of projected traffic impacts should the bridge be constructed or not constructed.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed concern at the lack of information on alternatives and on how cyclists and pedestrians could be accommodated by a bridge or tunnel. It also requested more information on the terms of reference of the competition and wondered if perhaps the process had been ill-designed. It took the opportunity to recommend that ICOMOS and the Secretariat carry out a study of the impact of new bridges on cultural World Heritage Sites.

ICOMOS reported that it had received a good deal of information in German on 18 June 2009. The reports acknowledged the negative impacts of all the schemes considered to varying degrees. ICOMOS expressed concerns over the methodology used to determine the impacts of the various bridge designs. It also stated that no information on the terms of reference of the design competition had been provided and further noted that the option of using and extending ferry services had not been part of the overall impact assessment. At the time of inscription, the dossier had mentioned various potential bridge projects. Concerns had been raised over this issue, but ICOMOS had been assured that the options under consideration at the time were for a location outside the property's boundaries.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that the lack of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value could be part of the problem in this case. Without this Statement, it was effectively impossible to be certain about the potential impacts of the project on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It added that the same situation applied to concerns over noise from trains.

The Delegation of **Sweden** agreed with Israel on the need for a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of new bridges on World Heritage properties in general. It reminded the Committee of the difficult decision it had had to take with regard to the removal of a property from the World Heritage List earlier in the meeting (Dresden Elbe Valley). It remarked that once again the Committee was faced with the possibility of another bridge being built in a Cultural Landscape. The Delegation indicated that the Draft Decision should reflect a spirit of conservation and the interest of the Committee in working with the State Party in attempting to resolve this issue.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que le Comité est confronté à une situation difficile. Elle s'inquiète à propos des questions entre patrimoine et développement. Il faudrait réfléchir à des orientations pour guider le travail du Comité, car pour l'instant celui-ci en est réduit à régler la question au cas par cas. La Délégation du Maroc se demande quels critères doivent être adoptés pour examiner des aménagements importants amenant un nouvel élément dans le patrimoine mondial, et estime qu'une réflexion approfondie sur la

question est nécessaire. Elle a le sentiment d'un manque de communication et même d'un dialogue de sourds. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS si l'étude d'impact environnemental a été finalement reçue. Puis elle évoque la situation passée du bien d'Aït Ben Haddou, qui avait obtenu l'autorisation d'aménager un pont, quoique la taille du fleuve à traverser soit sans comparaison avec celui qui occupe le Comité actuellement. Elle prend finalement l'exemple des centrales nucléaires du Val de Loire pour s'interroger sur le fait que le franchissement d'un fleuve par des moyens modernes pourrait être considéré comme une continuation de moyens anciens, et soumet cette réflexion à l'appréciation du Comité.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** estime que le Comité est en pleine expérimentation. Elle accepte pour sa part l'idée d'un paysage culturel vivant et en évolution. Il faut tout traiter au cas par cas car il n'y a pas d'orientations. L'Etat partie a fait tout ce qu'il pouvait l'étude est actuellement disponible ; la Délégation de Madagascar appuie donc la suppression du paragraphe 4. Elle estime qu'il faut se pencher sérieusement sur ces cas "d'expérimentation" afin d'arriver à terme à des orientations rigoureuses pour traiter à l'avenir ce genre de cas, à partir du moment où on accepte l'évolution et le vivant dans ces paysages culturels urbains.

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked ICOMOS for its rapid assessment of the recent study provided in German. It reminded the Committee that this case was not specifically about a bridge, but rather about the impact of the building of infrastructure on Outstanding Universal Value. In this case, there were competing issues between the viability of a community on the one hand and Outstanding Universal Value on the other. It expressed regret that the issue would have to wait another year before it could be considered by the Committee, given the very late provision of information from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its agreement with previous speakers with regard to the need for a close analysis of this particular case, though it expressed regret over the long delay this would cause. It recommended that ICOMOS be given the necessary time to study the Report and that the Committee not be pressed to make a Decision on the matter during this session.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested changes to paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** and of the **United States of America** and **Sweden** recommended further minor changes to the Decision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur, who read out the standard language to request a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Delegation of Israel to explain its amendment to paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegation of **Australia**, explained that as the Environmental Impact Assessment had been received, ICOMOS should now evaluate it. It also proposed to delete paragraph 8, as it was unclear how railway noise impacted on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

La Délégation du **Maroc** fait remarquer qu'elle ne comprend pas en français ce que l'on veut dire par "autres solutions" et demande quelles sont les autres solutions qui existent en dehors du pont ou du tunnel.

The Delegation of **Israel** further clarified its proposal.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification as to why a new report had been requested from the State Party if ICOMOS had not yet examined the Environmental Impact Assessment.

The **Secretariat** clarified that this was a standard request for a progress report on the situation.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime que l'expression "mis à jour" est inutile.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B 104** was adopted as amended.

Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)

The **Secretariat** announced that it had not received any new information on this property.

The Delegation of **Canada**, with support from the Delegation of **Israel**, proposed to replace the wording "socio-economic impact" in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision by "impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.111** was adopted as amended.

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

The **Secretariat** noted that this Report had been opened because of the proposal for the inscription of the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It further clarified that it had received a letter from the State Party on 4 June 2009, which mentioned that the relevant decrees to allocate substantial funding for the management of the property and to implement the Management Plan had now been approved.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the State Party of the Russian Federation to explain its reaction to the proposal to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** (Observer) noted that in 2014 it would celebrate the anniversary of the inscription of this property. It reiterated the information already provided by the Secretariat on the recently approved decrees and therefore considered In-Danger Listing to be premature. It proposed that a monitoring mission should be fielded in order to evaluate the impact of the measures already taken.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegations of **China, Egypt and Nigeria**, agreed with the proposal to postpone the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to organize a mission instead.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that the inscription of this property on the In-Danger List had been discussed over several sessions, and it therefore supported the Draft Decision. It further explained that In-Danger Listing should not be considered as a penalty.

The Delegation of **Spain** stressed the willingness the State Party had manifested in safeguarding the property and said that it was against inscribing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed to the specific challenges experienced by federal states. It supported the proposal by Kenya, but requested that the standard wording be added to the Decision in order to note that in the absence of progress the property could be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session. This proposal was also supported by the Delegations of **Bahrain** and **Canada**.

Moving to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Israel** requested clarification from the Secretariat on whether all the points in paragraph 6 were still valid.

The **Secretariat** and **ICOMOS** explained that they had only received limited information in the letter and that they had not received the other documents.

The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegation of **Kenya**, proposed to delete paragraph 8 and to add wording to paragraph 9 consistent with its previous intervention on the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.117** was adopted as amended.

Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)

The **Secretariat** noted that no report on the State of Conservation of this property had been received, despite the request of the Committee at its 32nd session. Only some maps had been submitted. A high-level mission including the Chairperson had visited the property in May 2009, and comments on the mission report were received from the State Party on 19 June.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its concern about this property and noted that already last year the Committee had decided that in the absence of substantial progress it would be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It therefore requested clarification if substantial progress had in fact been achieved.

ICOMOS expressed its concern about the lack of concerted management of the property and clarified that it considered that only limited progress had been made.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that this was a very critical site and expressed concern about the new boundaries.

Moving to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Bahrain** presented amendments to paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 8. The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegation of

Bahrain, proposed to change the name of the tower and the management authority to management system, in line with the request from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation of **Israel** concurred but requested the view of the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** (Observer) expressed its astonishment at the proposal and explained that this had not been proposed by the mission. It appealed to the Committee to postpone the Decision to the next session and to field another mission.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that in the case of In-Danger Listing, consultation with the State Party would be advisable, and it agreed to postpone the Decision until next year. The Delegations of **Peru** and **Kenya** agreed, but the Delegation of **Kenya** also noted that there was a need for the State Party to act.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegations of **China**, **Tunisia** and **Canada**, agreed with the proposal from the Delegation of Israel. The Delegation of **Bahrain**, while accepting the view of the majority, noted that the exact same wording had been used the year before.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee seemed to be moving towards a consensus.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its opinion that the Decision should be more firm and should note that the property could be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger next year.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported this and noted that it had submitted an amendment.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed to withdraw its amendment on the corrective measures, but the Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that the reference to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be kept. The **Chairperson** clarified that this was included in paragraph 4.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 118** was adopted as amended.

Kizhi Pogost (C544) (continuation)

It was noted that mention of the Monitoring Mission to this Site had not been included in the relevant Decision, and discussion returned to the property of Kizhi Progost.

The **Chairperson** proposed to add the usual paragraph concerning sending a joint mission in the final Decisions adopted at the end of the session. This proposal was agreed.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that no new information was available.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked ICOMOS if a mission was needed. Given that a mission was already heading to the Russian Federation, it could be cheaper to group various missions together.

The Delegation of **Israel** repeated its question.

The **Secretariat** answered that a mission had already taken place to the property and that the only information expected in a report from the State Party was whether there had been progress in the implementation of the Committee's Decision.

The Draft decision **33 COM 7B. 119** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Vice-Chairperson, would take over discussion of the Works of Antoni Gaudi (Spain).

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

The **Secretariat** said that a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission had been carried out from 27 to 30 April 2009. Over its last six sessions, the World Heritage Committee had expressed concern at a variety of significant threats to the Site, including the demolition of Ottoman-period timber houses, the poor quality of repairs and excessive reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine walls. Other areas of concern had been the potential negative impacts of the construction of the Marmaray Rail Tube Tunnel and the Gebze-Halkalı Surface Metro System, as well as the Haliç Bridge Project and the absence of a World Heritage Management Plan. Concern had also been expressed over legislative arrangements and the effectiveness of organizational and coordination relationships between the decision-making bodies responsible for safeguarding the property.

The proposed new metro bridge across the Golden Horn was a towering cable-stay structure that would have a significant negative impact on the setting of the historic peninsula, the Golden Horn itself and the Süleymaniye Mosque in particular, which was the single most important Ottoman-period monument in the city. This was a masterpiece by the architect Sinan, and it had been identified at the time of inscription as a work of human genius. The proposed project combined a swing bridge that would open for ships and a metro bridge incorporating a station above the deck. The bridge was 460 metres long, and the pylons would stand 65 metres above the water level. The bridge's platform would be about 15 metres above the water level (the existing Galata Bridge and Atatürk Bridge are less than 10 metres above the water level). The station would be 180 metres long and about 10 metres high, and the bridge deck would be 10 metres wide. This bridge had been planned for one and half years, and it could be finished in 13 months' time. It would connect two sections of the metro network, which was otherwise 99% complete. The bridge was a cable-stay structure with pylons topped with curving "horns".

It was planned for the immediate vicinity of the Süleymaniye core area and the Süleymaniye Mosque, the minarets of which are 112.4 metres high.

The mission considered that the design of the bridge was inappropriate for this position, both because it would irreversibly impede many important views of the World Heritage Site and because the bridge, presented as a “work of art”, would compete with the Süleymaniye Mosque that was identified at the time of inscription as a work of human genius and had been designed by Sinan (under criteria (i) and (iv)). The mission considered it essential that alternative designs for a flat bridge without pylons be considered. These should be supported by thorough environmental impact studies based on an assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including the skyline of the historic peninsula.

Work was also urgently needed on the Management Plan in order to provide the framework to ensure that development and improved infrastructure respected the attributes and value of the property. Without this framework, the property was in increasing danger due to the dynamic development of traffic and building projects in its core area and in the historic peninsula. Although work had been planned for the Management Plan, so far little progress had been made and there was concern that illegal demolitions, inappropriate reconstruction and development, and the lack of impact studies for some projects reflected the absence of a Plan. There was an urgent need to make progress with the Plan, which should be based on agreed boundaries and buffer zones and encompass regeneration, tourism-management, traffic-management and awareness-raising aspects.

Many of the benchmarks agreed by representatives of the Turkish authorities during the 2006 and 2008 missions and endorsed by the Committee at its 30th and 32nd sessions had not been met within the specified timeframe or had yet to be completed. Progress in meeting such benchmarks was urgently needed.

The **Secretariat** indicated that on 8 June 2009 it had sent a copy of the joint Reactive Monitoring Mission Report to the State Party (mission held from 27 to 30 April 2009) for comments. No comment had been received from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** acknowledged that Turkey was one of its close friends and one of the main tourist attractions for Israeli citizens. The Committee was confronted with another bridge issue here, since the issue did not only have to do with the proposed bridge on the Golden Horn or the wooden houses. Instead, it touched on a much wider issue. The Delegation requested hearing the State Party’s views before coming to a proposal for a Decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that this Report had raised a number of concerns. It said that placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger was one of the possibilities should bridge construction go ahead. It also had an amendment to propose.

The Delegation of **Turkey** (Observer) assured the Committee that it attached the utmost importance to the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the historic centre of Istanbul. It valued the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. Substantial progress towards reaching the benchmarks set by the Committee had been made through conservation work, capacity-building and the realization of the management framework through participatory processes. Turkey was determined to mobilize all the resources necessary to reach the level of achievement requested. For example, significant financial resources had been allocated to the conservation of World Heritage

Sites in Turkey. The private sector in Istanbul and NGOs were also making valuable contributions. Furthermore, the Management Plan for the Site would be finalized by the municipality very soon. Deadlines would be kept. The Delegation also underlined a further important factor, which was that Turkey had a National Conservation Registration Plan that included important elements from the Management Plan, and this was expected to be adopted before the end of the year.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested mentioning the potential inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in paragraph 11.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** reminded those present that the agreed language on the development of Outstanding Universal Value should be added to this paragraph.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled its proposal for the Draft Decision, which was to highlight a proposed study of the impact of bridges more generally. It reminded those present that there were also other components of the urban fabric and suggested changing the wording to “including”.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** constate que le Comité est confronté au même problème chaque fois que la question de la circulation dans les villes est abordée ; il ne faudrait pas que le Comité refuse systématiquement tout projet de pont. Il est indispensable de prendre en compte l'évolution et le développement inévitables des villes.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed that the Committee should provide assistance to the State Party of Turkey as Istanbul was a unique place for the history of humanity.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** withdrew its previous amendment about Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Maroc** partage le point de vue de la Délégation de la Tunisie concernant la problématique de l'évolution des villes et de leur conservation, et particulièrement la construction de ponts. La Délégation pense que la formulation de l'amendement présente une certaine ambiguïté et devrait être clarifiée. S'agit-il d'un abandon du projet ou de la révision de la proposition du pont proposé ?

The Delegation of **Israel** gave further suggestions on the wording to be used regarding the possible inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Canada** offered to withdraw its proposed amendment if necessary.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its appreciation for the achievements of the State Party and supported the statements of the Delegations of Tunisia and Morocco. It did not wish the Committee to use “threatening language”, but it would prefer a clear formulation specifying the bridge project.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested using the words, “in the absence of substantial progress, with a view to inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

The Delegation of **Jordan** reiterated its wish not to use threatening language.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with the Delegation of Jordan that the Committee should provide assistance to the State Party and that threats would not lead to improvement.

The **Chairperson**, without wanting to influence the Members of the Committee, indicated that the Committee usually used this kind of wording if the State Party needed to be informed that the situation was becoming serious.

The Delegation of **Kenya** confirmed that it had understood the Chairperson's explanation. However, if the State Party had not already been informed about the matter then it would be premature to use threatening language. It preferred to leave this formulation to the 34th session of the Committee in 2010.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** pointed out that problems at the Site were long-standing. Eight Reactive Monitoring Missions had been fielded to the Site, meaning that the State Party should have been aware of the situation and should have been expected to have made progress.

The **Secretariat** noted that at the 32nd session of the Committee the possibility of inscribing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger had already been raised for the 33rd session.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that in that case the "threatening language" should be used as had been proposed in order to remind the State Party of its obligations.

The Delegation of **Spain** agreed with the Delegation of Kenya that the same procedure should be used as the one used for the Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the fact that there was no opposition indicated that there was a consensus.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 124** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that no new information was available.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.126** was adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson**, Mr. Greg Terrill, took over the chairmanship.

Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)

The **Secretariat** indicated that no new information was available and that no Committee Members had submitted amendments.

The Delegation of **Peru** wished that to know if the work had already commenced and if there was an alternative to the project proposed.

The Delegation of **Israel** had the same question as the Delegation of Peru.

The Delegation of **Spain** confirmed that the work had not yet started, but that it would begin by mid 2010. It also pointed out that the Sagrada Familia was not a cathedral, as was stated in the Secretariat's Report, but a church. Further to the comments from Members of the Committee, it explained that there was no alternative solution and that the tunnel could not be moved due to the location of the Sagrada Familia and the underground. It also wished to mention that although the study by ICOMOS had explained that a completely new project would be technically very difficult and would considerably increase project costs, this had not been mentioned in the Working Document. It agreed that the Sagrada Familia should be inspected before the work started. The Delegation also stressed that a monitoring system for the church was in place and that any vibrations would immediately be detected. The Spanish authorities were cooperating with the Foundation of the Sagrada Familia, it said, concluding by asking for all the ICOMOS recommendations to be taken into account.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it was a pity that the information had not been received earlier, thus obliging the Committee to redraft the Decision on the spot. The Committee might have opted for mitigation measures rather than for inscribing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, had it received the information earlier. The Delegation requested assistance from the World Heritage Centre or ICOMOS in dealing with the issue.

ICOMOS clarified that in order to ensure the safeguarding of the Sagrada Familia the tunnel's location would need to be moved. However, should this not be feasible, then the tunnel-boring method and the proposed project would need to be described in much more detail, in order to see whether there would be impacts or not. Tunnel experts should carry out an independent check of the proposed solution, and far more detail was required from the State Party.

La Délégation du **Maroc**, eu égard aux commentaires de l'Etat partie, souhaite que l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ne soit pas mentionnée dans la Décision. Elle suggère d'attendre les recommandations du comité d'experts mis en place par l'Etat partie et qui va bientôt se réunir.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the statement made by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the Committee not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, stressing the importance of cooperation with the State Party. It felt confident that the State Party would do its utmost to protect the church.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime son accord avec la Délégation du Maroc.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out with regard to paragraph 4 that further text should be added in order to reflect the discussion, not just analysis of the methodology. It again stressed that such a Decision could not be drafted on the spot, the result of receiving information at the last minute in verbal form.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the problem should be covered by paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested deleting the words “possible rerouting solutions” and replacing them by “...mitigation measures on the design and implementation of the tunnel and relevant monitoring systems,” should these words be approved by ICOMOS.

ICOMOS said that the word “monitored” had been used in connection with the project’s methods and their potential impacts and that there was no question of monitoring once the project was finished.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it meant the word “monitoring” to be understood in an environmental sense, rather than in the sense used by the World Heritage Committee. Since it was late in the day, the Delegation asked for assistance with the wording.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed an amendment reading, “allow a thorough compromise with ICOMOS about the matter of the tunnel”.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with Egypt and proposed further wording for the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Kenya** enquired whether this wording was the same as “compromise”.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested deleting the wording after “Familia”.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that the Sagrada Familia was in fact not a church but was what in Spanish was called a “templo”. It was up to the Secretariat to find the appropriate translation in English or French.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.121** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** took back the chairmanship.

State of Conservation Reports for the Europe and North America region to be adopted without discussion

The **Secretariat** read out the list of State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

86. Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)
87. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis)
88. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)
89. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)
90. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)
91. City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)
92. Fertő / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev)
93. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)
94. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)
95. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)
97. Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)
98. Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church (Denmark) (C 697)
99. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)
105. Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof (Germany) (C 1155)
106. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)
107. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 and 400 bis)
108. Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)
109. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)
110. Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726)
112. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)
113. City of Valletta (Malta) (C 131)

- 114. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)
- 115. Auschwitz Birkenau
German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31)
- 116. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)
- 120. Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170)
- 122. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)
- 123. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)
- 125. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)
- 127. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)
- 128. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426)
- 129. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)
- 130. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)
- 131. City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428)
- 132. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728)

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

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev)

The **Secretariat** said that no new information had been received on this property. Noting that a Member of the Committee had requested to open the item for discussion and had submitted an amendment, the Secretariat asked the Chairperson whether she wished clarifications to be provided immediately, or whether these should be provided after hearing from the Members of the Committee.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** explained that it had suggested an amendment in the shape of a new paragraph 4, given that this was a fragile Site with management problems. It wanted this to be recognized in the Decision. Even if the architecture of the Site was

changing, it was important to keep the urban fabric along the lines of the existing plots. The Delegation also stated the importance of referring to sustainable tourism.

Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel**, with regard to paragraph 7, pointed out that it would have been preferable to have an update submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre by 2010 and a formal State of Conservation Report submitted to the Committee in 2011.

The **Secretariat** explained that an update in 2010 would not be necessary as regular missions to the property were undertaken within the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention, thus providing the necessary reporting.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to leave paragraph 7 as it was and to delete the proposed amendment.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.77** was adopted as amended.

Melaka and Georgetown, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223)

The **Secretariat** noted that, with respect to the information contained in Document 7B.Add, major developments had taken place concerning this property, which explained the revised Draft Decision that had been distributed. Following the joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission carried out in late April 2009, and the submission of its Report, the Malaysian authorities at both federal and state levels had written to the World Heritage Centre stating that they had decided to implement all the Report's recommendations. In a letter dated 15 June 2009, the State Party had confirmed the following:

1. The height of the two proposed development projects within the inscribed area, Bousted and AGB, would be reduced to 18 metres;
2. The impact of the two projects in the buffer zone, E&O and Bintang, had been reduced through the implementation of the modifications negotiated between the local council and the developers;
3. The provision allowing building higher than 18 metres within the inscribed property under certain circumstances in Georgetown had been abolished;
4. The existing "Guidelines for Conservation Areas & Heritage Buildings" would be renamed "Regulations for Conservation Areas & Heritage Buildings";
5. Special area plans for the inscribed property and its buffer zone that would provide planning controls and guidance at a more detailed level would be prepared;
6. There would be no approval given for developments higher than 18 metres in the buffer zone until such time as the Special Area Plans were adopted;
7. A Technical Review Committee would be established, including a representative of the Federal Government (Department of National Heritage), to review all major development proposals and proposed planning controls and policies that could impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
8. Other measures to support the conservation of Georgetown had been taken, including the creation of a World Heritage Office, the strengthening of the

Heritage Department within the City Council of Penang, and the creation of a World Heritage Day in Penang.

In view of this new information, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS had revised the Draft Decision, which now took note of these very positive developments and commended the State Party on its commitment to the protection of the World Heritage property. The Draft Decision also requested the State Party to continue its efforts towards the full implementation of the recommendations of the mission. An update had been requested for 2011. The Secretariat noted that the radical change in the situation of the property showed what could be achieved when all the parties involved contributed to solving difficult issues in a spirit of trust and cooperation. This example should be highlighted in future as one of the successes of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Australia** was pleased with the State Party's reaction and wished to commend it and to hear its reaction to the revised Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it had been following this nomination since the inscription of the Site on the World Heritage List. It welcomed the involvement of the whole community in carrying out its responsibilities. However, it also asked why the situation had arisen.

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated the State Party on having complied so positively with ICOMOS's recommendations.

The Delegation of **Egypt** also congratulated the State Party, especially as the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List only last year.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated its appreciation of the efforts made by the State Party and noted that while there were many details in the Draft Decision it left out some of the concerns raised by the Committee in 2008. It suggested an amendment between paragraphs 8 and 9.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** also commended the State Party, as well as ICOMOS for having acknowledged the excellent contribution of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** (Observer) thanked the Members of the Committee for their comments and offered answers to the questions raised. With respect to the special area plans, two preparatory meetings had been held, resulting in the drafting of terms of reference and the setting out of a timeline for their completion. This stood at 12 months. With regard to why the situation had arisen, the Observer Delegation said that it had arisen from a misunderstanding, to the effect that the regulations contained within the nomination dossier would only come into effect after inscription on the World Heritage List. Long and serious deliberations had taken place with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and the State Party wished to thank the Centre, ICOMOS and the Committee for their advice and cooperation. It took note of the recommendations and would submit a progress report by February 2011. It finally reiterated its commitment to protecting the property.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite la Malaisie pour ses efforts et son intérêt à l'égard du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que l'ICOMOS pour sa coopération avec l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Israel** had a question for ICOMOS with regard to the evaluation process and sought clarification concerning countries that had federal, state and local structures. When putting together nominations there should be a clear understanding of the State Party's and the stakeholders' obligations. It further noted that the problem did not only concern the 18-metre height of the buildings, but that it also concerned the size of the plots.

ICOMOS stated that these projects had not been mentioned in the nomination dossier and that they had been approved before the dossier had been drawn up. The height was not in conformity with the guidelines. Following the submission of the nomination file, the regulations in place had been modified to allow certain buildings to be built above 18 metres high.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Israel** proposed new wording in paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed that paragraph 10 be placed between 8 and 9.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested adding the words, "urban and architecture".

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered whether the words "all the buildings", or the "whole townscape", would capture the same idea.

The **Secretariat** reminded those present that this language had been used by the Committee at the time of the Site's inscription and that there was no need to add further qualifications to the paragraph. These were already contained within the two paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Canada**, with regard to paragraph 9b, asked whether this included the appropriate type of phrasing for addressing the Federal Government.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that, as the Delegation of Israel had already mentioned, Penang had complete autonomy as far as the use of land was concerned and that the Federal Government did not have veto power. It had asked for mechanisms to be put in place that would allow the Federal Government to have such power. This had been discussed in detail with the authorities, taking into account the specific legal and institutional context of Malaysia. The Secretariat therefore assumed that the proposed wording was appropriate.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that this type of language might not be appropriate in all federal contexts.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it had no problem with the wording as suggested by the Secretariat if it captured what the Delegation had intended to say in its previous intervention.

In response to the remark by the Delegation of Kenya, the **Secretariat** reiterated that paragraph 9 already contained a reference to the urban fabric and that there was thus no need to add this reference to paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested further wording.

The Draft Decision **33COM 7B.78** was adopted as amended.

Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) C 451

The Secretariat explained that no new information had been received and asked the Chair how to proceed with the clarifications requested by the States Parties. It was explained that the reason why this item had been opened for discussion was that one Member of the Committee had suggested asking the State Party to submit the requested Environmental Impact Assessments for the two proposed developments – the cricket stadium and the new port – by 31 October 2009 “at the latest”. This would have enabled the Reactive Monitoring Mission to have had these documents before its visit to the property. The Secretariat suggested that this would have indeed been desirable; however, it wondered if the words “at the latest” could not have been replaced by “if possible” in the case that the State Party was not able to comply with such a short deadline. In any case, the Secretariat added, the Reactive Monitoring Mission would have been necessary if nothing else to assist the State Party in assessing the impacts of the two developments proposed.

The Chairperson gave the floor to the Delegation of Bahrain in order to start discussion of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of Bahrain accepted adding the proposal of the Secretariat to its proposal.

The **Chairperson** turned to the examination of of the Draft Decision. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted. Concerning paragraph 5, the Chair mentioned the amendment from Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested deleting the last part of paragraph 5, “in advance of the project moving forward”, explaining that this could give the impression that the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS had an approval or veto role in the process for assessing the impacts of proposed developments, which was not the case.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested the omission of “at the latest” in favour of “if possible”, as suggested by the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Kenya** enquired what would happen if the State Party were not able to submit the requested reports. Would it be better to set some sort of timeframe?

The **Secretariat** explained that the World Heritage Centre would consult with the State Party in order to identify dates for the Mission and to enable the State Party if possible to complete the Environmental Impact Assessments. However, a Reactive Monitoring Mission would need to take place in any case.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that it agreed with Kenya that some deadline was desirable and suggested adding to “by 31 of October, if possible,” the words, “and at the latest by 1 February 2010”.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande à ce que soit enlevée la date butoir du 1er février pour la soumission du rapport, et estime qu'il faut faire confiance l'Etat partie.

The Chairperson explained that the previous intervention had been made in order to simplify the text.

The Delegation of **Kenya** insisted that a deadline was needed.

The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to focus on the final formulation of the paragraph.

The Delegation of **China** proposed to simplify the text and suggested to use the standard timeframe of 1 February 2010.

The **Chairperson** explained that there were three options concerning the date.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the Delegation of China.

The **Chairperson** requested the deletion of all the previous amendments and adopted paragraph 5, as amended by the Delegation of China. She then moved to paragraph 6 and gave the floor to the Delegation of Bahrain to present an amendment.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested information on the demolitions and requested that the State Party submit information by 31 October 2009. It asked if a representative of the State Party was in the room.

The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party was in the room, which was not the case. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed concern at the reference in the Draft Decision to a "demolition programme" of the buildings of the cricket stadium. It wanted to know whether this was appropriate.

The **Chairperson** agreed that sports issues were important to take into consideration and gave the floor to the Secretariat for clarification.

The **Secretariat** explained that the demolitions were related to illegal buildings around the cricket stadium. These demolitions had been decided by the State Party and endorsed by the Committee at its previous session.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested reflecting these comments in the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **33COM 7B.82** was adopted as amended.

Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)

The Secretariat said that no new information had been received and referred to the Draft Decision, which had been corrected to amend a mistake in paragraph 9 concerning the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. This was deemed no longer necessary by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, as explained in the Report. As for the other amendments proposed by Committee Members, the Secretariat noted that these were all agreeable to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** started the adoption of the Draft Decision and adopted paragraphs 1 and 2. She gave the floor to the Delegation of Bahrain to start discussion on paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** explained the intention behind its proposed amendments to paragraphs 3 and 5, which was to ensure that the Draft Decision was fully aligned with the findings and recommendations of the mission, notably with respect to the need to establish an effective management framework for the property.

Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 with the amendments of Bahrain, together with paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that in the version of the Draft Decision that appeared on the screen it was now proposed to delete paragraph 9, whereas the corrected Draft Decision distributed in the room retained this paragraph. Could a clarification be provided?

The **Secretariat** acknowledged the discrepancy and suggested that it would be up to the Committee to choose an appropriate solution, in the light of its understanding of the nature of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

La Délégation du **Maroc** estime qu'il serait pertinent de se référer aux documents du dernier Comité avant de se prononcer sur le maintien ou non du mécanisme de suivi renforcé, et de vérifier si une date limite avait été fixée par la dernière Décision du Comité.

The **Chairperson** stated that paragraph 9 could be deleted.

The **Secretariat** explained that in the previous Decision on this property, taken by the Committee at its 32nd session in Quebec in 2008, a timeframe for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism had not been established. Deleting the current paragraph 9, or retaining it to reflect the Committee's Decision not to continue applying the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, would depend on the way in which the Committee understood the nature of this Mechanism, i.e. whether it considered it to be an action that could be decided on a case-by-case basis, or whether it thought of it as a status to be applied and/or revoked.

The **Chairperson**, in order to avoid confusion, proposed to include the words, "decides not to apply the Mechanism".

The **Delegation of Korea** recalled that the Committee had only established a clear timeframe for the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism in the case of Machu Picchu (Peru).

The **Delegation of Canada** agreed with the Chairperson on the need to include a paragraph to clarify the Committee's Decision.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 84** was adopted as amended.

State of Conservation Reports of the Asia-Pacific Region to be adopted without discussion

The **Secretariat** read out the list of State of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion:

- 64 The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)
- 65 Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C1224 rev)¹
- 66 Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C811)
- 67 Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C1110)
- 68 Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C707ter)
- 69 World Heritage Properties in Beijing (China)
- 70 Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C1101)
- 71 Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C241)
- 72 Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C593)
- 73 Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C642)
- 74 Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)
- 75 Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C115)
- 76 Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)
- 79 Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev)
- 80 Historic Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)
- 81 Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C138)
- 83 Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)
- 85 Complex of Hue Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)

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

¹ Concerning the World Heritage site of the Temple of Preah Vihear, the State Party of the Kingdom of Cambodia had written to the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to express its concern about the contents of the Report presented by the Secretariat on the State of Conservation of the property.

At the same time, the State Party of the Kingdom of Thailand had also written to the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to express its concern about the process that had led to the inscription of the property and the consequences of this on the ground.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation Report on the Site, stressing that this was a unique example of the harmonious interaction between nature and culture and a sacred territory relating to the conception of time and space in the Andes. It also reminded the Committee that a Reinforced Monitoring Mission had taken place in January 2009 and that the Citadel had always been reported as having a good state of conservation. It had been recognized by past monitoring missions that on-going efforts were being made by the State Party. It stressed that it was important to remember, however, that the Citadel only represented 10% of the total area of the World Heritage property. It also said that a visitor-management plan was being developed by the National Institute of Culture (INC), in order to identify a better solution for the bottlenecks at the property that created congestion and potentially impacted on the original materials. A remote-control system has been installed by the INC in order to study visitor numbers and frequentation, as well as visitor flows at key access points. This facility was going to be explored further in order to monitor the Site's conservation.

Urban development at the Machu Picchu Village located in the core zone of the property continued to be uncontrolled and unregulated by the local municipal authorities, in disregard of the regulations set out by the authority for the environment. The existing situation did not reflect any implementation of the existing urban plan. Inadequate buildings continued to be constructed close to the riverbed and under the cliff faces. Besides dramatically impacting on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site and the visual integrity of the property, these were also a clear and major security issue for both the local inhabitants and visitors. The recent building of the Carrilluchayoc Bridge had increased accessibility to the Sanctuary through the western area, as noted by previous missions, opening up the traffic route from the northwest and increasing uncontrolled tourist facilities and unregulated services in the area. The Bridge had been approved and constructed without consideration being given to the acute vulnerability of the geological landscape and the consequent impact of the increased traffic. Access to the Sanctuary via the western area of the Site permitted visitors to arrive within 4.5 km of the Citadel. To reach the Citadel, visitors could then walk along the railroad track connecting the hydroelectric plant with the Machu Picchu Village, creating a serious risk of injury or death.

Solid and liquid waste continued to be a critical issue and a potential health and environmental hazard. The Mission had specified clear guidelines for an Action Plan to be drawn up for the property, premised on its implementation as part of an inclusive, interdisciplinary and multi-sectoral process that would contain clear and precise activities and would contribute to the holistic management and conservation of the property. The Action Plan would also address the priority aspects that needed urgent action, including governance, risk-preparedness, western access to the Sanctuary and management, as representatives of the Advisory Bodies would also explain.

The Delegation of **Spain** informed the Committee that it had a doubt about the feasibility of the proposed deadline stipulated in the Draft Decision. It stated that the State of Conservation of Machu Picchu had been carefully monitored during recent sessions of the Committee and that it wanted it to be a success story. It requested confirmation from the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies on whether 2010 was an objective timeframe and

on whether they thought the State Party would be able to implement the requested actions on time.

The Delegation of **Israel** had a follow-up question to the statement from the Delegation of Spain. As this was a long-term activity, it would like more details, as well as milestones, in order better to understand how the Site was to be restored.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stressed that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be used only in special cases and primarily for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In Quebec last year, the Committee had decided to apply the Mechanism to this Site over the coming two years, depending on developments in its state of conservation. The Delegation of Sweden proposed that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should not be further applied to the Site. Standard monitoring would be more appropriate. However, in view of the Secretariat's Report, the possibility of placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be envisaged in 2010. An amendment in this direction had been submitted to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Peru**, in response to the question asked by the Delegation of Spain, answered that it could not implement all the measures before the deadline. However, it wanted to express to the Committee Members its determination to continue implementing all the measures requested. It expressed its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their efforts in assisting it in improving the state of conservation of the property. It informed the Committee that a 21-month Action Plan, starting in August 2009 and finishing in April 2011, would be an important tool. However, the proposed timeframe was very short. It also added that work was being done on finalizing budgetary issues related to the Action Plan and that all this preparatory works needed time. On the basis of the above, it requested an extension up to 2012 in order to finalize the Action Plan. As an alternative, it asked for authorization to implement the programme to an extended deadline, in coordination with the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Israel** wanted to know whether parts of the Decision could be undertaken by 2010, or whether 2011 would be more appropriate.

The Delegation of **Peru** answered that that was exactly the point. It added that it would like to work closely with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre in order to come up with a realistic deadline.

The Delegation of **Cuba** requested that paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision reflect the deadline proposed by the Delegation of Peru.

The Delegation of **Spain** suggested that 2012 be considered for paragraph 5 instead of 2011.

The **Chairperson** moved towards the examination of the Decision. Paragraph 1 and 2 were adopted. Paragraph 3 was amended by Cuba and Spain. Paragraph 5 was adopted

The Delegation of **Israel** requested the State Party to establish a clear timetable and milestones.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the date of 2011 could be included in paragraph 3, and the Chairperson answered that that had been the original proposal of the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it had said all it wanted to say and suggested the wording, "2009 and determine timetable for completion of ...in coordination with the Advisory Bodies".

The **Chairperson** requested to see the heading and the connection to the Israeli proposal.

The Delegation of **Spain** stated that this was an acceptable solution.

The Delegation of **Cuba** agreed with the Delegation of Spain. It also wanted to explain again that it was important to consider the fact that the State Party of Peru would not have sufficient time to implement the measures.

The **Chairperson** noted that a reference to time limits appeared in paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Canada** insisted on submission in February 2010.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her statement that in paragraph 5 references to time limits appeared, but that there was no deadline mentioned in the other paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Israel** approved paragraph 5b, but it still had concerns about the workshop.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 42** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** then announced a presentation by Ambassador Kondo, as well as the timing for the elections and time-management issues. She indicated that the Bureau would start at 8.30 a.m. and the Committee at 9 a.m.

ITEM 14B REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The **Chairperson** invited Ambassador Kondo to take the floor to present the results of the Working Group on the election of the Members of the World Heritage Committee, as referred to in Document 14 B.

Ambassador Kondo recalled that the Working Group had met four times and that the last meeting had taken place on 19 May 2009. It had been an open-ended process, and progress had been made on a step-by-step basis in order to achieve equitable representation on the Committee.

The Working Group had also looked into the past records of elections, including legal and other issues. All possible measures to ensure fair rotation had been explored, as had a less time-consuming method of holding elections. Discussions had sometimes been heated, and several decisions were referred to in the Document provided, including

refraining from nominations during a mandate on the Committee (paragraph 35), the introduction of reserved seats for groups not represented (paragraph 23.1), and the introduction of a four-year gap between mandates (paragraph 23.2).

The **Chairperson** underlined the remarkable work done by the Working Group.

ITEM 18 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 34TH SESSION

The **Chairperson** opened point 18 on the agenda for discussion, the Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and the Rapporteur of the 34th Session of the World Heritage Committee, and requested the Delegation of Spain to present the candidate for the Chairperson of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Spain** started by expressing its gratitude to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for the way she had chaired the 33rd session. It stated that she had done an excellent job. On the basis of the close relationship between Spain and Brazil, it proposed Mr. Juca Ferreira, Minister of Culture of Brazil, as Chairperson of the 34th session. It made a detailed presentation of Mr. Ferreira's background and career, before concluding that in the light of his qualifications, it felt that Mr. Ferreira was the right person to chair the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee, which would be held in Brazil in 2010.

The Delegation of **Egypt** welcomed the nomination proposed by the Delegation of Spain and thanked the Government of Brazil for its kind invitation to host the 34th session. It concluded by commending the wise leadership of the present Chairperson, adding that it had found the 33rd session to be democratic and exemplary and thanking the people of Seville for their warm welcome.

The Delegation of **Cuba** warmly welcomed the nomination of Mr. Ferreira. It trusted that Brazil would now take the torch of World Heritage further in the future.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the minister on his election. The fact that Brazil was very active in contributing to all UNESCO's Conventions was proof of its leadership. She underlined the minister's impressive background and remarked that Brazil was a leader in all fields of international cooperation. A multicultural approach would be employed during Mr. Ferreira's period as Chairperson. She hoped that under his chairmanship cooperation in the field of World Heritage would continue. She invited the Committee to proceed with the election of the Vice-Chairpersons for each regional group and the Rapporteur, and she requested the Delegation of Madagascar to put forward a candidate on behalf of the Africa Region.

La délégation de **Madagascar** remercie la Présidente pour son excellent travail. Elle félicite également le Brésil pour avoir proposé sa candidature au poste de nouveau Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour 2010. Elle déclare enfin que les membres africains du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Kenya, Madagascar, Maurice, Nigéria), ainsi que tous les membres du groupe Afrique présents à cette 33^{ème} Session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, estiment qu'il n'y a pas d'urgence à élire un Vice-président et qu'en attendant l'élection des nouveaux membres du Comité, le Vice-président actuel, le Kenya, peut continuer à représenter le groupe Afrique jusqu'à la

Conférence Générale d'octobre 2009. Les nouveaux membres africains du Comité procéderont alors à l'élection d'un Vice-président pour le Comité.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its gratitude for the Chairperson's excellent leadership and underlined the fact that Seville was a city at the crossroads of civilizations and an excellent example of coexistence between the three monotheistic religions. It thanked the Chairperson again for her leadership, something that would stay in everybody's minds. It then congratulated the new Chairperson, who would lead the work in Brazil, and emphasized that if an ocean divided those present, many bridges also connected them. It concluded with the nomination of Dr. Ali Radwan from Egypt as Vice-Chairperson for the next session of the Committee. It introduced Dr. Radwan as being a well-known academic who spoke many languages, had long experience in many fields of culture, and was an expert in Ancient Egyptian art.

The Chairperson welcomed Egypt as the next Vice-Chairperson for the Arab States Region and asked the Delegation of Australia to put forward the candidate for Vice-Chairperson of the Asia-Pacific Region.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that the Asia-Pacific Region would be spoken for by the Delegation of Korea on this point.

The Delegation of **Korea** stated that Australia would continue as the Vice-Chairperson for the Asia-Pacific Region, with the agreement of China.

The **Chairperson** welcomed the election of Australia as Vice-Chairperson for the Asia-Pacific Region.

The Delegation of **the United States of America** presented Sweden as the candidate of the Europe and North America Group.

The Chairperson welcomed Sweden as Vice-Chairperson for the Europe and North America Group. She announced that the Vice-Chairperson for the Africa Region would be elected at the next General Assembly meeting. She further added that, following the conclusions of the Working Group on elections, it had been ensured that there would be a representative from Group II. The Chair opened the floor to appoint the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its gratitude to Spain, and particularly to the City of Seville, for hosting the successful meeting, and it commended the Chairperson's efforts at managing the session. It then congratulated Brazil on hosting next year's session. With regard to the nomination, it proposed Dr. Britta Rudolff, the Representative of Bahrain, for the post of Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the nominated Rapporteur for the 34th session and gave the floor to the Ambassador of Brazil to UNESCO and the Governor of the Federal District of Brasilia.

The **Ambassador of Brazil** reiterated his gratitude to the Chairperson and congratulated Spain as host of the 33rd session. He expressed his great satisfaction on the election of Mr. Juca Ferreira, Minister of Culture of Brazil, as Chairperson of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Governor of Brasilia** stated his pleasure at being in Seville and expressed his deep gratitude at the fact that Brazil had been chosen to host the next meeting of the

World Heritage Committee. He pointed out that this historic meeting would be held in the context of the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the new capital city of Brazil. He described Brasilia as a monumental city, the first modern city to be recognized by UNESCO as part of the Heritage of Humanity. He said that for this reason Brasilia and UNESCO had a historic and emblematic relationship. He then explained that Brasilia's buildings and public spaces were true works of art that were on open-air display. He mentioned that Brasilia had been constructed in 1,000 days, which made it a symbol of modernity for all. He recalled Brasilia's artistic, cultural, aesthetic and social dimensions, as well as its vocation to bring very different people together in the hope of a better life and with the powerful awareness of participating in history. Brasilia, he said, had thus become a tool for social inclusion and one capable of promoting a new consciousness in its citizens.

The Governor of Brasilia then paid tribute to the Brazilian people and to the various political and artistic geniuses who had contributed to the creative and innovative spirit of this people. He stated that Brasilia also represented cultural diversity as a result of the various traditions it brought together and that, as an example of a work of Outstanding Universal Value, it would feel proud to welcome the World Heritage Committee. He concluded by saying that the greatest contribution that Brasilia could make took the form of its great intellectual and emotional heritage, and he assured all present that the Municipality of Brasilia would make every effort to guarantee that the next meeting would be as fruitful and constructive as the meeting that had been held in Seville.

The Chairperson thanked the Brazilian representatives and asked them to present her greetings to the ministry. The Chairperson thanked the IPHAN for its support and thanked the Rapporteur of the 33rd session, Mr. Antonio Ricarte, for his support.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked Spain, congratulated Brazil, and thanked the Arab Group for having chosen Bahrain as Rapporteur of the next session. It said that the Kingdom of Bahrain would be honoured to host the 35th session of the Committee in 2011, particularly since it had hoped to be honoured by hosting this session since it entered the Committee in 2007 and had been making preparations since then. It mentioned that this would be the fourth time an Arab country had hosted a session.

The Chairperson gave the floor to the Delegation of India (Observer).

The Delegation of **India** (Observer) expressed the willingness of the Government of India to host the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in India in 2012.

There was then a video presentation by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Chairperson thanked Brazil for the video presentation and closed the session.

The meeting rose at 8:30 pm.

SEVENTH DAY – TUESDAY, 30 JUNE 2009

FIFTEENTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 2.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'Etat partie n'a pas transmis de rapport pour la deuxième année consécutive ; il ne dispose donc que des informations fournies par le rapport de la mission conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial / ICOMOS de février 2009. Le Secrétariat rappelle que les problèmes principaux sont l'absence de délimitation du bien et de sa zone tampon, la pression urbaine, un projet d'autoroute, une carte archéologique incomplète et l'absence de stratégie de conservation et de plan de gestion.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.57** was adopted.

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

Le **Secrétariat** indique qu'aucun rapport n'a été reçu de l'Etat partie et qu'il n'y a pas d'information supplémentaire.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.58** was adopted.

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

Le **Secrétariat** indique qu'aucun rapport n'a été reçu de l'Etat partie et qu'il n'y a pas d'information supplémentaire.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.59** was adopted.

State of Conservation Reports for the Arab States to be adopted without discussion

The **Secretariat** read out the list of State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

51. Tipasa (Algérie) (C 193);
52. Casbah d'Alger (Algérie) (C 565);
53. Qal'at al-Bahreïn – Ancien port et capitale de Dilmun (Bahreïn) (C 1192);
54. Thèbes antique et sa nécropole (Egypte) (C 87);
55. Le Caire historique (Égypte) (C 89);
56. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordanie) (C 1093);
60. Ksar d'Aït-Ben-Haddou (Maroc) (C 444);
61. Fort de Bahla (Oman) (C 433);
62. Systèmes d'irrigation *afaj* d'Oman (Oman) (C 1207);
63. Ancienne ville de Damas (République arabe syrienne) (C 20).

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested clarification on why these Reports would not be discussed.

The **Chairperson** said that a list of properties to be discussed or not to be discussed was given to the Committee with the Documents of the session, together with the criteria on which this list had been drawn up. There had been the possibility for Committee Members to request the opening of additional reports for discussion by the deadline of 15 June.

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

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

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

The **Secretariat** explained that the State Party had not submitted a Report in time, but that a few days ago a five-page summary report had been received. The Secretariat further noted the lack of resources for the management of the property and a proposed tower project.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, supported by the Delegations of **Canada, Israel and Sweden**, expressed its concern regarding this property, since its worrying state of conservation had already been noted at the previous session. It proposed asking the State Party if it would consider inscribing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as this might be an option to attract more resources.

The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party of Panama was not represented in the room and proposed to move to the examination of the Draft Decision. She noted the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain to paragraphs 3 and 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if there was a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property. The **Secretariat** clarified that there was not. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to include the standard paragraph between paragraphs 4 and 5 to request this.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed an amendment to paragraph 7, for the next session to consider placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the absence of substantial progress. The Delegation of **Bahrain** concurred and withdrew its proposed new paragraph 8, which was similar.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the word “possible” should be included to remain consistent. The **Chairperson**, after consultation with the Rapporteur, answered that both versions had been used depending on the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, proposed to delete “possible”.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stated that it was willing to adopt the proposal, whichever version it was. It added that the State Party had been present but had been unable to stay until the final day.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested that when a State Party could not be present when one of its properties was discussed, it should leave a report for Committee Members so that they would have an idea of what the State Party would have said if it had been present.

The Draft Decision **33 COM7B.140** was adopted as amended.

Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 b)

The **Secretariat** explained that while the State Party had recently sent some supplementary information, the situation remained unclear. A complete proposal for the railway station project had not been received. A cable car project was also under development. The State Party had not submitted an impact assessment report on these projects.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its concern at the significant number of projects that were under development and for which the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had not been assessed. It proposed that a joint mission be carried out to the property.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the proposal for a mission but requested the State Party to provide more information on the projects under discussion.

The Delegation of **Peru** explained that the increase of the population had caused pressure with regard to urbanization. Projects having a social component had been undertaken in order to deal with housing problems. The safety and sanitary condition of the buildings was an issue. Moreover, it was necessary to provide the centre of Lima with parking facilities, and the theatre project was important for tourism.

Moving to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to replace the words “visual integrity” in paragraph 4 with “Outstanding Universal Value”. The **Chairperson** also noted the amendments from the Delegation of Bahrain to paragraph 6 and the proposed new paragraph 7 to request a mission.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to insert the paragraph on the mission after the paragraph on the development of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.145** was adopted as amended.

State of Conservation Reports for the Latin America and Caribbean Region to be adopted without debate

The **Secretariat** read out the list of the State of Conservation reports to be adopted without discussion:

133. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445);
134. San Agustín Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744);
135. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526);
136. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2);
137. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129);
138. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414);
139. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412);
142. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016);
143. Chavín Archaeological Site (Peru) (C 330);
144. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700);
146. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747);

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

AFRICA

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

Le **Secrétariat** indique qu'il n'y a pas de nouvelles informations. Le point a été ouvert pour discussion car le rapport demandé lors de la 31e session du Comité n'a pas été fourni par l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that this property had been followed up by the Committee for many years, and it wanted to know if the World Bank project was now taking into account the recommendations of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** deplored the fact that the State Party had not provided a Report and proposed to invite the State Party to present any additional information.

The Delegation of **Sweden** wondered why no Report had been requested for examination at the next session.

The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party of Ethiopia was not represented in the room.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que le Centre du patrimoine mondial a évoqué avec la Banque mondiale le grand projet d'aménagement touristique que celle-ci développe à Lalibela. Il est indiqué que la Banque mondiale a accepté de se conformer aux principes de la Convention du patrimoine mondial et de tenir le Centre au courant de la mise en œuvre du projet.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the examination of the Draft Decision. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to add the words "and their sustainable implementation" at the end of paragraph 4. The Delegation of **Sweden**, supported by the Delegation of **Bahrain**, proposed an amendment to advance the date of the Report to 2010.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 43** was adopted as amended.

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que le suivi réactif renforcé s'applique à Tombouctou depuis la 32e session du Comité, à la suite de la construction d'un nouveau bâtiment près de la mosquée de Sankoré. La mission conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial / ICOMOS de février 2009 a constaté que l'amphithéâtre avait été réduit en hauteur ; mais l'impact visuel demeure. La mission a demandé la correction de la couleur des façades afin qu'elles s'intègrent mieux dans le paysage. La présence de ce bâtiment a accéléré l'utilisation de matériaux inappropriés. Il devient donc urgent d'adopter un règlement d'urbanisme interdisant tout nouveau projet en dehors des réhabilitations. Un atelier local s'est tenu en juin 2009 sur la gestion de la ville pour expliquer les mesures correctives demandées par le Comité. Les conditions actuelles de mise en œuvre de ces mesures n'étant pas assez bonnes, le Centre propose de continuer à appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé.

ICOMOS noted its concern at the precedent set by the construction of the community centre in using non-appropriate construction materials. It recalled that the Committee had in the past expressed its support for an extension of the property to include the entire city, but it feared that as a result of the current developments the old city could lose its authenticity.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the State Party for the work that had been accomplished and recommended continuing to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism to the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** directed several questions to the State Party of Mali on the accessibility of the centre to the public and its use of diverse building materials. It queried the State Party's statement that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was not helpful.

The Delegation of **Sweden** also wanted to know the opinion of the State Party on the use of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and noted that a Reactive Monitoring Mission had also been requested.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) rappelle que certaines des mesures correctives ont été mises en œuvre. Une feuille de route avait été jointe au rapport soumis par l'Etat partie, indiquant la diminution de la hauteur de l'amphithéâtre de 3,60 m, le recouvrement de toutes ses façades de matériaux locaux. Elle rappelle que la communauté locale est disposée à délocaliser les salles de classe et les toilettes publiques à condition qu'on puisse leur trouver un nouveau terrain en compensation, ce qui requiert des fonds. Elle indique aussi que le suivi renforcé est perçu sur place comme une punition, une mise sous tutelle, comme si le site était en péril. La population est consciente de l'importance de ses bâtiments, et souhaiterait voir le suivi renforcé leur être appliqué.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the proposal by the Delegation of **Sweden** to deal with this property through regular reactive monitoring.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the use of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism meant that the Committee would receive a report in between sessions.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** shared the sentiments of the Delegation of Sweden and the United States of America and was pleased with the assurance given by the State Party that the classrooms would be relocated.

The Delegation of **Kenya** also supported the proposal by the Delegation of Sweden.

Le **Secrétariat** précise que l'Etat partie n'envisage pas le déplacement des salles de classe et des toilettes publiques dans l'immédiat, mais seulement des modifications dans leur architecture. Ces modifications étant difficiles à apprécier, c'est la raison pour laquelle le Centre avait proposé le suivi renforcé.

The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, noted that it was pleased by the progress reported by the State Party but insisted that written reports needed to be submitted and that it was difficult for the Committee to consider last minute oral information.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that its main concern was to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It wanted to know from the State Party how it would count on managing the challenges related to the new developments shown in the pictures and if it had plans to extend the property to the entire old city.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) répète que la population locale est extrêmement consciente des menaces qui pèsent sur la ville. Un plan de règlement d'urbanisme de la vieille ville de Tombouctou a été établi : reste maintenant à l'améliorer et à l'appliquer. Un Comité de gestion et de conservation de la vieille ville de Tombouctou a également été institué, regroupant les imams, les maçons, les élus et les services techniques. Le problème des limites a été abordé au cours du séminaire de juin dernier et le débat continue dans le cadre de l'extension du bien culturel à l'ensemble de la vieille ville de Tombouctou.

Moving to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Israel** proposed not only to focus on the issue of the classrooms and toilets in paragraph 5, but also to refer to the earlier recommendations made by the Committee. It also proposed to include in paragraph 7 wording to request the drafting of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed to insert a new paragraph to welcome the assurance given by the State Party that the classrooms and toilets would be relocated. It further noted that the issue of the technical strategy was covered in paragraph 8.

The **Chairperson** also noted the amendment by Sweden to discontinue the Reinforced Monitoring of the property.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.45** was adopted as amended.

Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

Le **Secrétariat** a reçu de nouvelles informations quant aux progrès du plan de gestion et de conservation. Le lancement de sa préparation a eu lieu début juin, via une réunion des parties prenantes financée par le programme Africa 2009 et le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed the importance of not only focusing on the monuments, but also on the urban fabric. It requested clarification from the Secretariat on why the issue of authenticity had not been included in the Draft Decision and wondered if the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** considered that the State of Conservation Report was confusing and that it did not provide a clear response to the question raised by the Committee at its previous session. It recalled the Decision made last year to consider placing the Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at this session in the absence of substantial progress. It asked for clarification from the Secretariat on whether the property was subject to ascertained or potential danger.

Le **Secrétariat** explique qu'une mission conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial / ICOMOS a conclu qu'il n'y avait pas de raison pour l'instant de considérer l'inscription sur la Liste en péril. Un inventaire de l'île a permis de recenser 1.749 bâtiments historiques, dont 37 réhabilités, et 42 en ruines. Plusieurs projets extrabudgétaires sont

en cours de réalisation grâce au Japon, au Portugal et aux Flandres. Le Comité de gestion en place est fonctionnel, le plan directeur est en cours d'élaboration avec l'aide des fonds portugais et le plan de gestion est lancé.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the Delegation of Bahrain and noted that the urban fabric and authenticity of the Site seemed to be threatened. It noted the importance of Makuti. However, it recalled that the State Party should be consulted on the issue of In-Danger Listing.

The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party of Mozambique was not represented in the room.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, supported by the Delegation of **Bahrain**, agreed with the Secretariat on the progress that had been made but insisted that the State Party should propose solutions. With regard to the issue at play in Makuti, which involved thatching, it was of the view that this was no longer appropriate as it was increasingly difficult and did not affect the Site's Outstanding Universal Value.

Moving to the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Bahrain**, supported by the Delegation of **Barbados**, proposed to include the wording that had also been included by the previous session to consider inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session in the absence of progress.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B. 46** was adopted as amended.

Robben Island (Republic of South Africa) (C 916)

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que ce point est discuté à la demande d'un membre du Comité et indique qu'il n'a pas reçu d'informations additionnelles.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the Draft Decision and noted amendments to paragraphs 4 and 6 from the Delegations of Kenya and Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed that reporting be advanced to 2010 in order to be considered together with the Report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.50** was adopted as amended.

State of Conservation reports for the Africa region to be adopted without debate

The **Secretariat** read the list of State of Conservation Reports to be adopted without discussion:

44. Vieille ville de Lamu (Kenya) (C 1055);
47. Île de Saint-Louis (Sénégal) (C 956 bis);
48. Ile de Gorée (Sénégal) (C 26);
49. Paysage culturel et botanique du Richtersveld (Afrique du sud) (C 1265).

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee had now reached the end of its consideration of the State of Conservation Reports. She announced that the work of the working groups on the future of the Convention and on the budget would now be presented and discussed.

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

ITEM 14A REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/14A

Decision: **33 COM 14A**

The **Vice-Chairperson** (Australia) took over the Chairmanship and recalled the process under way. At its session in Quebec, the Committee had taken a Decision to reflect on this process. 44 written submissions had been received by 1 October 2008, and background papers had been prepared by the Centre to structure the debate. These had been posted on the Web. In February 2009, the workshop had taken place with 180 participants from States Parties, Advisory Bodies and Observers. The results were included in Document 14A in the form of a Report by the Chairperson, Ms. San Segundo. The Consultative Body had been formed in June during the current Committee session, and this was the final stage in the reflection requested in order to provide materials to the General Assembly.

The objective of the Consultative Body, whose mandate was adopted with Decision 14.A.1, was to review the outcome of the February 2009 workshop. It had met during five morning meetings and was open-ended. It had been constituted under Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure in a spirit of openness to others. There had been an excellent spirit of cooperation, together with a wish to “think big” in including past successes and continuing into the future.

The Vice-Chairperson noted that the Draft Decision included three main elements:

1. It transmitted the results to the General Assembly and also to the next meeting of the World Heritage Committee. Therefore, it was not an end point, but represented work carried out to date;
2. It identified six areas of action in response to Document 14A for short and medium-term actions, as identified in paragraphs 12 to 18 specifically;
3. It also provided “the architecture for the future of the Convention”, allowing it to continue to perform in the future as it had in the past.

Furthermore, the Document also highlighted the Decision for the General Assembly. First, a draft vision similar to the Budapest Declaration was provided in Annex 1. Second, a strategic plan with goals for the next 10 years had been identified, and third, a draft Action Plan with a shorter horizon had been taken from the February workshop.

The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the Draft Decision and asked for comments and also to move swiftly ahead.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated the Vice-Chairperson on the work, which was strategic and constructive.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported this view and asked whether the Consultative Body could be called upon in the future.

The **Vice-Chairperson** clarified which work had been the responsibility of the Committee and which was a matter for the General Assembly. It was open to the Committee if it wished to continue.

The **Vice-Chairperson** moved to the examination of Draft Decision, and Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the text was still available on the Web.

The **Vice-Chairperson** said that it was and moved to the adoption of paragraphs 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked whether the wording was correct in “convene” a process, or whether it should be to “commence”.

The **Vice-Chairperson** asked for this matter to be left to the Rapporteur and Paragraphs 14, 15, 16 and 17 were adopted.

He noted that he had spoken to the Secretariat on the terms of reference to be used by interested parties.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 14A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 14A of the Agenda

POINT 16A RAPPORT SUR L'EXECUTION DU BUDGET 2008-2009

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/16A

Decision **33 COM 16A**

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the floor and invited the next **Vice-President**, Ms. Alessandra Cummins, Chairperson of the Budget Group, to come to the podium.

Ms. Cummins presented the Working Group on Financial Issues and highlighted its overall orientation. She noted that the State Party of Barbados had chaired the Group, and she thanked all the Delegations for their time, as well as the Advisory Bodies and the Centre for their support and for any additional information required by the Group.

She informed those present that the Group had met on four occasions in order to review the budgetary implications in Item 16A for 2008 to 2009, as well as to review proposals

for 2010 to 2011 under Item 16B. She said that the Secretariat had made a brief presentation to the Group on 16A. On this occasion, he had noted the accounting implications and in particular the allocation of funds from UNESCO depending on State Party contributions and the reserve fund. The budgetary cycle used by ICOMOS did not coincide with that of the Centre, and the Advisory Bodies and the Centre had been asked to address this issue in the next budget. He had also covered the issue of fluctuations in exchange rates.

Referring to Item 16B, the Secretariat had noted that in keeping with directives from the Committee and the Bureau of the Budget of UNESCO, royalties, obligatory and voluntary funds. The other issue had been to increase the reserve fund from 700,000 to 1 million USD, in order to fund activities under contractual arrangements in a timely fashion. The budget for the Advisory Bodies was an important part of the whole budget, and Advisory Body work processes and cycles had been explained to the meeting. The Advisory Bodies had also noted the contributions from their networks and the use of their staff time. The Committee Members expressed their appreciation for the answers given by the Advisory Bodies and the Centre.

Major questions raised during the Group meetings had concerned the differences between current and future biennia (Table 1), and the staffing given in Table 5 had been adjusted in the revised Document. The need to estimate the real cost of each type of activity was important in order to make informed decisions on the budget. Furthermore, the financial implications of Decisions for the 2010 to 2011 budget were an important issue, in particular for any revised Decisions taken at the present session.

Ms. Cummins said that the Working Group had recommended that the Secretariat prepare an implementation report on the budget with clear notes on any expected impacts. The Working Group had provided recommendations to the Director-General of UNESCO on core funding, State Party contributions of funds, and key areas of World Heritage activities, including sound management tools, a table compiled by the Advisory Bodies and the Centre and a draft overview of workloads. It had recommended that the post of Deputy-Director of the Centre be filled and that the contractual obligations of the Centre be respected. She noted that the budget of the Centre remained at 6.67 million.

She added that this figure had been kept in square brackets, so that any adjustments could be taken into account in the light of new Decisions. Final figures would be presented in due course. However, the overall budget would not change, and any changes and adjustments made would be within the 10% range. She stressed in particular that the budget did not envisage two sessions of the Committee. She finally thanked all those who had participated and requested to turn attention to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the Working Group for the Report and asked the Secretariat to comment on Item 16A paragraph 6 and Item 16B paragraph 11 in order to ensure consistency.

The **Secretariat** noted that a full analysis would require time, but during the four meetings the Group had been able to look into financial details and realities.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that Document Rev 1 contained no changes as such, but had rather been prepared to inform those present that the heading was not by Australia but by the Working Group.

The **Secretariat** stated that the overall budget had shown clear trends and that its components had also shown clear trends. For example, 56% of the budget was now going to the Advisory Bodies, which was the first time this had happened and meant that other parts of the budget, such as international assistance, would have to shrink. The 1% contribution could not be changed, and most countries had ratified the Convention, giving it nearly global coverage. This should be seen in the context of the support of Member States, which provided funds for projects and international assistance. A realistic approach should be taken when looking at the Fund, which in the future could be used to service the Convention, depending on the findings of a future Working Group.

The **Barbados** then noted that Item 6 of 16B referred to the annex tables and gave details of the heading. The Delegation of **Canada** intervened and noted it was 16A.

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked the Working Group for its hard work and noted a couple of elements in the Decisions which were important advances for the Working Group, in particular the request to provide analysis of budgetary information in the future in such a way as to clearly identify how much money was spent on nominations, conservation and communication. The Delegation stated that having this sort of information would be very important for the future management decisions made by the Group. Together with the request in Decision 16B for a cost estimate and staffing time estimate in relation to every Decision the Committee made in the future, it was an important advance that the Committee as a whole should be aware of. The Delegation noted that the realization that the Decisions taken were not cost free, and that each Decision required a certain amount of resources, would help the transparency of the process.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite le groupe de travail pour ses résultats et demande s'il y a eu une coordination entre les groupes de travail et si le lien a été fait avec les résultats et recommandations du groupe de travail précédent sur l'avenir de la Convention. La Délégation se réfère à la proposition de deux sessions du Comité par an et demande quelles en seraient les implications budgétaires.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the information had been exchanged between the two Groups. Minor adjustments up to 10% could be made, but not enough for two sessions.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported Australia in saying that the implications of cost and staffing were important to appreciate fully. Other tasks could be eliminated.

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the speakers for their interventions and the Working Group for the consolidated information, including a table on obligatory requirements.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 16A** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 16A of the Agenda

ITEM 16B ADOPTION OF THE BUDGET FOR 2010-2011

Documents: WHC-08/33.COM/16B

WHC-08/33.COM/16B Rev.1

Decision: **33 COM 16B**

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that for 2011 paragraph 6 of 16A should be substituted and the reference to paragraph 5 eliminated.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the words, “for improved efficiency and to execute the Decisions of the Committee” should be added to the end of paragraph 11.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that liaison with UNESCO services was not in the other paragraph.

The **Vice-Chairperson** suggested amending the paragraph to include the words, “to proceed, in liaison with”.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked about the difference on the Fund and the RP; for which the Committee

The **Secretariat** said that liaison was guaranteed, as the Fund came under UNESCO’s financial regulations.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite le groupe de travail et attire l’attention sur le paragraphe 14. Tandis que la notion de « volontaire » lui semble claire, la Délégation demande ce qu’il faut comprendre par « équitable » dans le contexte des fonds supplémentaires. Elle demande si cela serait appliqué selon les contributions de tous les Etats parties au Fond du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation demande également une explication pour la phrase qui fait référence à la flexibilité budgétaire en fonction du « pourcentage des biens inscrits ».

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that “equitable” was a matter of calculating the 1 % and that one way of looking at this would be to take into account the number of properties by country.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 16B** was adopted as amended.

The **Vice-Chairperson** closed Item 16B of the Agenda

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that the terms “World Heritage Centre” and “Secretariat” had been alternated and that the Rapporteur should take care of this.

The **Vice-Chairperson** reiterated his thanks to the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the Members of the Working Group and turned the floor back over to the Chairperson of the Committee.

POINT 8C : MISE A JOUR DE LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL ET DE LA LISTE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL EN PERIL

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/8C

Decision **33 COM 8C1, 8C2, 8C3**

The **Chairperson** thanked both Working Groups for the excellent work that had been undertaken. She then called for consideration of Item 8C.

The **Secretariat** briefly provided the customary outline of the Decisions taken by the Committee concerning inscriptions on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It read out the following figures:

The World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session inscribed **13** new properties on the World Heritage List, **2** natural and **11** cultural, and approved the extension of **3** properties already inscribed on the List. Following the debates on Item 8B, **7** properties were referred and **2** deferred. At this session, in **7** cases the Committee changed the Advisory Body recommendation as presented in the Draft Decision. The new overall figures of the List include a total of **890** properties, of which **689** are cultural, **176** natural and **25** mixed.

This year, the Committee allocated a little more than **18** hours of discussion to examine **27** nominations, this resulted in an average of **40** minutes for the discussion of each property.

Before the beginning of this session, the **List of World Heritage in Danger** had included **30** properties. As a result of the Decisions relating to the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the Decisions on nominations of properties to the World Heritage List, the Committee had decided to inscribe the following properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Belize, Belize Barrier Reef System (Decision **33 COM 7B.33**);
- Colombia, Los Katios National Park (Decision **33 COM 7B.36**);
- Georgia, Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Decision **33 COM 7B.102**).

At the same time, **é** properties were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Azerbaijan, Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Decision **33 COM 7A.25**);
- Germany, Dresden Elbe Valley (Decision **33 COM 7A.26**).

Accordingly to these Decisions, there were now **31** properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decisions **33 COM 8C.1, 8C.2 and 8C.3** were adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8C of the Agenda

ITEM 8D : CLARIFICATIONS DES LIMITES ET DES SUPERFICIES DES BIENS PAR LES ETATS PARTIES SUITE A L'INVENTAIRE RETROSPECTIF

Document : WHC-09/33.COM/8D

Decision : **33 COM 8D**

Le **Secrétariat** présente le document et souligne qu'il s'agit surtout de cartes visant à clarifier les limites d'un certain nombre de biens inscrits.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 8D** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8D of the Agenda.

ITEM 11A: RAPPORT D'AVANCEMENT DU DEUXIEME CYCLE DE L'EXERCICE DE SOUMISSION DES RAPPORTS PERIODIQUES DANS LES ETATS ARABES

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/11A

Decision **33 COM 11A**

Le **Secrétariat** présente le document 11A qui résume l'avancement de l'exercice de soumission des rapports périodiques dans les Etats arabes. Il rappelle que le deuxième cycle du rapport périodique a été lancé par la 32e session du Comité en 2008. Depuis cette date, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a mis en œuvre le plan de travail qui a été présenté à la précédente session du Comité. Une réunion régionale et trois réunions sous régionales se sont tenues, à Bahrein, Amman, Doha et Meknès. Les points focaux nationaux et les gestionnaires de sites, avec le soutien des mentors, ont largement entamé les deux sections du questionnaire révisé. En outre, ils ont également commencé à préparer les Déclarations rétrospectives de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, demandées pour 61 des 65 biens de la région. Une réunion finale dont le but est de réviser, avec les Etats parties concernés, la synthèse du Rapport et d'élaborer un plan d'action régional se tiendra au mois de décembre 2009. Le rapport sera présenté à la 34^e session du Comité en 2010.

The **Chairperson** called for comments by the Committee.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite toutes les institutions impliquées et exprime sa satisfaction avec le rapport sauf sur deux points : La Délégation informe, d'une part, qu'elle a soumis un amendement pour le paragraphe 8 afin de changer la date de remise des déclarations au 1^{er} février 2010, expliquant que la date proposée par le projet de décision (- 31 juillet 2009- lui semble trop proche pour y répondre de manière adéquate. D'autre part, Deuxièmement, la Délégation informe qu'elle souhaite être associée à la préparation du rapport final.

Le **Secrétariat** explique et clarifie que le paragraphe 8 ne porte pas sur le deuxième cycle des rapports périodiques mais sur l'exercice de l'inventaire rétrospectif qui est mené en parallèle et dont la date limite de remise de cartes et d'autres documentation fixée à l'origine le 1^{er} décembre 2008a été reporté au 1^{er} juillet 2009. Le Secrétariat souligne néanmoins qu'il incombe au Comité de prendre une décision sur ce point. Concernant le paragraphe 10, il confirme que l'exercice est mené en étroite collaboration avec les Points focaux et les gestionnaires de sites des Etats parties de la région qui seront totalement associés à l'élaboration du rapport final.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the Delegation of Tunisia and suggested that the deadline indicated in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision should be 1 February 2010, because the material would have to be examined by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that it would be difficult to have the Advisory Bodies evaluate the Statements properly.

The **Secretariat** noted that more than 600 statements needed to be prepared. Perhaps a word of caution could be inserted, he said, since 61 Statements would need to be prepared for the Arab States.

The **Chairperson** agreed.

The Delegation of **Israel** was worried about the number of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value needed and asked whether the timetable of the Periodic Reports could be respected. The Secretariat agreed with this comment, as Periodic Reporting was on a cyclical basis.

ICOMOS commented on the issue of the adjustment of schedules, saying that the proposal made by Israel would mean that there was no exchange with States Parties. It said that the Committee was fully cognizant of the implications.

The **Chairperson** agreed that the Committee needed to be fully informed about the consequences of the proposal.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that there should be no set date, but that things should take place within the timeframe of the Periodic Reporting. It read out its amendment. The **Chairperson** said that the problem remained, as the 34th session was mentioned.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the words "within the 34th and 35th sessions", and the **Chairperson** proposed "within the coming sessions" instead, saying that priority needed to be given to the preparation of the Statements. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested the words, "for review in consultation with the Advisory Bodies".

The Secretariat noted that for the Periodic Reporting, the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value were a priority as they were referred to in the questionnaire and clear deadlines were needed.

The **Rapporteur** requested Israel to check the screen.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it was essential to mention that evaluation would be done by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies before the

Statements were presented to the Committee. Targeting of either the 34th or 35th session therefore depended on the delivery capacity of the World Heritage Centre in its consultations with the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** said it would be best to keep to the 34th session.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.11A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11A of the Agenda.

ITEM 11B FOLLOW-UP ON PERIODIC REPORTING FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/11B

Decision: **33 COM 11B**

The **Secretariat** explained that the Document distributed to the Committee concerned activities carried out in the region since 2007. The information contained in the Document, structured according to the strategic objectives of the Convention, was complemented by various other documents available on-line, including an impressive compilation of activities carried out by Pacific States Parties. Preparations were on-going for the next cycle of the Periodic Reporting, while the Pacific Sub-Region was also working to develop a new Action Plan covering the period 2010-2015. In this respect, Annex I of Document 11B contained the results of a workshop held in Cairns in October 2008, identifying a strategic framework for the next Action Plan as well as several actions that States Parties from the Pacific felt were necessary. These were shown in the Table provided at the end of the Document. The Secretariat highlighted two of these actions, which concerned the possible establishment of a regional network for training instruction and the development of sustainable financing arrangements, as discussed by the Committee under Item 6B the previous week. The Draft Decision included a request for funding, which would be complemented from the Regular Programme of UNESCO and extra-budgetary resources, in addition to the contribution made by Australia under its UNESCO Trust Fund.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 11B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11B of the Agenda.

POINT 11 C: LANCEMENT DU DEUXIEME CYCLE D'EXERCICE DE SOUMISSION DE RAPPORTS PERIODIQUES EN AFRIQUE

Document: WHC-08/33.COM/11C

Decision : **33 COM 11C**

Le **Secrétariat** présente le document expliquant qu'il est basé sur la décision 32 COM 11E sur laquelle s'inscrit le lancement du deuxième cycle des rapports périodiques en Afrique à la session actuelle. Il informe que depuis la dernière session du Comité, un atelier d'information sur l'élaboration des Déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle s'est tenu en Tanzanie en mars 2009 financé par l'Etat partie de la Suisse ainsi que le Fond pour le patrimoine mondial africain. Il informe par ailleurs que des représentants de 18 Etats parties ont participé et que depuis la fin de l'atelier, 9 projets de déclarations d'un total de 44 ont déjà été soumis au CPM avec 20 autres en cours de préparation. Il attire l'attention sur le fait que l'Etat partie du Sénégal a signalé son intérêt pour accueillir la Réunion régionale de lancement officiel du deuxième cycle en janvier 2010. Il souligne également que tous les Etats parties ont été invités à nommer des Points focaux. Le Secrétariat présente les différentes étapes de la préparation ainsi que le calendrier d'ici à l'année de présentation du rapport final au Comité en 2012. Il informe également que la Suisse a confirmé son engagement d'accompagner l'exercice pendant toute sa durée. Pour finir, le Secrétariat attire l'attention sur le fait que le programme AFRICA 2009 se terminera en décembre 2009 ; le bilan fait à cette occasion souligne la nécessité qu'une suite soit donnée au programme avec une nouvelle stratégie pour la région qui compléterait une initiative déjà commencée pour le patrimoine naturel dans la région.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** appreciated the Report and called attention to the Africa 2009 Programme, which had helped to raise awareness. Given its success, Nigeria urged the Committee to support follow-up programmes.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it would like to offer to host the East Africa Sub-Regional Meeting to launch the Periodic Reporting and the Training Programme. Following the comments made by the Delegation of Nigeria, it wanted to thank the Centre and the sponsors of the Africa 2009 Programme, one of the success stories of heritage management and community involvement that had been replicated in other regions and of which Africa was extremely proud. The Programme had not yet ended, and follow-up would continue, for which there was also a need. Africa was ready and waiting to start the process, the Delegation said.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives pour leur travail et leur soutien. Elle considère que les premiers résultats sont prometteurs et qu'ils ont permis d'apporter d'importantes améliorations. Elle remercie également la Délégation du Kenya pour sa proposition d'accueillir un atelier sous-régional sur le sujet. Enfin, elle attire l'attention sur la nécessité de continuer à soutenir et renforcer la région de l'Afrique.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Kenya for its readiness to support the implementation of the Periodic Reporting exercise in Africa.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le travail effectué en Afrique jusqu'à présent, qui s'avère être très prometteur et dont il est important d'assurer la continuité. La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie également tous ceux qui ont pu aider l'Afrique, tant pour le patrimoine culturel que naturel, sur un plan technique ou financier, et attend la poursuite d'un apport allant dans le sens de l'amélioration de l'existant. La Délégation de **Madagascar** remercie par ailleurs le **Kenya** de sa proposition d'accueillir la prochaine réunion pour le lancement de l'exercice et précise que ce qui est fait actuellement en Afrique doit être soutenu afin de renforcer les acquis.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its support for the activities being implemented in Africa, in particular within the framework of the African World Heritage Fund. It stressed the importance of twinning arrangements as a way of further promoting cooperation and stated that it would submit an amendment to the Draft Decision in this regard. With respect to the Africa 2009 Programme, the Delegation asked how the results of this would be integrated into the Periodic Reporting process and how its achievements could be consolidated.

ICCROM thanked the Members of the Committee for their support for the Africa 2009 Programme, which came to an end this year. Activities, however, would continue through the various African institutions in the field of heritage conservation, such as the Ecole du Patrimoine, which would now drive the process rather than being partners in the framework of a Programme implemented from Rome, as had been the case until now. A new Programme should thus be planned and implemented, this time focusing more on natural heritage. ICCROM stated that now that the Africa 2009 Programme had concluded, it would be appropriate to present a Report on its outcomes at the next session of the World Heritage Committee in 2010.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, considering that the country was located on the African continent, wished to express its congratulations and gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and all the Advisory Bodies for the support provided. The Delegation also saluted the African World Heritage Fund, to which it contributed substantially and which it constantly supported, and it looked forward to further promising results from this Fund.

The **Chairperson** suggested examining the Draft Decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed that, as suggested by ICCROM, a request for a Report on the Africa 2009 Programme at the next session of the Committee be added to the Draft Decision.

Paragraphs 1 to 8 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested adding the words, "and encourage twinning programmes for specific actions in capacity-building and periodic reporting" to paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** declared paragraph 9 adopted, as amended by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to include a reference to its proposal to host a regional meeting in paragraph 10.

Paragraph 10 and 11 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed a new paragraph 12 to request a Report on the Africa 2009 Programme at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee and to integrate its results into the coming cycle of Periodic Reporting.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed new wording to suggest that the possibility of developing a new Programme for the Africa Region be looked into.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to call this new Programme “Africa 2020”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noticed that in the proposed formulation it was understood that it was the Committee that was looking into the possibility of launching the new Programme, and it asked whether this was what had been intended. The Delegation asked whether, according to the amendment by Kenya, it was the Committee that was meant to look into the possibility of continuing the Programme, or if the aim was to ask the Advisory Bodies to look into the possibility.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the request was addressed to the Advisory Bodies.

The **Secretariat** intervened to recall that discussions were quite advanced among all parties concerned on the development of a successor Programme to Africa 2009. For this reason, rather than requesting to “look at the possibility”, the Committee might wish to “support the continuation” of the Africa 2009 Programme.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the Delegation of Kenya if it had a specific project in mind.

The Delegation of **Kenya** referred to the main areas of work covered by the Africa 2009 Programme, including the development of legal protection, the promotion of community participation and the fostering of traditional knowledge. A new Programme would need to focus on what had not been done until now, in order to be complementary to the achievements that had been made and building on and consolidating them.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** explained that it shared the sentiments of the earlier speakers regarding continuation and said that it therefore would chosen the word “encourages” rather than “supports”. It also requested to hear from ICCROM whether it envisaged continuing the Programme or developing a new one based on the policies and strategies of Africa 2009. It explained that this clarification could help in the formulation of the Decision.

ICCROM noted that discussions on the possible scope of a new Programme had been going on for some time. The new Programme would be driven from within the region and would aim at strengthening the achievements of Africa 2009, to which it would constitute a follow-up.

The Delegation of **Kenya** advocated the development of a new Programme in Africa, a disadvantaged region, and it called for support from the international community.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested adding the sentence, “encourages the Advisory Bodies, in consultation with the States Parties, to develop programme activities based on the results of the Africa 2009 Programme”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed replacing the word “encourages” with “requests”, in particular “requests ICOMOS and ICCROM”.

The **Chairperson** suggested that a general reference to the Advisory Bodies, without naming them individually, be included in the text of the Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** reiterated its proposal to call the new Programme “Africa 2020”.

Le **Secrétariat** suggère aux membres du Comité d'éventuellement ajouter, dans ce paragraphe, une mention au sujet d'un autre programme important à développer : le programme Africa Nature.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed adding a reference to the World Heritage Centre in paragraph 12.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 11C** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11C of the Agenda

ITEM 12 PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN HERITAGE

Document: WHC-09/33 COM/12

Decision : **33 COM 12**

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que depuis la 26eme session du Comité un soutien est apporté, notamment à travers le Fonds du patrimoine mondial, aux institutions palestiniennes en charge de la préservation du patrimoine culturel et naturel. Le Secrétariat indique également que jusqu'à ce jour une allocation de 500 000 dollars des Etats-Unis a été fournie à ces institutions. Il informe par ailleurs le Comité que le document 12 résume les activités mises en œuvre depuis la 32eme session, essentiellement par l'intermédiaire du bureau de l'UNESCO à Ramallah qui travaille avec la Direction des Antiquités et du Patrimoine culturel palestinien. Le **Secrétariat** précise que ces activités sont associées à des projets extrabudgétaires notamment financés par les gouvernements de l'Italie, de la Norvège et par la Commission européenne. Le **Secrétariat** cite quelques projets : le plan de gestion et de conservation de Bethléem, un travail similaire pour les villes de Naplouse et Hébron, un autre pour les sites archéologiques de Qasr Hisham à Jéricho et de Tell Balata à Naplouse et enfin des études sur les paysages culturels et la préparation de dossiers de proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Jordan** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the work achieved in the Palestinian Territories and expressed its wish to see it continuing in the future in cooperation with the relevant institutions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** also commended the efforts to protect the Palestinian heritage and called for more financial and technical support, considering the importance of preserving this heritage.

The Delegation of **Kenya** joined previous speakers in expressing appreciation for the good work done. It stated that there was still a need for capacity-building among

Palestinian heritage experts and that this should be done within a coherent strategy, not through *ad hoc* activities.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that in previous decisions on the same issue the Committee had encouraged the reactivation of a joint Palestinian-Israeli Expert Committee on Archaeology. It regretted that the Draft Decision did not include a reference to this mechanism for cooperation, since it could have promoted the harmonization of policies and practices on heritage within the same geo-cultural area.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe aux félicitations adressées au Centre du patrimoine mondial, organisations ainsi que toutes les institutions qui accordent un intérêt particulier au patrimoine palestinien lequel est jugé comme étant vulnérable. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite apporter un amendement au paragraphe 7 en avançant la date de soumission d'un rapport au Centre du patrimoine mondial de la 35e session du Comité en 2011 à la 34e en 2010.

The Delegation of **Jordan** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Report did not include anything about Gaza, especially after the violent Israeli bombing that had affected it. It expressed its wish to see the World Heritage Centre present a report on the state of conservation of the cultural and natural heritage of Gaza.

The **Chairperson** noted that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision covered that point.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked why the Delegation of Jordan could not respond to its previous suggestion regarding the reactivation of the joint Palestinian-Israeli Expert Committee on Archaeology, instead of raising new issues when a consensus on the Draft Decision had been reached. A discussion on Gaza and its cultural heritage was outside the scope of the Committee's work and would have obliged the Delegation of Israel to mention the use of heritage sites as shields during armed conflicts.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reminded those present that the Delegation of Tunisia had requested the Report to be submitted in 2010 and not 2011.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.12** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 12 of the Agenda.

ITEM 17 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Document: WHC.09/33 COM/17

Decision 33 COM 17

The Chairperson informed the Members of the Committee that this item would remain open until the end of the session to enable possible modifications.

The **Secretariat** presented the provisional agenda of the General Assembly. Following a Decision made by the Executive Board, authorizing the General Assembly to hold its session after the end of the Executive Board and General Conference, the General Assembly would start on 23 October at 2 p.m. and would run for one hour. Elections

would be held on 26 October. On 27 and 28 October (a.m. only), the General Assembly would hold debates on substantive issues, including the future of the Convention. The Item was for information only, since the General Assembly would adopt its own agenda.

The **Chairperson** recalled the unanimous support within the Executive Board for the General Assembly being given sufficient time for debate. She asked the Members of the Committee if they had any comments.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that after listening to the outcomes of the Kondo Group on election procedures to the World Heritage Committee, it had realized that there would be a need for a change to Rules 13 and 14 of the Rules of Procedure before the election of the new Members of the World Heritage Committee. It had noticed that this issue was not well reflected in Document 3A, which was just a report on the reflection. Perhaps a new agenda item could be inserted between 3A and 3B, in order to address the changes in the Rules of Procedure, so that all States Parties would be aware that this important item would be coming up before the elections.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the Delegation of Bahrain and suggested that this Item be the first to be discussed by the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that Items 8 and 9 were clearly related to Item 11. Perhaps a rearrangement could be made.

The **Chairperson** stated that these useful comments would be taken into account by the Secretariat and the necessary adjustments made.

The Draft decision 33 COM 17 was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 17 of the Agenda.

ITEM 7B TRENDS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

Document *WHC-09/33 COM/7B*

Decision: **33 COM 7B.148**

The **Secretariat** noted that a Revised Draft Decision, 7B.148 Rev, had been distributed in the room. This concerned the analysis of the trends of state of conservation provided in the first part of Document 7B. The circular letter on this topic had been provided to Committee Members after the Quebec meeting and was complemented by various other reports available on the Internet. The analysis, which had been requested by the Committee, contained statistics on the most recurrent types of threats affecting the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to review the various paragraphs of the Draft Decision and declared paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to add that the reference to the State Party which proposed the amendment should be deleted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** intervient pour signaler que le texte en français n'est pas encore disponible à l'écran.

The **Chairperson** asked the French-speaking Members of the Committee for their understanding, since it appeared that the French version of the Draft Decision was not on the computer. She suggested that for this particular Decision, the Members of the Committee could use the paper version, which had been distributed in the two languages.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, with reference to the Draft Decision's suggesting that it would have been "desirable to receive...", requested clarification on who was being targeted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** explained that this proposed paragraph was merely a statement followed by an action request in the following paragraph, where the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies were requested to provide the information.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that paragraph 16 be deleted, since the matter was already covered in paragraph 15.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed adding after "in this report" the sentence, "...as well as proposed revisions to the Operational Guidelines regarding buffer zones, taking into account the results of the expert meeting on this issue".

The **Delegation of Bahrain** asked that these results be reviewed before they were taken into account and suggested deleting this paragraph.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled that these results had been presented to the Committee at its previous session.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7B.148** was adopted, as amended.

ITEM 8B. EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS

Document: *WHC-09/33 COM/8B*

WHC-09/33 COM/8B1

WHC-09/33 COM/8B1 add

WHC-09/33 COM/INF.8B2

Decision: **33 COM 8B**

The **Chairperson** asked the Members of the Committee to consider the Revised Draft Decision 8B.54, presented by the States Parties of Bahrain, Barbados, Canada, Israel, Kenya, Peru and Sweden, which had been distributed in the room.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** commented that it was incorrect to present this Draft Decision as having been proposed by all the mentioned States Parties. Some Delegations had contributed only to individual paragraphs, and these had then been combined.

The **Chairperson** presented her apologies to States Parties that may not have been involved in the Draft Decision; however, this had been the way in which it had been presented to the Rapporteur and the Chairperson. She proceeded with the examination of the decision paragraphs by paragraphs.

Regarding paragraph 4, the Delegation of **Canada** stated that this issue was more appropriately addressed under Item 14C of the agenda of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was no contradiction, since the current paragraph 4 was only saying that it would have been desirable to amend the Rules of Procedure, not in fact to amend them.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** déclare s'associer à la proposition du Canada et précise qu'elle souhaite voir les Etats membres « associés » au vote et non pas en être exclus.

The **Chairperson** stressed once again that the Committee would look at the substantive issues under Item 14C.

The Delegation of **Canada**, supported by the Delegation of Cuba, suggested deleting paragraph 4 from the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Cuba** declared that it was in agreement with **Canada's** proposal.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that what was proposed by Tunisia was essential and had to be taken into consideration and discussed.

The **Chairperson**, noting that a consensus on the Draft Decision had apparently not been reached contrary to her initial understanding, stated that there was obviously a need for further consultation among the Members of the Committee.

She therefore proposed to adjourn the session and resume at 3:30 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – TUESDAY, 30 JUNE 2009

SIXTEENTH MEETING

3.30 p.m. – 11.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. María Jesús San Segundo

ITEM 10 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM.10.A*
 WHC-09/33.COM.10.B
 WHC-09/33.COM.10.C

Decision: **33 COM 10**

The **Chairperson** indicated that Draft Decision 33 COM 10 was still pending.

She proposed finishing the examination of the Draft Decision and asked if there was agreement on paragraph 4. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted and the deletion of paragraph 4 proposed.

The Delegation of **Barbados** proposed deleting paragraph 4 because it would be treated under the Rules of Procedure.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the Committee was dealing with paragraph 4 and then with paragraph 5 with amendments.

The Delegation of **Israel** wanted the Advisory Bodies to clarify this point.

The **Chairperson** noted the amendment proposed.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 10** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10 of the Agenda

ITEM 7.2 REPORT ON THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM

Document *WHC-09/33.COM.7.2*

Decision **33 COM 7.2**

The Delegation of **Israel** requested comments from the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** agreed and gave the Advisory Bodies one minute each.

IUCN said it was a calendar issue. There was no comment from ICOMOS or ICCROM.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said it was concerned by a Decision that could cause an extra workload. It underlined that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism had originally been designed to be a tool to be used in the special cases of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and also as a way of avoiding such listing. The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be used only when it was absolutely necessary in the cases of properties inscribed on the In-Danger List and not for properties on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** appreciated the Report, which could function as a source of instruction. The conclusions were important for future Members of the Committee, and it had submitted a draft amendment.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with Sweden on Reinforced and Reactive Monitoring. It supported the Centre in not using the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for Sites not on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It detected a feeling that Reinforced Monitoring was not really necessary and that States Parties considered it to be a negative tool. The Delegation considered this to be incorrect and referred to the seven sites for which the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism was really needed.

The **Chairperson** said there was a total of seven sites at which Reinforced Monitoring was in place: Jerusalem, four parks in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Preah Vihear.

The Delegation of **Canada** took a different view to that of Israel. Reinforced Monitoring could be a useful tool in emergencies, though there was not much detail as to how it could work. Proposals as to how it could be improved were required.

The **Chairperson** said there were many amendments to consider for this Decision. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted. Paragraph 4 was the subject of amendments from Australia and the United States of America. The amendment by Australia was read out.

The **Rapporteur** requested the Centre to develop recommendations for the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for consideration at the 34th session of the Committee. An amendment was proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that Canada also had an amendment on a procedural question.

The Chairperson asked **Canada** about its amendment.

The Delegation of **Canada** said an amendment had not been submitted formally, but it wished to formulate one during the debate.

The **Chairperson** said that Australia and the United States of America did not share the Canadian view.

The Delegation of **Canada** mentioned that one point in its amendment was already mentioned in that submitted by Australia. Furthermore, each decision to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism needed clearly to state the nature of the monitoring mission and the frequency of reporting required. Finally, each application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be reviewed annually.

The **Chairperson** said a paragraph 4b would be created.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that a paragraph 4b had been suggested by Sweden, namely that each Decision to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism would clearly state the nature of the monitoring mission and the frequency of reporting required. Each application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism would be reviewed annually.

The **Chairperson** said paragraph 4b was proposed by Sweden and supported by Canada.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said many States Parties had presented the same ideas and that part of the paragraph could probably be withdrawn.

The **Chairperson** regretted that the letter from the World Heritage Centre asking the Members of the Committee to submit their amendments before the session did not seem to have reached them. In spite of the new working method using two screens, it had been necessary to print the Decisions, including the five amendments, and to distribute them to the Committee Members for examination.

The **Chairperson** said she was waiting for five different amendments from five countries. She indicated that this item will remain open and proceeded with examination of items 10A, 10 B and 10 C.

ITEM 10A SERIAL TRANSNATIONAL NOMINATIONS

Document: WHC-09/33.COM.10.A

Decision **33 COM 10A**

The **Secretariat** took the floor and referred to the two Documents circulating in the room other than Working Document 10A. These Documents were an analysis carried out by the German Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) and IUCN on Serial Natural World Heritage (SNWH) properties and the Report on the workshop held in Vilm in November 2008 in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. He noted the growing popularity of serial properties: out of 37 nominations this year, 22 had been serial properties, having a total of 130 component parts.

The **Secretariat**, in response to last year's Committee Decision 32 COM 10B, discussed the workshop in Vilm. He explained that 27 participants had shared their experience on both existing and in-progress Serial Trans-National World Heritage properties and

nominations and that relevant State Party comments had also been considered. The definition of a “serial property” had been much discussed at the workshop, as the definition in the Operational Guidelines was unclear. The Guidelines acknowledged that recognition of the series as a whole was more than of its individual parts, but there was also a need for each property in the series to have Outstanding Universal Value. He noted that the participants had agreed that properties with Outstanding Universal Value in their own right should be treated as single properties, and that properties with non-contiguous components should be part of the serial category, with at least two component parts coming together to form a series. The workshop participants had also agreed that because serial nominations were generally more complex and challenging, particularly in terms of resource implications and management requirements, they should be more cautiously encouraged. These issues were particularly important within the context of cultural properties and conclusive decisions could not be taken from the Workshop alone. The Secretariat pointed to the Report that was circulating for more details from the Workshop.

The **Chairperson** said the Item would be put to the Committee and that more information would be available next year after the recommended technical workshop on the subject had been held.

The Delegation of **Sweden** thought there was strong support from the States Parties for an expert meeting. The State Party of Switzerland would inform the Committee about its offer to organize such a meeting.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** suggère l’organisation d’un deuxième atelier technique sur les propositions d’inscription en série, notamment pour aborder celles qui sont culturelles. L’Etat partie propose par conséquent d’organiser un atelier sur les propositions d’inscription en série culturelles et naturelles, basé sur les conclusions et recommandations de l’atelier de Vilm, et répondant par là même à la Décision 32 COM 10B du Comité

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked Switzerland and Germany. The Report of the Centre to the meeting had emphasized a cautious approach to serial properties, it said, and the Committee needed rules for this element of its work.

The Delegation of **Canada** concurred. States Parties were taking increasing interest in serial nominations.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the previous speakers and said that the discussion was now moving from individual nominations to a larger consideration of the subject as a whole.

The **Chairperson** suggested examining the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, which should include the offer from Switzerland. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 5, which could stand alone or be attached to another paragraph and regarded the hosting of an expert meeting on natural and cultural Serial World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** thought the paragraph could be incorporated elsewhere.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it understood that a workshop on natural serial nominations had already taken place and that there was a need for a workshop on cultural sites only.

The **Secretariat** mentioned the need to harmonize the relationship between cultural and natural properties, and hence this would be an integrated workshop.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that an integrated workshop would be more useful and referred to the wording in paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to harmonizing the wording concerning hosting the expert meeting on natural and cultural Serial World Heritage properties in line with the World Heritage's Centre comments.

The Delegation of **China** said the meeting in Vilm in 2008 should be taken into account, as should key issues on cultural properties and serial trans-national nominations.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that there were two alternatives: either to delete the original language or to retain the proposals from the Delegation of Switzerland and the Delegation of China.

The Delegation of **Australia** said the offer by the Delegation of Switzerland was for natural and cultural serial properties, which was the most logical. Links between the two still remained to be explored.

The Draft decision **33 COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10A of the Agenda

ITEM 10B GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM.10.B*

Decision: **33 COM 10B**

The **Secretariat** underlined that the Global Training Strategy had been developed and implemented for many years. Strategies had been approved in 2000 and 2001.

ICCROM took the floor to speak about improving coordination of the Global Training Strategy. First, it provided the background. The Strategy had been initiated in 1994 for cultural heritage and in 1995 for natural heritage. In December 2000, the "Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage" had been adopted, and in December 2001 the "Global Training Strategy for Cultural and Natural Heritage" and Priority Action Plan were adopted. It then went on to outline the strategic objectives of the Strategy, including improving implementation of the World Heritage Convention, encouraging proactive use of the World Heritage Fund, integrating training for cultural and natural heritage where possible, ensuring training for meeting on-going needs that had been identified by the Committee, ensuring the highest standards of training, and encouraging collaboration among Advisory Bodies, as well as regional and national partners.

ICCROM then discussed the implementation of the Convention. It identified the development of key concepts, including Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, and the need for workshops on this and on Periodic Reporting. There was also a need for workshops on nomination dossiers in Anglophone and Francophone Africa, to be held with the AWHF, and there was a need to develop a resource manual for nominations. Improving site management was then discussed. Key issues, such as the development of management systems, management-planning courses (offered regularly as part of the Africa 2009 and ATHAR Programmes), workshops on management planning by WHITR-AP (Asia-Pacific), World Heritage management training by universities around the world, and the development of resource manuals for managing World Heritage Sites, were mentioned.

ICCROM then discussed strengthening conservation skills. It explained that these were not limited to World Heritage properties. It mentioned the need for better monitoring of training for technical, scientific and traditional conservation skills, both on a short and long-term basis. It noted the ICCROM courses on the Conservation of the Built Heritage, the Conservation of Stone and Wood, and on Modern Architecture. Technical conservation courses had also been offered as part of the Africa 2009 and ATHAR Programmes and by the ACCU Nara Office. Regional activities were then discussed, including Periodic Reporting Action Plans, the Africa 2009 and Pacific 2009 Programmes, and *ad hoc* regional-training activities funded by international assistance.

ICCROM then discussed the state of progress on natural heritage. It mentioned a workshop in June 2008 that had considered coordinated approaches to natural World Heritage, the development of a five-year programme for capacity-building for natural heritage, and how the programme had been developed in cooperation with IUCN, ICCROM and the World Heritage Centre. It then mentioned resource manuals. The World Heritage Committee had approved a revised timeline for resource manuals at its 32nd session. Due to budgetary constraints, manuals would be in PDF format with an interactive Web version. Hard copies would be produced when funds were available. The Status Report on manuals in progress included a draft joint manual on nominations, which was complete and ready for testing, and draft individual manuals for managing cultural and natural heritage, which were in preparation and would be ready for testing in 2010. It also included draft manuals on disaster risk reduction, which were complete and currently being tested. A list of future manuals would include those on Tentative Lists (linked to nominations), monitoring, tourism and public use (linked to management), vulnerability assessment for climate change, and impact assessment.

Regional training and research institutions were then discussed. These had been established to assist in capacity-building at the regional level through training, research and participation in various World Heritage processes. A number of them were applying for the status of Category 2 Centres under the auspices of UNESCO, in order to help the Organization fulfill its mission. They were autonomous initiatives, but they could be seen as promoting UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention, and they were also in line with the Global Training Strategy's regional focus. Current institutions with or applying for Category 2 status included: WHITR-AP (China) for the Asia-Pacific Region, which had become a Category 2 Centre in 2007 and had begun activities; the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (Bahrain) had applied for Category 2 status, and this would be discussed by the General Conference in October 2009; and there was also the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre (Brazil) for Latin America. Other related

institutions with or applying for Category 2 status included the Nordic and African World Heritage Foundations. Finally, it was noted that other States Parties were considering setting up similar institutions.

Capacity-building was then discussed. Other actors needed to be considered within the framework of the Global Training Strategy, including universities teaching World Heritage Studies and other related topics, UNESCO Chairs in heritage-related issues, and the Forum UNESCO university network. A proposal for a capacity-building programme, whose objective would be to provide an effective framework in support of protected-areas management, was then discussed. The strategy would be high profile, coordinated and integrated among institutions, and it would include delivery of "World Heritage Approved" capacity-building events. The Programme would also work with other Conventions and Programmes and it would encourage an improved delivery process. Implementation would need to include: inter-institutional cooperation, including focal points, research and analysis of needs and provision; the development of training modules, materials and activities (courses, mentoring processes, exchanges, etc.); and a network of cooperating academic institutions. Evaluation, reporting and financing were also mentioned. The Programme was mentioned as the final step in on-going cooperation between cultural and natural heritage institutions, leading to further expansion of activities in favour of cultural heritage.

ICCROM then moved to key issues for the future of the Global Training Strategy, including better coordination and cooperation with the actors involved in World Heritage capacity-building, such as Category 2 Centres, universities, etc., within the framework of the Global Training Strategy. Capacity-building needed higher visibility on the Committee's agenda. Periodic Reporting needed to be better used for the development of regional capacity-building programmes and for original needs assessments at the international level. There was a need for the continuing development of resource manuals and other capacity-building materials and to revise the Global Training Strategy in order to take into account progress and changes since 2001.

ICCROM finished by referring to the Decisions presented to the Committee. First, it requested support for Category 2 Centres, as well as for the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICCROM's Natural Heritage Training Programme. It also requested an additional 141,000 USD for continuing work on the manuals. It pointed to the request in budgetary Document 16B for 30,000 USD to revise the Global Training Strategy and to incorporate new partners to join IUCN, ICOMOS and the Centre.

The **Secretariat** said the issue of Category 2 Centres had been discussed many times. One such Centre had been opened in China in 2007, and two more were to be discussed at the forthcoming General Conference. The aim would be for there to be more such Centres, in order to cover different parts of the world. There were three types of Category 2 Centres: management training (China), specialized (Spain for prehistory and Egypt for archaeology), and others (the African Fund and the Nordic World Heritage Foundation). This work would be completed over the years to come.

The Delegation of **Australia** thanked the Director for the Report on this Item. It referred to tourism at World Heritage Sites and paragraph 5b of the Manual, making a small amendment to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked ICCROM to inform the Committee how it envisaged Category 2 Centres working.

The Delegation of **Egypt** confirmed its wish to establish a training and scientific research centre. Consultations were necessary, and it hoped that the World Heritage Centre could give its assistance in this regard.

ICCROM referred to the Tourism Manual in the World Heritage Paper Series, which discussed public use. The idea was that this Paper would be integrated into the Management Manual. In answer to the question from Brazil, the operation of the Centres would be part of the Periodic Reporting process. The institutions would develop specific programmes according to specific needs following the Periodic Reporting process.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted the four elements in paragraph 20. Its first comment was that assessing modifications should be prioritized. It supported Category 2 Centres as a concept and as a way of getting people involved. Local institutions should also be encouraged in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to the presentation by ICOMOS and noted that paragraph 5 remained unchanged.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** wanted to add to paragraph 3 that negotiations were in process for a new Centre for Training and Research in Egypt with the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** thought this would interfere with the workings of the Executive Board, since the adoption of a Category 2 Centre was a matter for the Executive Board and the General Conference.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it should be announced again in Brazil in 2010.

The **Chairperson** said that the question of the Category 2 Centres could move forward at the Executive Board and the General Conference as soon as the Executive Board had analyzed the Document.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said it had sent the relevant Document officially to the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** said the Centre had received the letter from the Egyptian Permanent Delegation. The establishment of Category 2 Centres was not up to the World Heritage Committee, but was rather a matter for UNESCO. It would therefore be advisable to have proposals put to the Executive Board.

The **Chairperson** indicated that there was a political compromise here, and that the procedure would need to go through the Executive Board. She asked whether the Delegation of Israel wished to intervene.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked why the Category 2 Centre in China had not been considered as a training institute.

The **Chairperson** said there were three new institutes to be presented to the Executive Board.

The Delegation of **China** pointed out that the Chinese Category 2 Centre had been established two years ago.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Centres in Bahrain and Brazil had recently been approved by the Executive Board, and that they would be going before the General Conference in October. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Decision were adopted. Paragraph 5 on the budget was then discussed.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to paragraph 20 of the Document. Assessing impacts on World Heritage should become paragraph 2, and the other paragraphs should be rearranged.

The **Chairperson**, referring to paragraph 20, said she would move Item 4 to first place in terms of priority and replace paragraph b.

The Delegation of **Australia** said this was probably a wise proposal.

The **Chairperson** referred to assessing impacts.

The Delegation of **Israel** wanted to check whether this was to be included in paragraph a or b and whether paragraph c was to be deleted. It would be happy for it to be included in paragraph a.

The Delegation of **Australia** said there was a minor amendment to paragraph a.

The **Chairperson** referred to the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage and said that Committee Members needed to look at assessing impacts and the World Heritage Tentative List.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wanted paragraph 3 to remain, as it dealt with an important issue.

The **Secretariat** said a choice had to be made as regards manuals and that the original priorities proposed by ICCROM had changed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wanted to propose a vote on the adoption of the Decision.

The **Chairperson** said that discussion should continue on this point. There had been an agreement to retain monitoring and tourism, and Committee Members should be consulted.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that extra-budgetary resources for the third point could possibly be found and would not be difficult for this item.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with Brazil. A workshop on Tourism and Operational Guidelines would be held in China later this year.

The **Chairperson** said there were two more requests from the floor and mentioned funding for the third point.

The Delegation of **Jordan** suggested to add to paragraph a the words, “and tourism projects/activities on the Outstanding Universal Value on the World Heritage properties” and “assessing of proposed development and tourism activities”.

The **Chairperson** said there was a proposal from the Delegation of Jordan for an amendment to paragraph 5a, or alternatively to keep the whole of paragraph 5c. A Decision had to be made on an important issue, and it was important to ensure that the priorities were correct.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thought the Delegation of Jordan’s proposal was reasonable.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Cuba** supported Jordan’s proposal, as it was clear that tourism and development were linked.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** indique trouver cette proposition parfaitement cohérente.

The **Chairperson** mentioned again paragraphs a, b and c.

The Delegation of **China** suggested adding a new paragraph between paragraphs 3 and 4. It welcomed the participation of ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN and said that the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties continued to broaden the Global Training Strategy together.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of China to repeat the proposed new paragraph, which it did.

The **Chairperson** said that the new paragraph could be placed between paragraphs 3 and 4 and commence with the words, “encourages the World Heritage Centre ...”. A new paragraph 3b could be created.

The Delegation of **Israel** raised two points, asking whether China would accept for this to become part of paragraph 3 and referring to the final paragraph about tourism.

The **Chairperson** repeated paragraph 3 with reference to China.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked for another look at the paragraph, as it was not sure it had understood China’s suggestion. It also agreed with Jordan’s proposition.

The **Chairperson** returned to the original text proposed by ICCROM for paragraph 5 and sub-paragraphs 5a and 5b, after having adopted paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Australia** said if the reference to tourism and public use was to be retained, along with the reference to manuals, then paragraph a could end with the words, “taking into account the existing World Heritage Manual on tourism and the upcoming workshop on sustainable tourism to take place at the Magao Caves World Heritage Site in September 2009.”

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with the Jordanian proposal and supported the Australian amendment for sustainable tourism, rather than leaving this just as tourism.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the Advisory Bodies if they were taking on too much.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** made the same comment. It was aware of the impacts of tourism, but this was too much for the Advisory Bodies. There should be two manuals.

The **Chairperson** said that all those who had spoken had made positive points, but that the Secretariat had said that there would probably be funds available. There could be three Manuals. If the Committee agreed, discussion could continue about omitting one of the three.

The Delegation of **Israel** brought up the subject of the budget of 170.000 USD. It supported the proposal, but the World Heritage Centre should be indicated in the wording.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that he was optimistic.

The **Secretariat** explained that part of the funds were located in the budget. It would be likely that they could find resources from States Parties, as had happened in the past. He was quite confident there would be no major obstacle.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if the text could be adopted as it was.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 10B** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10B of the Agenda.

ITEM 10C GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST - THEMATIC STUDIES

Document: *WHC-09/33.COM.10.C*

Decision: **33 COM 10C**

ICOMOS indicated that the Advisory Bodies welcomed the opportunity to provide information about thematic studies, as they agreed that these could contribute to achieving the goals of the Global Strategy. Such thematic studies were also one of the core responsibilities outlined in the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS noted the past inconsistency of such work, largely the result of limited resources.

Referring to Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and discussions with the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel, ICOMOS identified gaps in the list of thematic studies. ICOMOS noted that continuing work included sub-regional studies of rock-art (with Central Asia identified as the next priority) and agro-pastoral Cultural Landscapes in the Mediterranean region. The thematic study on the Cultural Landscapes of the Pacific

Islands had been completed, and discussions with the Pacific Islands States Parties and the World Heritage Centre were on-going in order to identify the next priority for this sub-regional work.

In addition to thematic studies funded through the World Heritage Fund, ICOMOS had also prepared a special edition of *Heritage@Risk* on *The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism* (2007). Following the publication of *Cultural Heritage in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions* (2004), a new publication was now available on *Historical Polar Bases: Preservation and Management* (2008). In 2009, ICOMOS had started working with the International Astronomical Union, in tandem with the celebration of 2009 as the International Year of Astronomy. Work had started, but additional funding was being sought through States Parties. Lack of funding had stalled identified priorities for thematic studies on irrigation and water-management systems, 20th-century heritage and the Arctic Region.

IUCN noted that its work on thematic studies could be found in a series entitled “World Heritage Studies”. The latest additions included studies on volcanoes and volcanic landscapes, caves, and karst landscapes. Thematic studies on deserts (under peer review) and the Arctic were currently underway, and a draft of the former study was available. Additional thematic work from 2008-09 included publications on Outstanding Universal Value for Natural World Heritage, World Heritage and Protected Areas, Serial Natural World Heritage Sites, World Heritage in Danger, Natural World Heritage Nominations, and Management Planning for Natural World Heritage Properties. IUCN was keen to develop partnerships, including with interested States Parties, in order to extend its thematic work. It required support for new subject areas and for translating studies into other languages.

The **Chairperson** moved towards the examination of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** was pleased to propose several amendments to this Decision on the part of several Committee Members. In February 2009, a working group of marine experts had been held in Bahrain. The resulting draft Action Plan would soon be available online, including capacity-building, networking, meeting dates and key actions. IUCN was coordinating the Action Plan. Marine world heritage was very important as 70% of the surface of the globe was covered by water. The revised marine thematic study would be presented at the Committee session in 2011.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reiterated that this was extremely important and supported Australia.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed that these were important documents and asked which were the manuals and which the thematic studies. There was a “hit-and-miss” approach being used at present in terms of priorities, it said, and the Committee should look at priorities in terms of overall strategy and statements made over the course of the year, for example regarding technology and science.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said the marine environment was very important and that it supported marine world heritage.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** est persuadée que cette étude sera essentielle, eu égard à l'importance de la diversité biologique au sein du patrimoine mondial. De plus, elle

rappelle que les milieux marins sont sous-représentés au patrimoine mondial, la représentativité scientifique n'est donc pas équilibrée. Il faudrait en outre améliorer la formation des gestionnaires de sites marins.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported Australia concerning the thematic studies on the marine environment. It also said that the studies of natural sites and volcanic landscapes reflected the concerns of the 2003, 2004 and 2006 Caribbean workshops. Further examination of sites was necessary and the importance of the African Region was stressed.

The **Chairperson** said she felt sure this would be followed up by the Secretariat. There were no more requests for interventions.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that it had presented amendments before June 12, but that these were not present online.

The **Chairperson** replied that this would be checked. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. Paragraph 3 was examined with amendments by Canada, Sweden, the United States of America and others.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the thematic studies should be reviewed in terms of how they contributed to the Global Strategy and the under-represented categories mentioned by the Advisory Bodies.

Paragraph 2b and paragraph 3 were adopted as amended as well as Paragraphs 4 to 7

The Delegation of **Israel** said they should add the words "as identified by the Committee at previous sessions" to paragraph 7.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that a new paragraph had been added by Madagascar and Australia in French : "Note en outre que cette étude thématique aidera à renforcer les zones marines protégées qui sont actuellement sur la Liste indicative des Etats parties".

The Delegation of **Barbados** said the terminology was "protected marine areas" and not "zones".

The **Chairperson** said they would move to the paragraph and the Rapporteur would replace it.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its approval of the proposal on thematic studies. It put forward new wording for its discussion and adoption at the next session: "requests the World Heritage Centre, with the Advisory Bodies, to present a report on the thematic studies and their continuing prioritization at the 34th session of the Committee in 2010".

The **Chairperson** pointed out that much was being scheduled for the 34th session. There was also the 35th session. She asked which session should be included in paragraph 9 and asked the Advisory Bodies for their opinion.

IUCN said 2011 was a suitable date.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 10.C** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10C of the Agenda.

ITEM 9 DISCUSSION ON OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Document: WHC-09/33.COM/9

Decision: 33 COM 9

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS for the presentation of the Compendium on Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS explained that the Compendium had been created in response to a request by the World Heritage Committee (Decisions 30 COM 9 and 32 COM 9), in order “to undertake a careful review of past Committee Decisions, and create two Compendiums of relevant material and Decisions, compiled in the form of guidance manuals, from which precedents on how to interpret and apply discussions of Outstanding Universal Value ... can be clearly shown.”

In 2008, there were 29 properties from 25 States Parties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. 12 had been removed from the List, and 17 were currently still on the List. The duration of inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger had varied from two years to over 20. Jerusalem has been on the List longest, since 1982 (27 years in 2009). Though 12 cultural heritage properties had been removed from the List, there were also other properties that may need to be kept on the List for years to come. Some may have lost significant parts of their fabric (e.g. Zabid), though remedies had sometimes been able to effect recovery, as had been the case in the Kathmandu Valley. Among the reasons for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, ICOMOS mentioned:

- Natural disaster (Bam, Iran);
- Deterioration of building materials and structures (Chan Chan, Peru; Rice Terraces of the Philippines);
- Development pressures and new construction (Abou Mena, Egypt; Baku, Azerbaijan; Zabid, Yemen; Cologne Cathedral, Germany). Such pressures included the effects of planning, irrigation systems and road construction and the destruction and replacement of the historic urban fabric;
- Neglect or abandonment (Humberstone, Chile; Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani, United Republic of Tanzania);
- Armed conflict and military occupation (Bamiyan, Afghanistan). In such cases, the causes of the threats may be global in nature and depend on forces outside the World Heritage property’s boundaries.

With regard to monitoring systems, ICOMOS stated that between 1998 and 2003, Periodic Reporting and Reactive Monitoring had been formalized by the Committee. In 1998, the Committee had established the concept of Statements of Significance (SoS). In 2005, it had adopted Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, including Statements on Authenticity and Integrity, Protection and Management, as well as State of Conservation. In 2007, the Committee replaced the term “benchmarks” with “Desired State of Conservation”.

The precise identification of attributes that embody Outstanding Universal Value was crucial in identifying criteria for the inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as was the identification of indicators that would lead to their removal from the List. Attributes were also essential in identifying indicators to monitor the condition of properties and to determine the limits of what constituted acceptable change. Without such precise definitions, dealing with changing conditions, not foreseeable at the time of inscription, would become a complex task. The Desired State of Conservation was also an essential tool in this respect. In conclusion, ICOMOS stated that the meaning of a property's being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a tool prescribed in the Convention to rally the support and finances of the international community, needed to be revived.

IUCN thanked the Chairperson, saying that its Report brought together information regarding the use of In-Danger Listing. The headline message was that while 70% of Decisions revealed a consensus regarding the retention of properties on the List, there was a high rate of disagreement between the technical advice of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre and the Decisions of the Committee in relation to inscriptions or removals. Case-by-case analysis did not reveal a consistent pattern of Decisions in relation to additions, and thus a central task of the Compendium had not been able to be achieved.

IUCN noted a number of operational challenges in the use of the List of World Heritage in Danger. There were difficulties when States Parties did not welcome inclusion of a property on the List, and there was a lack of well-defined Statements of Outstanding Universal Value or Desired State of Conservation that could lead to a property's being removed from the List. There were problems of consistency in the use of language. IUCN recommended that the Committee support the more effective use of the List of World Heritage in Danger, in order to use it to send a consistent message and as a positive conservation tool that would operate in partnership with States Parties to address the real issues the Committee identified.

The last part of IUCN Report made a series of recommendations for moving forward. Tools recommended for use included the *Enhancing Our Heritage* toolkit developed by the Committee to provide positive support and develop purposeful conservation strategies. IUCN supported the separation of technical and political criteria for the inclusion of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and it recommended the engagement of important NGOs. The Report outlined points for possible action and gave examples of good practice, such as Rwenzori, Sangay and the Galapagos.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for interventions.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its appreciation for the efforts made by both ICOMOS and IUCN. It felt that the Compendium would be a useful resource for States Parties, site managers and World Heritage stakeholders. However, Canada was disappointed at the fact, expressed in IUCN's Report, that the approach taken in the Committee's Decisions over the last five sessions had not been sufficiently consistent to reach conclusions on the criteria required for inscription or removal of Sites from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Compendium illustrated the importance of defining the Desired State of Conservation of all the properties on the In-Danger List and using this as a basis for decision-making.

The Delegation of **Barbados** joined Canada in congratulating the Advisory Bodies. It stated that work on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value had engaged the attention of the world. It was aware of the many challenges facing the Committee, from the Vienna Memorandum in 2003 to recent efforts with respect to the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation. The success of the World Heritage Convention would continue to make demands on the World Heritage community as a whole. The Delegation felt encouraged by the discussions on impacts on Outstanding Universal Value, in particular with regard to visual interventions. The Delegation suggested that the presentation of these matters to the Committee required a more visual approach and that this should be done in electronic format and in hard-copy format well before the meeting. It noted that many of the Sites which were now considered would at one stage have been challenged by the planners of the day; their existence would have been associated with environmental degradation, forced labour and questionable funding, yet today they were celebrated. With regard to authenticity, the Delegation raised the question of finding agreement on alternative materials. It felt that it was possible to design acceptable and sustainable interventions that could enhance the Outstanding Universal Value of a given site. It looked forward to continuing discussions on this matter.

The Draft Decision **33 COM.9** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 9 of the Agenda.

ITEM 13 REVISION OF OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document: WHC-09/33.COM.13
WHC-09/33.COM/INF.13

Decision **33 COM 13**

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle qu'avant d'imprimer une nouvelle version papier des Orientations en 2009, le Comité du patrimoine mondial est invité à passer en revue tous les ajustements et amendements aux Orientations formulés pendant la 32^{ème} Session, en 2008. La prochaine version amendée sera donc imprimée après la présente Session. Comme demandé également, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives ont rédigé ces suggestions d'amendement et ont réalisé un contrôle attentif des Orientations pour assurer la concordance des références entre les différentes propositions pour soumission à cette Session. Le Secrétariat indique qu'il a été essayé autant que possible ne pas changer la numérotation dans les Orientations. En raison de la longueur du document et des contraintes de temps, le Secrétariat propose de revoir ces propositions d'ajustement à l'écran, de les passer en revue et d'attirer l'attention de l'Assemblée sur le paragraphe amendé et de demander s'il y a des objections ou des demandes d'informations supplémentaires. Le Secrétariat indique qu'un projet de décision révisé a été distribué afin de prendre en compte le travail réalisé par le groupe de travail sur l'emblème du patrimoine mondial.

Discussion sur les paragraphes amendés

Paragraphe 96

Le **Secrétariat** demande s'il y a une objection à l'adoption de cet amendement dans le § 96 qui prend en compte les amendements formulés dans la réunion appelée « Benchmark meeting » et qui fait référence au cadre de suivi

The Delegation of **Barbados** drew attention to the capitalization of the abbreviation "OUV" in both places.

Paragraphe 120 à 168 concernant les procédures d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial

Paragraphe 128

Le **Secrétariat** indique son souhait de corriger la date butoir de soumission notamment si celle-ci la date butoir tombe un week-end, et précise qu'il s'agit d'une harmonisation de l'ensemble des paragraphes en question qui ne devrait pas poser de problème.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that rather than including this cumbersome text, a single statement should be made instead: "any date that falls on a Sunday will be..."

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked if it would make sense to specify the time in all cases where there was just one day specified (a Friday, for example) or just one date (February 1).

Le **Secrétariat** indique que, depuis des années, une heure butoir est fixée afin de déterminer quels documents sont arrivés à temps. Elle précise qu'il est de tradition dans les Orientations, depuis toujours, d'établir cette date butoir.

Paragraphe 132

Le **Secrétariat** précise que ces indications supplémentaires visent à harmoniser ce qui est demandé en terme de plan de gestion afin de clarifier les éléments de ce paragraphe qui ne semblent pas toujours bien compris dans les propositions d'inscription. Aux points 5 et 10, il est précisé avoir réduit le nombre de copies imprimées requises a été réduit et surtout que toutes références aux disquettes, devenues obsolètes, ont été enlevées.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed a revision to paragraph 132 and asked whether the Committee still expected to receive a Management Plan in the nomination, or would a summary be sufficient.

Le **Secrétariat** note que, pour vérifier l'exhaustivité des propositions d'inscription, un résumé de l'ensemble du texte est suffisant. La soumission de l'ensemble du texte est apprécié, mais un résumé peut suffire s'agissant notamment de démontrer les modes de fonctionnement de ce système de gestion.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification on whether nominations were for natural properties or Cultural Landscapes.

Paragraphe 150

Le **Secrétariat** indique que ce paragraphe est relatif aux lettres d'erreurs factuelles dans lesquelles avait déjà été proposé, l'année dernière, le fait de changer la date butoir de « au moins deux jours ouvrables » par « au moins deux semaines ouvrables » avant

l'ouverture de la session. Le Secrétariat souligne que la soumission un peu tardive de lettres d'erreurs factuelles cause parfois un problème, d'abord en termes d'analyse de ce matériel qui parfois est reçu en très grande quantité et également en terme de traduction dans les temps de manière à pouvoir le mettre à disposition du Comité. C'est dans ce cadre qu'a été proposé cet amendement.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that it would be preferable to say "14 days" instead of "two working weeks" in order to avoid any ambiguity about what constituted a working week.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the Chairperson not read out the presentation.

Le **Secrétariat** indique que, lors de la rédaction de ce premier paragraphe, le ou la Présidente du Comité du patrimoine mondial étant au centre de ce dispositif décidant de ce qu'il est opportun de distribuer ou non. Le Secrétariat précise ensuite sa volonté de garder cette cohérence de qui reçoit la lettre et qui décide. Le Secrétariat conclut en disant que c'est au Comité de décider.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that it was not necessary to read out the statement. Instead of "and maybe read out", "or maybe read out" could be substituted.

Paragraphe 164

Le **Secrétariat** indique avoir voulu juste préciser que lorsqu'une modification mineure des limites d'un bien inscrit est proposée, elle est alors soumise aux organisations consultatives et que, dans ce cas là, ce n'est pas tant leur conseil que l'on requiert mais plutôt leur avis sur le caractère mineure ou non de la modification. Le Secrétariat rappelle alors qu'une modification mineure n'affecte pas la valeur universelle d'un bien, mais qu'une modification majeure modifie la valeur universelle d'un bien.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether the date of 1 February should be changed to 30 September in order to enable more interaction with the State Party about what might be minor modifications and to increase the chances of the submission's success.

Le **Secrétariat** remercie l'Australie pour sa proposition et précise que ce n'est pas au Secrétariat de décider pour les organisations consultatives, mais que c'est en effet dans la ligne de ce qui a été discuté précédemment. Le Secrétariat donne alors la parole aux organisations consultatives afin qu'elles répondent sur ce sujet.

IUCN responded that this led back to the comment on the Decision regarding more cooperation. Such cooperation regarding minor boundary modifications would not be possible if the date of 1 February was retained. The only other date would be 30 September, which was when States Parties submitted nominations for advice on their completeness. If the later date were adopted, it might be possible to avoid two different deadlines.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that the proposed amendment to paragraph 164 of the Operational Guidelines needed to specify that after seeking the opinion of the Advisory Bodies the Secretariat would submit a report to the Committee based on their opinion. Related to that, the text of paragraph 164 should read, "significant boundary

modifications”, and not “extension of the property”, in order to be consistent with the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that the date had not been changed on the screen in paragraph 164.

Le **Secrétariat** confirme que la date sera changée au 30 septembre.

Paragraphes 179 et 181

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle, pour mémoire, que ce paragraphe a déjà été adopté l'année dernière et qu'il ne devrait donc pas être sujet à discussion.

Paragraphe 240

Le **Secrétariat** précise que ce paragraphe est lié à l'Assistance internationale et explique que les modifications sont des ajustements suite à l'évaluation de l'Assistance internationale.. Un certain nombre d'éléments, qui ne sont pas nouveaux et qui ont déjà été adoptés, sont plus clairement explicités dans cette nouvelle version.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked why, in the section on the budget ceiling, the expression “per request” had been used and what the implications of this were.

Le **Secrétariat** explique avoir souhaité mettre « par demande » plutôt que « par projet » parce que parfois dans une demande il y a deux projets et que ceci portait donc à confusion. Il s'agit donc d'une clarification pour éviter les ambiguïtés.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether this meant that there would be a limit to the number of requests per site.

Le **Secrétariat** confirme qu'il n'y a pas de limite.

Point H – L'emblème du patrimoine mondial

Les Annexes aux orientations

Le **Secrétariat** explique qu'il est proposé d'amender les annexes 5, 10 et 11.

Il rappelle que l'année dernière l'Assemblée générale avait également demandé des modifications sur l'annexe 3 et explique vouloir, ayant fait le document des études thématiques, aller un peu plus loin en mettant à jour, dans le cadre de cette annexe, toutes les études thématiques qui sont en cours. Il précise que ceci n'était pas prévu l'année dernière et demande à l'assemblée la permission de le faire et précise que dans la décision sur les études thématiques cela semblait avoir été un point acquis. Cela sera donc fait lors de l'année en cours.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that on page 11, sub-paragraph 1, the word “etc.” should not be used and the expression “such as adjacent settlement buildings and routes” should be employed instead.

Le **Secrétariat** propose de procéder à un examen annexe par annexe.

Annexe 5: Format pour la proposition d'inscription de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that with regard to the amendments proposed to Annex 5.3, the Justification for Inscription should be tightened up in order to ensure consistency and avoid confusion. The new text describing the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should also be moved to section 3.1. In addition, the numbering of the sub-points should reflect the current numbering, i.e. a, b, c instead of 1, 2, 3. Integrity and authenticity should be presented as a single sub-point.

Le **Secrétariat** remercie le Canada et note une nécessaire clarification dans l'ordre de numérotation des paragraphes.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether the discussion on Annex 3 had been skipped.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que, comme indiqué l'année dernière il lui avait été demandé d'introduire certains points dans l'annexe 3, mais, en consultation avec les organisations consultatives, il lui semblait nécessaire d'introduire l'ensemble des études thématiques et en fait de reformuler l'ensemble de cette annexe 3 et que donc cela demandait un peu plus de travail. Le Secrétariat précise l'avoir de ce fait suggéré dans le point 10.c., sur les études thématiques, de manière à la réorganiser entièrement et d'y introduire toutes les études thématiques. Il conclut en expliquant que le Comité ayant été de cet avis durant cette Session, ils seront dans la possibilité de le faire désormais.

Annexe 10 : Déclaration de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle (nouvelle annexe)

Le **Secrétariat** souligne l'importance de cette nouvelle annexe qui permet de clarifier le format à l'heure dans une période où il est procédé à des Déclarations de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle rétrospectives. Ce document, explique-t-il, a donc pour but d'aider tous les Etats parties engagés dans cet exercice un peu difficile et complexe.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the standard format for the preparation of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but it could not accept that this should be limited to two pages. Sites with seven criteria could not be described in two pages, for example.

Le **Secrétariat** explique s'être posé cette question lors de nombreuses réunions sur ce sujet avec les organisations consultatives et avoir retravaillé le format. Le Secrétariat explique ne pas vouloir imposer de limites aux Etats qui ne le souhaitent pas, mais demande la possibilité, dans le processus de révision et de négociation avec l'Etat partie, de pouvoir encourager à un certain esprit synthétique. La deuxième chose sur laquelle le Secrétariat souhaite attirer l'attention, parce que cela a une répercussion sur les décisions adoptées pendant cette Session, c'est l'introduction à la fin de l'annexe 10 d'une durée. Le Secrétariat souhaite en effet proposer au Comité le même système que pour les propositions d'inscription en termes d'organisation du temps ; à savoir, que les Déclarations de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle soient soumises le 1^{er} février et

qu'elles fassent l'objet d'une révision pendant une année et demi, et non pas pendant quatre mois comme dans le cas des modifications mineures. Le Secrétariat et les organisations consultatives, précise-t-il, tiennent à cette durée, car il a été réalisé l'année dernière au Québec que cet exercice avait été fait trop hâtivement alors qu'il s'agit non pas d'un exercice administratif, mais d'un exercice de substance, puisque cela constitue la carte d'identité du bien ce qui justifie l'allongement du temps de révision à 18 mois pour un travail sérieux et rigoureux. Le Secrétariat conclut donc en proposant ce délai de 18 mois, de façon à ce que le Secrétariat, les Organisations consultatives et Etats parties puissent être en consultation et qu'un texte final soit juste adopté après par le Comité.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that Annex 10 should be improved. All properties should have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value approved by the Committee. Those inscribed before 2007 would require a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and preparation of such retrospective Statements should be a collaborative effort between the States Parties, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, rather than being a State Party submission requiring an 18-month-long process of evaluation. A retrospective Statement should be submitted to the Committee only when the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had agreed on it, in order that the Committee did not then need to refer, defer or reject it. Finally, the format of Annex 10 needed to be the same as that of Annex 5.

Le **Secrétariat** indique, dans ce cas, souhaiter recevoir les amendements par écrit.

The Delegation of **Israel** had a similar proposal to that of Canada, and it agreed with the Australian proposal that the two-page limit be deleted. It also asked about the font size of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that should be submitted.

The Delegation of **China** wanted to add detailed information to page 102 on the nomination format. With regard to point 1, it wished to add information concerning the map, stressing the need to change the scale at least.

Le **Secrétariat** constate un retour en arrière sur l'annexe 5 et explique avoir rajouté un amendement qui stipule que les cartes fournies doivent être d'une échelle suffisante pour permettre l'identification des éléments topographiques, parce qu'effectivement, l'échelle suffisante dépend de la typologie du bien. Le secrétariat précise que l'essence de cet amendement est d'expliquer et de définir le test effectué quand une carte est soumise dans un dossier de nomination. Cet amendement est donc explicatif. Il s'avère difficile, voire impossible d'insérer des échelles dans les Orientations, car on ne peut prévoir une série d'échelles pour chaque catégorie de biens.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought confirmation about the insertion of the text in the Annex.

Le **Secrétariat** précise qu'en effet le texte du Canada sera inséré dans l'annexe.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** s'interroge, concernant, l'annexe 10, sur les conséquences et incidences de la non approbation d'une Déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Le **Secrétariat** explique alors que l'amendement du Canada remédie à cet état des choses, parce qu'il nous invite à trouver une solution. Annexe 11 : Modification des biens du Patrimoine mondial (nouvelle annexe)

Le **Secrétariat** explique que cela correspond aux paragraphes 163 à 167 des Orientations actuelles et qu'il s'agit de donner des explications sur le modus operandi de la soumission de modifications qui concernent les limites de biens du patrimoine mondial, mineures ou importantes, des modifications de critères utilisés ou des modifications pour le changement du nom. Le Secrétariat précise recevoir énormément de demandes en la matière et suggère, donc, d'en faire une annexe afin de clarifier cette question.

The Delegation of **Canada** gave details of changes that it would also be submitting in writing: (a) regarding maps (point 6, page 18), the text should ask for the largest practical scale, instead of the largest available scale; (b) regarding the documentation requested (pages 17 and 18), the text should refer to Annex 3 of the Operational Guidelines instead of Annex 5; (c) regarding modification of the criteria on page 20, paragraph 1.66, of the Operational Guidelines, this paragraph should be revised to read: "Where a State Party wishes to have the property inscribed under 'additional, fewer or different criteria' and also will remain in the World Heritage List even if unsuccessful on having 'additional, fewer or different criteria' recognized"; (d) regarding the modification of the name of a World Heritage property (page 21), it would not always be practical to adopt a name that reflects the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and the first sentence on page 21 should be modified to read: "name of the properties inscribed on the List may be modified by the Committee after the inscription". Under documentation requested, point 2 should be revised to read: "Justification of the proposed change".

The Delegation of **Sweden** recommended that in paragraph 164, line 3, the word "advice" should be replaced by "opinion".

La Délégation de **Tunisie** exprime ses interrogations quant à l'idée de continuer à discuter avec les organisations consultatives en cas de non approbation d'une Déclaration. Elle se demande comment trouver une solution dans ce cas précis.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que l'amendement du Canada modifie en effet quelque peu le modus operandi prévu initialement et poursuit en expliquant que si cela devait arriver, alors le processus reprendrait avec un nouveau 'projet', des nouvelles consultations et une nouvelle présentation au Comité pour approbation.

The Delegation of **Israel** found it useful that the Operational Guidelines on the Website were highlighted in yellow. However, it suggested that a lighter colour be used.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed changing the date to 30 September from 1 February.

IUCN commented on its behalf and on the behalf of ICOMOS and asked to see some of the discussed changes in writing, since they concerned some of the fundamental concepts it worked with and the working methods it adopted. It suggested looking closely at the language used, prior to the adoption of any changes.

The Delegation of **Australia**, considering the point made by IUCN, asked whether it would be possible to complete the work through a technical check and consistency review to take place over the coming weeks.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur for advice on the adoption of this Decision in order to reflect the debate.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the number of amendments proposed was very large and that many of them had not been incorporated. Adopting everything at this stage would be the equivalent of signing a blank cheque. He suggested postponing the Decision until the next session.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated its preference for adoption, with a technical check to be done later. It said that some useful changes had been made, like the one on 14 nominations that were considered incomplete for mapping, which would be useful to States Parties. It referred to paragraph 2 of the Document, which noted that one of the recommendations of the Workshop on the Future of the Convention, held in February 2009, had been to refrain from revising the Operational Guidelines every year.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe à la position du Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments made by Australia. There were many issues relevant for Periodic Reporting and Statements of Outstanding Universal Value that should be dealt with. If a technical extraordinary meeting of the Committee needed to take place, then the Delegation supported this in order to approve the Operational Guidelines.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that a new Committee would be elected at the General Assembly. It could thus be problematic to hold such a meeting in October.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for Australia's proposal to progress as much as possible, with the possibility of deferring some amendments.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its concern after having heard the Rapporteur. It said it would like to follow the advice of the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported what had been said by the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported what had been said by the Rapporteur. Since the issue was a complex one, it expressed its wish to follow his advice.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported Canada and the Chairperson's proposal. The alternative would be to take Decisions on the clear points, while leaving the others to next year.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported Australia, stressing the importance of giving States Parties the best possible advice for submitting nominations.

The Delegation of **Spain** shared the concerns expressed by some Members of the Committee, but it also declared that some proposals might have an impact on the content of the Operational Guidelines. For this reason, it said that things should proceed and as much as possible should be adopted now.

The Delegation of **Korea** supported Australia, noting that the modifications would be of great help to States Parties in preparing new nominations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed to postpone the adoption of some of the modifications and suggested the adoption of what had not been modified.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** and the Delegation of **China** supported the Australian proposal to concentrate on important issues only and to leave the rest to next year.

The **Chairperson** prompted the Delegations to help in identifying the priority changes that had not received many amendments. The Chairperson suggested moving to the next point, the adoption of next year's Committee meeting agenda, leaving some Delegations to work on the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Australia** was prepared to work with the Chairperson's proposal.

The **Chairperson** asked for other volunteers to work on identifying the main changes on which agreement could be reached.

The Delegation of **Canada** offered to assist the Delegation of Australia.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** suggère de passer au vote s'il n'y a pas d'accord.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the next item while a group of Delegations continued work on the previous Item.

The Delegation of **Morocco** thought that this was important, but it wondered whether things were ripe. It asked whether this could be postponed until next year, as the Delegation of Tunisia, the Rapporteur and a majority of those present had suggested.

The **Chairperson** answered that the Committee was still debating, pending the possibility of reaching an agreement, but she was open to allowing the debate to continue. As there were no other proposals, the Chairperson suspended the point for informal consultations to take place.

ITEM 19: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE NEXT COMMITTEE SESSION

Document: WHC-09/33COM.19

Decision **33 COM 19**

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to change the dates for the next meeting of the Committee from 16 July to 30 July for a number of reasons, including the World Cup.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that this would give more time to prepare the Documents. The Brazilian football team was expected to reach the final, and everybody knew what football meant to Brazil. She also said that the Advisory Bodies had been overburdened this year, and changing the dates would also give them more time.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the dates suggested by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Peru** wondered whether there had been agreement on 15 days rather than 10 for the next session.

The **Chairperson** supported this proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled that in the Decision on the future of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Centre had been requested

to prepare a feasibility study. However, the Committee was now jumping ahead and drawing conclusions. It was not sure that this was the appropriate proposal and reminded those present that such a Decision would have budgetary implications.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that during this session the Committee had worked for 88 hours over seven days. There had been a lot of pressure, and on average the Committee had worked 12 hours a day.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked Brazil for its generous offer to host the Committee for two weeks, but it shared the concern of the United States of America. It suggested as a compromise to ask the Centre to assess the appropriate duration of the session with the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported Canada and the United States of America, saying that alternative options should be explored before expanding the duration of the Committee session. It reminded those present that this would put pressure on small Delegations, such as its own.

The Delegation of **Brazil** reiterated the importance of the proposal, given the complexity of the agenda for the next session. It then stated that if the proposal of a 15-day meeting was not accepted by the Committee, Brazil would need to make decisions quickly on the logistics and organization of the next session.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said the best choice would be somewhere between the two options. It proposed a period of 10 to 12 working days.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked Brazil for the generous offer, but pointed out that the logistics of being away from one's home country could be burdensome. It wondered if it could be determined from the agenda how long a period was needed, and if a decision could be made in October.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime son inquiétude quant au coût pour certains pays d'un Comité qui durerait 15 ou même 12 jours et propose de trancher entre une dizaine de jours ou deux sessions, l'une dans un pays hôte et l'autre organisée au siège de l'UNESCO. Elle suggère de trouver des solutions aux problèmes du nombre croissant de demandes et de questions à traiter. C'est pourquoi la Tunisie ne pense pas que, désormais, une seule session puisse suffire. La liste des rapports sur l'Etat de conservation s'allonge, mais il faut trouver une solution satisfaisante.

The **Chairperson** said she would present an analysis of the time required, but reminded those present that on five occasions the Committee had spent several hours debating. The first of these had been the discussion on the Secretariat's Report, and then there had been lengthy discussion of four Decisions (two on inscriptions and two on the Dresden deletion). She concluded by saying that there was no way to calculate if voting would be needed on inscriptions. The Chairperson explained the way in which timing was usually calculated, and she said that more Statements of Conservation Reports would require more time. There was a clear trade-off, she said, between the time spent and the quality of the analysis.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked Brazil for its generous offer, but also expressed concerns that a long meeting would mean additional burdens and financial costs. Adding one or two days would incur fewer costs than an additional meeting in Paris, and there was a risk of needing to work day and night, as had been the case in recent years. The

Committee should discuss the State of Conservation Reports, and the time allowed should not be restricted, as these contributed to capacity-building and conservation.

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed not only to the financial costs, but also to the psychological costs, of a long Committee session. It said that 12 days were probably enough, and it suggested that the Chairperson and the World Heritage Centre should make a decision when nominations were received on 1 February.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with Bahrain on the importance of the State of Conservation Reports, but encouraged the Centre to continue to explore its working methods. There needed to be reflection on the time spent in using the screens.

The **Chairperson** offered to go back to adopting Decisions without the use of the screens.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that the use of working groups could be a solution and asked whether the World Heritage Centre could increase this in the future, as it might be a way towards a solution.

The **Delegation of Jordan** supported Egypt and Bahrain's proposal to hold a 12-day meeting.

The **Chairperson** suggested asking the World Heritage Centre to work with the Delegation of Brazil on a proposal that could be presented at the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** commented on the agenda and the long list of items requested by the Committee. It said that four items were not on the draft agenda: (1) the Action Plan from the Prehistory Progress Report; (2) the World Heritage Programme on Tourism; (3) capacity-building actions related to the Small Island Developing States and the Small Island Developing States Regional Meeting Report; (4) the impact of contemporary architectural solutions on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. It asked the World Heritage Centre if these items would be covered on the agenda.

The **Secretariat** said that the Prehistory Progress Report could find a place in Item 5a, along with tourism development. Since the Small Island Development States had been discussed separately at this year's session, he asked Members of the Committee whether they wanted to keep it as a separate Item. As far as the last point was concerned, the Centre had produced a report under Item 7.1 that was related to the subject raised.

The Delegation of **Israel**, noting the list of items read out by Bahrain, thought it would be better to have a separate debate on the thematic studies, which would be more efficient than considering this item as part of the Secretariat's Report.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to separate as many of the items as possible from the Secretariat's Report. It suggested having separate discussions on thematic studies, which would include the reports on Prehistory, the Tourism Programme, the Small Island Developing States, and the priority to be given to future thematic studies. It suggested that there should be a further two separate Items, the first on the impact of contemporary architectural solutions, this being 7.1B, and the second on historic urban landscapes, this being 7.1A. It suggested including the feasibility study on the meetings and the meeting times on the agenda.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with these points and commented that the Pacific Region was also keen on keeping regional identities separate in the Small Island Developing States Report.

The **Chairperson** stated that the Centre would take on board all the proposals that had been made and suggested adopting the provisional agenda for next year's meeting.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the wording "between July 16 and 30" and requested the World Heritage Centre to consult with the incoming Chairperson on the details of the agenda.

The Draft Decision **33COM.19** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 19 of the Agenda.

ITEM 14 C: AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-09/33.COM.14C

Decision: **33 COM 14C**

The Delegation of **Australia** requested clarification regarding the adoption of paragraph 4 in Decision 8B.54 and the previous discussion on the Rules of Procedure on excluding Members of the Committee from participating in voting on their own sites.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the paragraph related to the earlier discussion on voting procedures for Committee Members during the inscription process.

The Delegation of **Canada** reminded the Committee that it had submitted a proposed amendment to paragraph 4 on this point.

The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Canada to present the proposed amendment to the Rapporteur for consideration by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** put forward the proposed amendment from the Delegations of Canada and the United States of America to paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to paragraph 2 and some missing text.

The **Chairperson** requested Canada to submit the original text.

The Delegation of **Canada** affirmed that the missing date in the proposed text would be left to the discretion of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** verified that the Committee had decided on the date of 1 December 2009 in paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to a previous discussion with Committee Members that had concluded by agreeing that any Decision with reference to Rules of Procedure would be decided in a meeting prior to the meeting in October in Paris.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the position of Brazil.

The **Chairperson** repeated the terms of the intervention of Brazil and requested a rewording of the text.

The Delegations of **Peru, Brazil** and **Cuba** supported the position of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil did not include a substantive Decision, and it expressed its support for adopting the Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the view of the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegation of **Canada** indicated that the proposed amendment did not relate to the Operational Guidelines.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification on the proposal of Brazil in order to reach an agreement and asked that the proposal be ready for the meeting in October.

The Delegation of **Canada** highlighted that the point raised was separate from the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to Rule 22.4, asking that the Rules of Procedure be discussed in a meeting prior to the next General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated it would agree with the proposal by Brazil as a means of moving forward.

The **Chairperson** introduced the Secretariat's proposed amendment that if proposals were put forward by 1 October 2009, then they would be ready for the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** disagreed with postponing the Item to the General Assembly, arguing that amendments to the Rules of Procedure needed to be amended by the World Heritage Committee. It outlined the options that had been put forward, namely to hold an extraordinary session either before the General Assembly, or during the 34th session of the Committee in Brazil.

The Delegation of **Korea** reiterated the comments of the Delegation of Bahrain.

The **Chairperson** stressed consideration of when proposals were to be ready and when they were to be debated.

La Délégation du **Maroc** demande l'opinion du Conseiller Juridique quant à la possibilité ou non pour le Comité de priver un de ses membres du droit au vote.

The UNESCO **Legal Advisor** stated that, for example, the Committee did not allow Members of the Committee to speak about a site proposed by a particular State Party. He added that the request, as presently stated, was for the Secretariat to propose for consideration to the Committee at its 34th session. The Secretariat would consult in relation to any legal matters.

The Delegation of **Brazil** fully agreed with the position of Egypt, stating that it was indeed a problem if a Committee Member were deprived of the right to vote. It further proposed to replace the word "amendment" by the words "legal opinion".

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested amending the text of the Draft Decision, such that it would be the Legal Advisor, rather than the Secretariat, that would be responsible for providing the "legal opinion".

The **Chairperson** reminded those present that the World Heritage Centre was the Secretariat for the World Heritage Convention and that the Secretariat consulted the Legal Advisor.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed removing the possibility of Committee Members participating in the vote.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Advisor to propose wording to amend Rule 22.4.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the insertion of the words, "propose the amendments, including a legal opinion on the possibility of modifying", in order to foster debate and move on.

La Délégation du **Maroc** propose de formuler la décision plus clairement, notamment en spécifiant qu'un conseil juridique est nécessaire concernant la question pour le Comité de priver un de ses membres du droit au vote.

The Delegation of **Cuba** requested that the references in the paragraph to the Rule number be checked.

The Delegation of **Canada**, in consultation with the Delegation of the United States of America, proposed deleting the amendment in order to move on.

La Délégation du **Maroc** déclare que la suppression de la phrase incluant une référence qui pourrait être erronée ne résoudra pas le problème.

The **Chairperson** clarified that Canada had proposed the deletion of the entire paragraph 4.

Les Délégations de Tunisie, Brésil et Jordanie expriment leur accord avec le Canada.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 14C** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 14C of the Agenda.

ITEM 20 ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC-09/33 COM/20

WHC-09/33 COM/INF.20

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to Decision 5A paragraph 19b, which was missing an amendment. The **Chairperson** indicated that the Rapporteur will take care of grammatical errors.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to Decision 33 COM 5C and sought clarification as to whether the Committee had put multilateral environmental agreements on the agenda.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that there was an Item on the agenda that involved World Heritage and sustainable development, together with environmental agreements.

Part 1 of the Report was adopted as amended. The Delegation of **Sweden** referred to the Decision on the Congo Virunga National Park (Decision 33 COM 7A.4) and proposed an amendment to paragraph 6.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an amendment to Decision 7A.1, paragraph 10, which would involve drafting a common text.

La Délégation **Maroc** exprime son accord avec la Délégation des Etats-Unis d'Amérique

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested moving the texts referring to the Congo sites to one place in the Decision.

Part 2 of the Report was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 33 COM 7B.1, paragraph 7, and sought clarification on the information requested of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed deleting the square brackets in Decision 7B.15, paragraph 11b.

The **Rapporteur** asked whether the Committee wished to keep the paragraph and introduce new text that included sites not on the List of World Heritage in Danger, or whether it wished to omit the paragraph in keeping with the current practice of the Committee in only applying this to sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** proposed to delete the paragraph in order to be consistent with the agenda items.

The Delegation of **Australia** seconded the proposal.

The **Rapporteur** referred to paragraph 7 of Decision 7B.1 and the issue raised by the Delegation of Bahrain and agreed that the paragraph should read, "...the information on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

La Délégation de **Madagascar**, se référant à la décision 7B.47 concernant les Forêts humides de l'Atsinanana, demande par quels moyens les autres Etats parties à la *Convention* pourront être mis au courant de cette décision.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the Decision was adopted without examination by the Committee. He reminded the Delegation of Madagascar of the Rules of Procedure that said that the Committee should adopt its Report on the session, including a list of Decisions taken in the month following the session and that this should be made public.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Decision could be included in Items for consideration by next year's Committee. The Delegation of **Israel** queried the introduction of paragraph 3a, as there were State of Conservation Reports missing.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the State of Conservation Reports discussed earlier in the day were considered in part 4.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 8B.10 on Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande, Cape Verde, and the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which included the words “a place of concentration of slaves”. It said that this should read “enslaved people”.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the inconsistency and noted the amendment to “enslaved persons”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 8B.13 on the Shushtar Historical Hydraulic System. Bridges, Dams, Canals, Buildings and Watermills from Ancient Times to the Present. It queried the summary and the meaning of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** said that this point would be checked with the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 8B.14 paragraph 2 and said that the words "natural criteria" were missing.

The Delegation of **Australia**, in reference to Decision 8B.12, noted that after the introduction of paragraph 4, paragraph 5 was now missing.

The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Delegation of Bahrain had requested deletion of the paragraph.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the text amendments indicated that Bahrain had requested the deletion.

The Delegation of **Canada** referred to Decision 8B.4 paragraph 7 and proposed the amendment “...these Flyways (plural)”.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** confirmed that it had requested the deletion of paragraph 5 in Decision 8B.12.

The Delegation of **Canada** reiterated that the proposed amendment in Decision 8B.4 was not in the French-language version.

ICOMOS proposed amendments to Decision 8B.13 paragraph 3, “recommends that as the collection of ancient trees is a key policy of the area”, and Decision 8B.19 paragraph 2C, “...to give greater guidance to owners and to...”.

The **Rapporteur** suggested the Delegation of Australia comment as it was its proposal.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the amendments by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to improve the concordance of the English and French texts in Decision 8B.4, paragraph 7, regarding the "migratory Flyways". The improved text was incorporated into the Decision and shown on the screen.

The Delegation of **Brazil** underlined its view that it was not necessary to revise all the Decisions at this time, and it reiterated its concern at making all such changes at this time.

The **Chairperson** clarified that although time was precious, it was understandable that Canada had raised the point since the expression "migratory Flyways" had been the subject of specific discussion by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Cuba** agreed with the Chairperson and reiterated that time was running short.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the proposals from the Delegations of Cuba and Brazil in order to adopt Decisions as soon as possible.

Part 4 of the report was adopted as amended. It was indicated that this Item will remain open, pending adoption of Part 3 and 5 of the Report.

ITEM 7.2 REPORT ON REINFORCED MONITORING (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** re-opened Decision 33 COM 7.2 for discussion and requested the Committee to examine the Revised Document 33 COM 7.2. She adopted paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 with five amendments.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed the addition of text to paragraph 4 from a previous version.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the current text included amendments that had been made following negotiations.

The Delegation of **Canada** read the proposed paragraph: "Every decision to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism will clearly state the nature of the monitoring mission and the frequency of reporting required. Each application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mission will be reviewed annually."

The **Rapporteur** put forward the amendment of the paragraph based on Canada's proposal: "Notes that every decision to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mission will clearly state the nature of the monitoring mission and the frequency of reporting required, and that each application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mission will be reviewed annually." He noted a disparity between the English and French versions of paragraph 4 and re-read the English version: "Takes note of the operational aspects that have been refined by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as requested in Decision 31 COM 5.2 in view of the requirements of this Decision that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be activated in exceptional and specific cases."

The Draft Decision **33 COM 7.2** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 7.2 of the Agenda.

Referring to Decision 8B.54, the Chairperson confirmed that it had been adopted with the deletion of paragraph 5 and invited the Committee to refer to Decision 13 on the UNESCO emblem.

ITEM 13 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (Continuation)

The Delegation of **Australia** questioned the inclusion of paragraphs 5 and 7 as part of the Decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with the comment by the Delegation of Australia and suggested that paragraphs 3 and 5 and the amendment in paragraph 7 be deleted.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the Delegation of Canada with reference to the text of paragraph 7 proposed for deletion.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the Secretariat clarify the meaning of paragraph 7.

Le **Secrétariat** clarifie que depuis 2005 le texte des *Orientations* inclut un sous-paragraphe stipulant que "la formulation d'exemples d'application des conditions d'intégrité aux biens proposés pour inscription est en cours". Pour finaliser ce travail il serait souhaitable d'organiser une réunion d'experts.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed the deletion of the reference to the Delegation of Canada in the paragraph, as the original amendment had been altered after it had proposed it.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested confirmation of the deletion of the reference to cultural properties.

The **Secretariat** referred to paragraph 89 of the Operational Guidelines that indicated that examples of the application or conditions of integrity should be provided. He stated that this had been put forward to the Committee in the Decision as it was a pending issue.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed further examination of integrity and/or authenticity according to what was already contained in Annex 4 of the Operational Guidelines. It suggested amendments to references to authenticity and to Section 2E in order to finalize Annex I of the Operational Guidelines.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 6 were adopted and paragraphs 3 and 5 deleted

The Delegation of **Israel** requested amendment of the text in paragraph 7 to replace "paragraph 89" with "Section 2E".

The Draft Decision **33 COM 13 Rev.** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 13 of the Agenda.

ITEM 20. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF DECISIONS (continuation)

The **Chairperson** stated that parts 3 and 5 of the Report would be discussed.

The Delegation of **Australia** confirmed that following discussions with Canada and Brazil during the break, the best decision would be to postpone adoption before the General Assembly, or at least before the election of the next Committee.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that “paragraph 89” remained in the text of Decision 13 and requested that it be amended. It requested details of the proposal discussed by the Delegations of Australia, Canada and Brazil.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the deletion of “paragraph 89” as previously agreed and the inclusion of “Section 2E”.

The Delegation of **Australia** outlined the proposal to decide on text in order for further work to occur before the election of the next Committee, such that States Parties could benefit from the changes included instead of putting off the problem until next year. It noted that 14 States Parties had unsuccessful nominations at the technical stage because the Operational Guidelines were unclear.

The **Rapporteur** said that it was not necessary to change the text and that this would be addressed based on the Summary Records and would be dealt with at the extraordinary session that would be convened. He added that consultations would take place before this meeting.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification on a final Decision on the consultation group and the extraordinary session.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the insertion of suitable text in order to move forward.

The **Chairperson** requested text on the proposed amendment to the Decision by the Committee and requested proposals from the Committee for part 3 of the Report on Mixed and Cultural Properties.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** underlined a contradiction between paragraphs 5 and 6.

The **Chairperson** suggested that there was a technical contradiction and confirmed the insertion of “2010” in paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 7B.118 on The Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg, paragraph 11, and recalled that the Rapporteur had been requested to insert the standard text. However, this was not reflected in the current text.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Rapporteur would check the text.

The **Rapporteur** noted a minor disparity and underlined that if the Committee wished to change the Decision, then it would have to be re-opened.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the current text remain unchanged and assured those present that the Rapporteur would check on any grammatical corrections. Part 3 of the Report was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** referred to Decision 33 COM.10C and requested the deletion of paragraph 12, as it was a repetition of paragraph 8.

The **Chairperson** noted the request to delete paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **Sweden** suggested amending Decision 10A, paragraph 5, to add the words, “the expert meeting”.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that “an expert meeting” was the text proposed by the Delegation of Sweden and requested that the text remain unchanged.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed the correction of Decision 33COM 8C.3 instead of 31COM 8C.3, and questioned the reference to Dresden Elbe Valley in accordance with correct procedure.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the reference was correct.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if it could refer to a point regarding the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed amendments to page 15, paragraph 2, which referred to the Chairperson’s summary Report on the workshop. It also referred to Decision 14A.2 and the mention of two missing attachments that would need to be included in the final Report. It added that Decision 14C needed to be updated to include the agreed date and paragraph 3 on the inclusion of an Item on the agenda of the next meeting.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that there was an amendment to Rule 8 on the next meeting’s agenda.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked if the prioritization of future thematic studies would be included on the provisional agenda for the 34th session.

The Delegation of **Cuba** referred to the Draft Decision on the elections of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons and requested clarifications regarding the two seats for Vice-Chairpersons that had been left vacant.

The **Chairperson** clarified that Egypt, Australia and Sweden had been elected as Vice-Chairpersons, and two seats had been left vacant for Africa and Group 2. She requested the Secretariat to check the wording of the Decision.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the wording was correct and that the Committee would take further Decisions at its forthcoming extraordinary session.

The Delegation of **Australia** reiterated its previous proposal referring to Decision 14A.2 and the inclusion of two attachments in the final report.

The **Rapporteur** proposed the insertion of a final paragraph to Decision 33 COM.13 to read: “Recalling the debate on changes in the Operational Guidelines during the 33rd session of the Committee, requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare an updated

Document of these changes for adoption at the 34th session in 2010 and circulate this for comments to States Parties before 1 December 2009”.

Part 5 was adopted taking into account amendment to Decision 13.

The whole report of decisions was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 20 of the Agenda.

CLOSURE

The Chairperson thanked all those who had made this Committee session possible. This included the Advisory Bodies for their high-quality work, for the fact that almost all the Documents had been ready on time, and for their advice during the Committee meeting. She thanked the interpreters and the technical teams from the World Heritage Centre and the Seville Convention Centre. She also highlighted the work of the people who had introduced the texts and presented them on the screens. The Chairperson and the Rapporteur had tried, and in her opinion had succeeded, to find the best-qualified people at UNESCO. She thanked David Martel (WHC/POL) for taking care of technical details. She further expressed her gratitude to the Spanish Minister of Culture, to the negotiators, who had had a record number of negotiations, to the Director-General of ICCROM, Mounir Bouchenaki, in particular, to the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mme. Francoise Rivière, to Spanish diplomat Mr. Pablo Barbara for reaching various agreements, and to one of the members of UNESCO Director-General Koichiro Matsuura’s cabinet. Without naming all the main actors from the World Heritage Centre, she expressed her appreciation to all of them. She finally thanked Mr. Francesco Bandarin, Secretariat, and the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Spain** bade the Committee farewell and expressed its hope that Spain had met everybody’s expectations. The country had worked very hard in order to host the Committee meeting, it said, and it invited the Members of the Committee to visit the City of Seville since the 88 hours of work during the session had not allowed them to do so. The Delegation thanked the organizers and all those who had taken part in the success of the session. It particularly thanked the Chairperson. The Delegation concluded by congratulating Brazil, wishing it good luck and stating that Spain was at its disposal to help in any way that might be necessary.

The Chairperson congratulated the interpreters and thanked the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** spoke on behalf of the Africa Region and thanked the Chairperson, the Spanish Government and the Delegations present.

The **Chairperson** extended her thanks to Brazil on its holding of the 34th session and thanked all the participants at the 33rd session.

The **Secretariat** thanked the World Heritage Centre staff for their participation and commitment, as well as the Advisory Bodies, the interpreters, the Committee Members, the Rapporteur and the Chairperson.

The meeting rose at 11 pm.