

Distribution limited

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.26

Paris, 13 March 2006

Original: English /French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-eighth session

Suzhou, China

28 June – 7 July 2004

SUMMARY RECORD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MONDAY, 28 JUNE 2004 (MORNING)		165
ITEMS 1 to 3	OPENING SESSION	165
ITEM 4	REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS	167
ITEM 5	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	167
ITEM 6	REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 27TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (PARIS, 30 JUNE - 5 JULY 2003)	168
MONDAY, 28 JUNE 2004 (AFTERNOON)		170
ITEM 7	REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 14TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (PARIS, 14-15 OCTOBER 2003)	170
ITEM 8	PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) APPROVED BY THE 32ND GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO	171
ITEM 13	GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	171
TUESDAY, 29 JUNE 2004 (MORNING)		175
ITEM 13	GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM MON. 28 JUNE 04)	175
TUESDAY, 29 JUNE 2004 (AFTERNOON)		178
ITEM 10B	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE	180
ITEM 14A	TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 15 MAY 2004 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE <i>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES</i>	183
TUESDAY, 29 JUNE 2004 (EVENING SESSION)		183
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	183
WEDNESDAY, 30 JUNE 2004 (MORNING)		187
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUES. 29 JUNE EVENING)	187
WEDNESDAY, 30 JUNE 2004 (AFTERNOON)		191
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM WED. 30 JUNE MORNING)	191
THURSDAY, 1 JULY 2004 (MORNING)		201
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUES. 30 JUNE AFTERNOON)	201
THURSDAY, 1 JULY 2004 (AFTERNOON)		205
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM THUR. 1 JULY MORNING)	205

<u>THURSDAY, 1 JULY 2004 (EVENING SESSION)</u>		<u>209</u>
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM THUR. 1 JULY AFTERNOON)	209
<u>FRIDAY, 2 JULY 2004 (MORNING)</u>		<u>215</u>
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM THUR. 1 JULY EVENING)	215
<u>FRIDAY, 2 JULY 2004 (AFTERNOON)</u>		<u>220</u>
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM FRI 2 JULY MORNING)	220
<u>SUNDAY, 4 JULY 2004 (MORNING)</u>		<u>229</u>
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM FRI. 2 JULY AFTERNOON)	231
ITEM 15A	PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER	234
<u>SUNDAY, 4 JULY 2004 (AFTERNOON)</u>		<u>241</u>
ITEM 15A	PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (CONTINUED FROM SUN 4 JULY MORNING)	241
ITEM 17 B.II	PROTECTION OF PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE	249
<u>SUNDAY, 4 JULY 2004 (EVENING SESSION)</u>		<u>249</u>
ITEM 15B	PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE	249
<u>MONDAY, 5 JULY 2004 (MORNING)</u>		<u>259</u>
ITEM 15B	PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE (CONTINUED FROM SUN. 4 JULY 04 AFTERNOON)	259
<u>MONDAY, 5 JULY 2004 (AFTERNOON)</u>		<u>271</u>
ITEM 15B	PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE (CONTINUED FROM MON. 5 JULY 04 MORNING)	271
ITEM 9	REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	276
ITEM 11	PRESENTATION OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN 2002-2003 AND SITUATION OF THE BUDGET 2004-2005	279
ITEM 12	PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2006-2007 (DRAFT 33C/5)	280
ITEM 13	GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUES. 29 JUNE 04 MORNING)	281
<u>TUESDAY, 6 JULY 2004 (MORNING 9H00 – 10H45)</u>		<u>285</u>
ITEM 16	PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND FOLLOW-UP REGIONAL PROGRAMME	285

TUESDAY, 6 JULY 2004 (18H00 - 20H00)		289
ITEM 19	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY	289
ITEM 10A	EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS	290
ITEM 23	ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR	290
ITEM 14B	NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM SUN 4 JULY 04 MORNING)	291
ITEM 14A	TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES (CONTINUED FROM TUES. 29 JUNE 04 AFTERNOON).	294
WEDNESDAY, 7 JULY 2004 (AFTERNOON)		295
ITEM 24	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-JULY 2005)	295
ITEM 25	OTHER BUSINESS	295
ITEM 26	DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (28 JUNE - 7 JULY 2004, SUZHOU, CHINA)	297
ITEM 27	CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	300

Monday, 28 June 2004 (morning)

ITEMS 1 TO 3 OPENING SESSION

Document

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.1

1. The 28th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by Mr Zhang Xinsheng (China) Chairperson, on 28 June 2004 in Suzhou, China. The Chairperson welcomed H.E. Mme Chen Zhili, State Councillor of the People's Republic of China, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Liang Baohua, Governor of Jiangsu Province, Mr Michael Abiola Omolewa, President of the UNESCO General Conference, Mr Hans-Heinrich Wrede, President of the Executive Board, Mr Yang Weize, Mayor of Suzhou, Committee Members, States Parties and all observers. The 21 members of the Committee: Argentina, Benin, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, India, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, South Africa and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland participated in the session.

2. 72 States Parties to the World Heritage *Convention* who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Barbados, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Vietnam and Yemen.

3. The Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO also attended this session as an observer.

4. Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the Committee, namely the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and

the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the session.

5. There were various interventions by the personalities attending the opening session, the resumés of which follow.

6. In his **opening address by Mr Zhang Xinsheng**, Chairperson (China), welcomed Madam Chen Zhili, State Councillor of the People's Republic of China, the Director General of UNESCO, President of the General Conference of UNESCO, President of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Members of the World Heritage Committee, and other distinguished Delegates and Observers. He stated that it was a dream come true to receive so many eminent personalities in Suzhou in the new Convention Center built for the occasion. He hoped that everyone would have the opportunity to learn about the Wu culture, including the Kunqu Opera and visit the wonderful classical gardens of Suzhou, as well as visiting other Chinese World Heritage properties, reflecting the great diversity of the country. With a 10-day working session, Mr Zhang recalled that the agenda had some important and heavy items: follow up to the Cairns Decision; evaluation of the Global Strategy; and the Periodic Report on Latin America. Under his Chairmanship, he announced China's wish to inaugurate a World Heritage Training and Research Institute, based in China. He also evoked an idea of establishing a World Heritage Prize to promote and reward outstanding work in the fields of training, education, or awareness-raising at World Heritage properties. Finally, expressing his personal goals for this session were to reach consensus on the complex issues on the Committee's agenda, he declared the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee open. (Mr Zhang's complete opening address can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

7. **In response** to the opening welcome by Mr Xinsheng Zhang, **Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, the Director-General of UNESCO**, addressed the distinguished personalities on the podium and in the meeting room, saying that it was a great honour to be received in China on the occasion of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee. He referred to the happy coincidence of 2004 being the Year of China in France. Recalling its 29 cultural and natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, he said that China also has a very rich intangible heritage, proclaimed by UNESCO "masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity": the Chinese zither – *guqin*. He recalled the proverb: "In heaven there is paradise, and on earth there are Hangzhou and Suzhou", saying that conservation and controlled development is consistent with the broader framework of the Millennium Development Goals adopted by the

United Nations. With UNESCO's new Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, adopted in 2003, the inclusive vision of the heritage should be reflected coherently in the implementation of UNESCO's various cultural conventions. With ever-growing numbers, the properties on the List could soon reach one thousand. Using regional periodic reports as a tool, the World Heritage Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be able to set priorities while pursuing the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List adopted in 1994, as defined by the "Cairns Decision". He expressed heartfelt thanks to Ms Chen Zhili, State Councillor of the People's Republic of China, and to the Chinese central and local authorities and wished the Committee excellent progress in their work. (The Director-General's complete speech can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

8. **Mr Liang Baohua, Governor of Jiangsu Province**, extended warmest welcome to all on behalf 74 million people in the Provincial People's Government of Jiangsu. China's five thousand years of culture bears witness to its unique civilization and natural heritage and that the Chinese authorities attach great importance to the implementation of the *Convention concerning the Preservation of the Cultural and Natural World Heritage*. Wishing the Committee success, he concluded by saying that the people of Jiangsu were honoured to host the session in Suzhou, with the theme of *Protect World Heritage - Promote Common Development*. (Mr Liang Baohua's complete speech can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

9. **Madam Chen Zhili, State Councillor**, then read a message from H.E. Mr Hu Jintao, President of the People's Republic of China, extending his warm congratulations and heartfelt welcome to all participating delegations. Every nation has its unique cultural and natural heritage, which constitutes precious wealth that belongs not only to each individual nation, but also to humankind as a whole. The 1972 *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, is of great significance in guiding the protection of world heritage. World civilization is marked by a basic feature – diversity. UNESCO's significant role could facilitate strengthening of dialogue among civilizations contributing to the noble cause of promoting world peace and development. He wished everyone a pleasant stay in China. (Complete message of H.E. Mr Hu Jintao's can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

10. **Mr Yang Weize, the Mayor of Suzhou**, said that UNESCO had shown great trust, and had high expectations of everyone involved in hosting the 28th session in Suzhou. Despite its ups and downs of 2518-year history, the city of Suzhou still stands at its original location with a well-preserved double-chessboard layout of "water and land in parallel, canal and street in each neighbourhood", and its unique landscape of "small bridges, flowing water, white walls, black tiles". Every effort will be made to preserve the classical water city for future generations. He wished the Committee success, saying that 28 June had been chosen as the "Heritage Preserving Day" making it a memorable day for every Suzhou citizen. (Mr Yang Weize's complete speech can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

11. **Professor Michael Omolewa, President of the UNESCO General Conference** and Permanent Delegate of Nigeria to UNESCO, said that the traditional enthusiastic welcome from the Government of the People's Republic of China was synonymous with the Chinese culture. In its 32 years' existence, 178 States Parties had ratified the *Convention*; 754 properties inscribed on the List in 129 countries. UNESCO is devoted to enlarging the notion of heritage, and complemented the 1972 *Convention* with the Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001 and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003. The responsibility entrusted to UNESCO and to the Committee to identify, protect and promote humanity's common heritage was fascinating, overwhelming and challenging. (Professor Michael Omolewa's complete speech can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

12. **Ambassador Hans-Heinrich Wrede, Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO**, reiterated sentiments of previous speakers. He quoted the UNESCO *World Heritage Convention* of 1972: "the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, to whatever people it may belong" saying that the individual and collective histories become vitally important in forging a common destiny in the 21st century. On behalf of the Executive Board of UNESCO, he wished the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee success, quoting the *Convention*, and said that it was incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value. (Ambassador Hans-Heinrich Wrede's complete speech can be found on the following web site: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

13. The **Chairperson** closed items 1 to 3 of the agenda.

14. The List of Participants is included as **Annex I**.

ITEM 4 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/4

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.4

15. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a last-minute request for observer status had been received from three representatives of the Global Heritage Fund.

16. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that Mrs Christina Cameron from Canada was identified as an observer in the document and suggested that her name should be removed from the observer list as she was the head of the Canadian Delegation. She also noted that there were many representatives from the media (journalists, broadcasters) on the list. She reminded the Committee that Rule 8 of the *Rules of Procedure*, governing requests for observer status, allowed for non-profit-making institutions only as observers to Committee sessions, and asked how it could be applied to media representatives.

17. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the media representatives concerned were there as partners involved in various World Heritage activities. They would be participating in the Partnership Presentations and would not be operating as journalists but as observers of the various organizations.

18. Referring to the draft decision **28 COM 4**, the Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that the category of observer missions to UNESCO, explicitly foreseen by the *Rules of Procedure*, be added to paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

19. The **Chairperson** closed item 4 of the agenda.

ITEM 5 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/5Prov

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.5 Rev

20. Mr. Zhang Xinsheng, the **Chairperson** of the World Heritage Committee, informed the Committee of a press conference to be held at 12:30, and reported on the previous day's Bureau recommendations to World Heritage Committee. He recommended the adoption of the provisional agenda as amended, whereby item 14 would precede

item 13. He noted that International Assistance requests would be discussed under item 10A of the agenda. He presented the Bureau recommendation that media not be allowed during the working sessions of the World Heritage Committee. He also reported on the Bureau recommendation that the World Heritage Committee review the nomination of the Bam Citadel in Iran given the exceptional circumstances surrounding that property. He also noted the Bureau's recommendation not to consider changing the current procedure in regards to producing 2 complete Summary Records of the Committee proceedings, one in French and one in English.

21. The **Chairperson** took the opportunity to invite Arabic, Chinese and Spanish language speakers to indicate in which language (French or English) they would like their interventions recorded in the summary record. After several interventions of the concerned Members of the Committee, it was decided that interventions made in Spanish, Arabic and Chinese would be reported in English.

22. In their interventions regarding the language of preference for the Summary Record, the Delegations of **Argentina, Colombia, Oman, India, and Lithuania** thanked the host country for its warm welcome and the Chairperson of the Committee for his good work.

23. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposed modifications of the agenda. However, it noted that in the future, it would like the order to be re-inversed so that the State of Conservation reports be examined before the Nominations.

24. The Delegation of **India** sought clarification as to the rationale for placing item 14 prior to item 13. Item 13 is integrally related to the Cairns Decision, and the Delegation expressed concern about lack of time to deal with it.

25. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that item 13 would now include the recommendations of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision, and that this Working Group would need the time to deal with the issue. Placing item 13 after item 14 would give the Working Group sufficient time to do so.

26. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** expressed concern on the small amount of time allocated to the periodic reporting section of the agenda. It stated that it had spent 2 years working on its own periodic report, and thought 4 hours to cover a new report, and follow-up on previous periodic reports was too short. If there was an opportunity to give more time, it would be appreciated.

27. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that Canada's observations were appropriate and all would be done to find additional time. He noted that a side event during the Tuesday lunch had been organized to discuss the Latin American and Caribbean periodic report. He hoped that this would help reduce the time needed during the Committee deliberations on periodic reporting.

28. The Observer Mission of **Palestine** thanked the Chairperson and the Chinese authorities for their warm welcome. Noting the amendment proposed by Lebanon regarding paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision **28 COM.4**, the Delegation also requested to be listed as "Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO" in the List of Participants.

29. The **Chairperson** asked for volunteers to form the Working Group on the Cairns Decision.

30. The Delegations of **India, Egypt, Colombia, Lebanon, China, South Africa, Lithuania, Saint Lucia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Benin, Argentina, Portugal, United Kingdom** and **Japan** offered to volunteer.

31. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed concern on the size of the working group and suggested that it be limited to a set number of countries per region.

32. The **Chairperson** noted that the Working Group would be open-ended and that others were welcomed to join. The Working Group would provide proposals for the Committee to discuss during agenda item 13.

33. The Delegation of **Norway** stated that according to *Rule of Procedure* 21, only members of the World Heritage Committee could be part of the Working Group. The Chair concurred.

34. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the Working Group size should be workable and operational.

35. In stating that the Delegation of **Benin** was very honoured by the welcome extended by the Chinese authorities, it emphasized that the Working Group was much too big and included almost all the Committee members. To be effective, the Delegation recommended that one or two representatives of each region and the Advisory Bodies, make up this Group.

36. The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the Working Group should be smaller to ensure effectiveness. It suggested that the number and identity of countries should be determined at lunch-time amongst those having expressed interest.

37. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the proposal to reduce the Working Group by limiting the number of its members and underlined that two representatives by region would be a good solution.

38. The **Chairperson** suggested that at a lunchtime meeting, the interested delegations could identify the members of an appropriately sized Working Group.

39. **Intervention by the Head of the New Zealand Delegation**

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen : Tena koutou katoa. Greetings

We have a saying in New Zealand, Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini. This saying acknowledges that tasks are never completed by one person or one group alone. The collective support and contribution of all that which drives excellence for World Heritage. It is with these few words that I especially acknowledge the many people who have assembled there today. The peoples of the Pacific share a common heritage. Our ancestors set out in ancient times from the distant homeland that we call Hawai'iiki, to settle the many islands of the Pacific and it was in this way that my ancestors came to Aotearoa (New Zealand). I also recently visited the Aboriginal people of Australia, in Uluru, and acknowledged the traditional owners of Australia and those who settled there on their own voyages of migrations. Today, it is my first intervention as a member of the Committee, I have the honour to begin a voyage with the peoples of the Pacific, building on our existing and longstanding relationships that will see that our places of outstanding universal significance will be recognized as World Heritage. May I say that New Zealand is happy to join the working group in the Cairns Decisions and support countries that will make statements to the Cairns Decisions.

Waiata–ehara

Explanation–kaitiakitanga

No reira, tena koutou katoa.

40. The **Chairperson** declared the agenda adopted as amended. He closed item 5 of the agenda.

ITEM 6 REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 27TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (PARIS, 30 JUNE - 5 JULY 2003)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/6

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.6

41. The **Rapporteur** of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Louise Graham, presented her report. The principles laid down by the

Committee regarding drafting had been applied consistently in the production of the Decisions and the Summary Record. There had been a substantial improvement in the formatting of the decisions, although some improvements could still be made. The previous year, 2003, had been a busy one for World Heritage, with three statutory meetings being held (the 6th extraordinary session of the Committee, 27th session of the Committee and 14th General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*). The volume of work involved in the preparation and follow-up of the meetings had resulted in delays in the production of the summary record of the 27th session, and revision of the *Operational Guidelines* had added to the delay. The first draft of the summary record had been produced seven months after the session. It had been sent to the heads of delegation only recently and they had been given two weeks to submit their comments. The comments had been incorporated in the draft and the latest version distributed at the present session. The document was in French and English, the Committee's working languages.

42. With regard to the present session, substantial changes were being made, and the Rapporteur hoped to have a first draft within six weeks. The style of the Summary Record had not yet met the standards requested by the Committee; however, the Secretariat's skills were being supplemented at that session in order to correct that aspect. She thanked Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh, the previous Rapporteur, with whom she had had regular meetings to ensure consistency, for her tireless effort, patience and skills. She also thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Assistant Director-General for Culture for their support and personal interest, as well as the Secretariat, which, despite losing key members and skills, continued to perform its duties in a professional and courteous way. The Rapporteur expressed concern at the loss of staff at the Centre over the past year, including those responsible for core functions. The Director-General of UNESCO had identified the problem at the 12th session of the General Assembly (2001), but little progress had been made since then. She said that the Committee had received a draft summary record of the 6th extraordinary session (17-22 March 2003), and asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Rapporteur of that session for a brief comment on the issue.

43. The **Rapporteur** of the 6th Extraordinary session, Mme Selfslagh, informed the Committee that the completed and corrected draft Summary Record would be available to the Committee in the afternoon of 28 June. Mme Selfslagh also informed that she would be at the disposal of delegations wishing to make comments. She hoped that the final

version, integrating any modifications proposed by the delegates, could be produced before the end of the work of present session.

44. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked both the Rapporteurs for their work and agreed with the remarks regarding staff changes in the Centre, expressing a need for continuity. It would be presenting some ideas thereon at a later stage of the session, in particular concerning resources devoted to the work of the Committee within UNESCO.

45. The Delegation of **Benin** thanked the two Rapporteurs for their excellent reports. It wished to know what measures the World Heritage Centre intended to take to respond to the important concern raised by the Rapporteur of the 27th session concerning the decrease in Centre staff. It proposed that the Committee bring this question to the attention of the Director-General of UNESCO.

46. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Rapporteurs and shared the concerns raised with regard to the staffing situation of the Centre. It noted its intention to return to the issue under Other business.

47. The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked both Rapporteurs and concurred with the concerns voiced by previous speakers regarding posts at the Centre. It further noted the particular problem of the lack of permanent staff dealing with the Latin America and Caribbean region.

48. The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Rapporteurs and endorsed the comments made by other delegations regarding staffing issues at the Centre.

49. The Delegation of **Portugal** took note of the report and thanked the Rapporteurs for accurate and detailed work. It endorsed other delegations' concern with regard to staffing issues at the Centre.

50. The Delegation of **Japan** also concurred with other delegations' concern with regard to staffing issues at the Centre and announced that it would speak on the issue later in the session.

51. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the summary record was an essential instrument in creating a better institutional memory. It would also express its views on staffing matters at a later stage.

52. The Delegation of **Kuwait** concurred with the previous speakers and made specific reference to the need to ensure that the different regional groups were represented at the Centre.

53. The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Rapporteurs for the quality of their work and expressed preoccupation with regard to the staffing situation of the Latin America and the Caribbean desk of the World Heritage Centre.

54. The **Chairperson** closed item 6 of the agenda.

Monday, 28 June 2004 (afternoon)

ITEM 7 REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 14TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (PARIS, 14-15 OCTOBER 2003)

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/7

55. The **Rapporteur** of the 14th General Assembly of States Parties (Paris, 14-15 October 2003), Ms. Alissandra Cummins, thanked the Chinese authorities for the excellent preparations for hosting the World Heritage Committee, introduced the document, which had originally been issued with the document code *WHC-03/14.GA/10*.

56. She said that the General Assembly, after electing its Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur, had considered and taken decisions on seven items concerning procedural and substantive matters. Given the shortness of time, she would not review procedural items such as Item 3A, "Revision of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly", Item 6, "Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of the States Parties' contributions" and Item 7, "Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the *World Heritage Convention*", all of which had been adopted without significant debate. She would instead concentrate her remarks on those issues that had generated considerable discussion.

57. Item 4, concerning a new voting mechanism and revision of procedures for election of members of the World Heritage Committee, had called for the General Assembly to adopt Resolutions 14 GA 4.1 and 14 GA 4.2. The General Assembly had paid significant attention to Resolution 14 GA 4.2, concerning proposed amendments to Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure which aimed to establish a clear timetable and procedure for the invitation, presentation, notification and closure of the list of candidatures for elections to the World Heritage

Committee, as reflected in the paragraph 2 of the Resolution, which set out the new Rule 13.

58. Item 5, "Report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on the activities of the World Heritage Committee", had generated considerable debate because the limitation on budgetary resources had affected the Committee's ability to address the persistent imbalance in both the geographical representation of sites as well as the bias in favour of cultural sites over natural sites, while recognizing that there were still over 40 States Parties with no World Heritage sites. The General Assembly had adopted Resolution 14 GA 5 as amended. The Resolution urged the Director-General to give priority to identifying new additional resources for the activities of the World Heritage Centre, whether within the Regular Budget or through extrabudgetary funds, particularly when preparing document 33 C/5.

59. The General Assembly had adopted the resolutions on Items 6 and 7 without amendment.

60. Item 8, "Progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List", had led to much debate. According to the Rapporteur, the States Parties had been preoccupied by the rate of progress of the initiatives undertaken within the Global Strategy to assist under- or non-represented States Parties, particularly concerning the implementation and reinforcement of capacity-building and training as well as increasing the representivity of the World Heritage List, giving special attention to the Pacific and Caribbean regions.

61. She recalled that the States Parties had identified a need for a future action plans to be informed by "an in-depth analysis of the implementation of this Strategic Objective" (para.148 of the working document). Citing paragraph 159 of the working document, she stressed that, "Under-representivity was linked both to funding issues and to priority-setting by the World Heritage Committee and the States Parties. The Committee should develop recommendations to urgently address the under-representivity of the List and should also adopt a time frame for action" in Suzhou. Furthermore, she recalled, Resolution 14 GA 8, which had been prepared by a working group, recommended that "additional financial resources be allocated to the World Heritage Centre" for programmes to strengthen capacity in regions under-represented on the List, and requested that the Centre submit to the 28th session of the Committee draft proposals to enable the development of appropriate action plans.

62. Under Item 9, "Elections to the World Heritage Committee", States Parties had been invited to

consider the composition of the World Heritage Committee since 1976 when filling eight seats on the Committee, including one seat to be allocated to a State Party not represented on the World Heritage List. The Rapporteur recalled that the Chairperson had been asked to provide information, prior to the start of elections, on the implementation of the voluntary reduction of the term of office from six to four years, in accordance with the Resolution of the 13th General Assembly, as well as the recommendation by the Committee at its 24th session under agenda item 6.2, "Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee", regarding the representation of the different regions and cultures within the Committee and on the World Heritage List.

63. The Rapporteur noted further that the lack of satisfactory response given and the inadequacy of the information provided had caused great concern amongst the States Parties. The matter remained an outstanding issue that must be dealt with and guidelines for the format and timely presentation of information on the voluntary reduction of the term of office must be developed in conformity with previous decisions and prior to the next elections in 2005. She reported the outcome of the elections, whereby Kuwait, Benin, Chile, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway had been elected to the Committee.

64. Finally, she concurred with the points made previously by the Rapporteur of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee on the production of documents. She thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture and the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff for their support. The first draft of the document had been prepared in late November 2003 and finalized by January 2004 when it had been available for circulation to the States Parties for comment and amendment.

65. The **Chairperson** said that if the Committee so agreed, he would consider that it took note of the working document. He closed Item 7.

66. The Delegation of **India** noted that the Committee might take more time to reflect on the working methods of the General Assembly.

ITEM 8 PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2004 - 2005 (32C/5) APPROVED BY THE 32ND GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/8

67. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the working document and briefly

described the objectives of the two Main Lines of Action concerning support to the World Heritage governing bodies, and the implementation of technical assistance to States Parties within the framework of the four strategic objectives of the Budapest Declaration on World Heritage of 2002.

68. The Delegation of **Argentina** requested information on the implementation status of activities outlined in document 32 C/5 and their results, as well as on the use of the additional US\$ 1 million provided by the United States as allocated by the General Conference at its 32nd session. It asked for the information to be made available in time for the discussion on Item 11, Execution of the Budget, as it would enable the World Heritage Committee to make any necessary adjustments to its decisions under Item 12, Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33 C/5).

69. The Delegations of **Saint Lucia, the Netherlands** and the **United Kingdom** supported the proposals made by the Delegation of **Argentina**.

70. The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to provide the information requested by the Delegation of Argentina and closed Item 8.

ITEM 13 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents
WHC-04/28.COM/13
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13^A
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13
BWHC-04/28.COM/INF.13C
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D

71. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to give their opinion on the open-ended working group established under decision **27 COM 14** on the Cairns Decision.

72. The Delegation of **India** referred to the importance of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List in the context of the Cairns Decision, and said that a mandate had been given to the working group to look at statistics concerning the List, as it did not reflect fully the cultural heritage of humankind and the world's natural treasures. A holistic policy framework was much needed.

73. The Delegation of **Japan** said that World Heritage was UNESCO's most visible programme and expressed its respect for the Centre's work. The Cairns Decision had been the result of a lengthy

discussion process and covered many different issues. Thus far, 754 sites were inscribed on the List, and the question of its upper limit would arise in the decade to come. Another question was how the Centre could fulfil its task with the current limitations on its capacity and budget; the same was true for the Advisory Bodies. Conservation of the heritage was an essential duty, and ways and means for applying comprehensive safeguarding principles based on a common understanding should be found.

74. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Cairns Decision was related to two issues: workload and representivity. Global and comparative studies were certainly helpful, but it was up to States Parties to decide which sites to nominate. The development of tentative lists was certainly critical and it was important that assistance in that respect was available on grounds of intellectual rigour. The workload of the Centre and the Committee was also a problem, but the most important issue was that the sites already on the World Heritage List had to be managed adequately. The basis for World Heritage was its outstanding universal value and to deal with targets would undermine the *World Heritage Convention*. Only sites that satisfied the criteria of the *Convention* should be nominated.

75. The Delegation of **Benin**, not having made any comments on the Cairns Decision, to which it had however actively participated, thought that any digression from the international cooperation that the *World Heritage Convention* was intended to foster should be avoided. The decision in question, adopted less than four years ago, is the fruit of a compromise, obtained following extensive consultations. To question it would be to reject the desire of a regional balance which presided at the time of its adoption. Whereas, the question is to know in what measure the World Heritage List may effectively be more representative and credible, in other words, to seek efficient modalities to strengthen technical cooperation and technical assistance capacities. This is the way to go to truly contribute towards changing the situation in Africa.

76. The Delegation of **Portugal** said that the *Convention* was an instrument for international cooperation. The Cairns Decision was one of a group of closely connected decisions, including those regarding tentative lists, the credibility of the List, and natural and cultural balance. To date, there were still well over 40 countries without sites and the 14th General Assembly of States Parties, in its Resolution 14 GA 8, had clearly indicated the need to develop action plans in that respect. Tentative lists should be seen as an active tool in redressing the current situation, the Internet should be used and an overall review of the Global Strategy should take

place in 2007. Finally, it supported maintaining the Cairns Decision and integrating it into a broader framework.

77. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that not enough time had elapsed since the adoption of the Decision - it was important to take a long-term perspective. It underscored the fundamental role of selection under the *Convention*. The promotion of cooperation between transborder sites was critical. It was also crucial to preserve the spirit of the *Convention* and for the situation to be assessed by the working group.

78. The Delegation of **Oman** said that countries were entitled to review the Cairns Decision, but that it would be useful to wait until it had been implemented for a five-year period before making an evaluation. The working group should examine the critical issues of expertise in some countries, the assistance needed to prepare nominations, and the capacity of the Centre.

79. The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its wish for a holistic approach including capacity-building, international cooperation and global coverage. The efforts of States Parties should focus on cooperation and complementarity of activities.

80. Concerning the guidelines for the working group, the Delegation of **China** said that it should look at the main purpose of the List, the imbalance of the List and an effective methodology that could ensure quality. While the Cairns Decision should be maintained as it stood, the Delegation welcomed efforts to redress geographical distribution, under-representation of types, and the workload of the Advisory Bodies. It recommended a three-year time period for review. In the spirit of the *Convention*, it called for an objective assessment of the situation that could provide a basis for recommendations and practical development to supplement the Cairns Decision in joint efforts.

81. The Delegation of **Chile** recalled that the Decision had already been modified in 2003 with the change from 30 to 40 nominations. It agreed with the comments of the Delegation of Benin concerning representivity and management, and said that any further modification had to be undertaken in that spirit. The working group should put forward practical proposals.

82. The Delegation of **Columbia** said that it was in favour of maintaining the Cairns Decision, which was a consensus decision, but an assessment of it would be timely. The capacity of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to study and screen sites was critical.

83. The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that there seemed to be more agreement than disagreement in the Committee. The basic problems were human resources and the capacity for handling nominations. Practical solutions were also needed for urgent issues including earthquakes, global warming and environmental pollution. The Decision should be reviewed in two to three years' time.

84. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the Cairns Decision was not unchangeable. Over 40 countries were still without a site and there were many questions to be addressed by the working group, including the qualities a site should have to merit inscription; the regional imbalance of the List; the credibility of each site; whether there should be a limit to nominations; how to deal with sites in danger; the human resources of the Centre; the viability of the Global Strategy, and the availability of funds, which might be decisive.

85. The Delegation of **Norway** supported the views expressed and considered that the Cairns Decision should remain in place for a number of years. The main issues for the group would be the credibility of the World Heritage List and the question of capacity.

86. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it had submitted comments and proposals in writing on the subject under discussion. As regarded the mandate of the working group, it had an excellent reference tool in the form of the guidelines handed down by the Committee at its 27th session.

87. The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that not enough time had elapsed since 2000 to be able see concrete results and that the focus should be on capacity building. The Advisory Bodies and the staff of the Centre were overburdened with work. It recalled that there were other options for assistance, and said that regional programmes to train trainers should be reinforced. Another important issue concerned the state of conservation for which the Committee had global responsibility, in particular as many sites had no management plans.

88. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that it was too early to evaluate or question the Cairns Decision. Like the Delegation of Benin, it recalled that this decision was the fruit of a compromise. To question it would appear to question the capacity of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to carry out their tasks responsibly. The working group should reflect upon the best way in which to implement the Cairns Decision.

89. The Delegation of **Kuwait** agreed that more time was needed. As the Centre already had capacity problems, it wondered how it would be affected with even more sites on the List.

90. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** noted that the discussion revolved around three main points: the spirit of the Cairns Decision, its applicability and the question of its annulment or not. The Delegation supports the spirit of Cairns as well as the rationalisation of the work of the World Heritage Centre. With regard to the application of the Decision, it noted a basic misunderstanding because the Committee has associated two aspects which should not be linked: limitation of the number of sites to be inscribed and matters relating to the Centre. And it pronounced in favour of keeping the Decision. Taking into account the balance of its financial contribution to the Centre, the Delegation made the following concrete proposals aimed at improving the Decision without, however, penalizing the States Parties already represented on the List: capacity building, similar to efforts made by Italy in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean; financial support by States Parties to the World Heritage Fund for natural sites; establishment of training programmes for World Heritage experts in cooperation with universities, based on the model of activities carried out in cooperation with Sienna University and the Florence Institute; technical assistance for the establishment of management plans for those sites without management plans.

91. The Observer Delegation of **France** noted that the Cairns Decision had already borne fruit since its adoption. It begged the Committee not to forget, in its reflection on Cairns, the damage that World Heritage sites continued to undergo, whether or not they are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Tuesday, 29 June 2004 (morning)

ITEM 13 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM MONDAY 28 JUNE 04)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/13

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13^A

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13B

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13C

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13D

92. The **Secretariat** provided some information about interpretation arrangements and apologized for technical problems that had occurred the previous day.

93. In reply to a request from the Delegation of **Lebanon**, the **Chairperson** clarified the order of the Agenda to be followed. He proposed to postpone the examination of items 9, 10A, 11 and 12 to be discussed after nominations. He introduced item number 13 (Global Strategy) and asked the Advisory Bodies to present their analyses.

94. **ICOMOS** presented its analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists as regarded the cultural heritage.

95. **IUCN** presented its analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists as regarded the natural heritage.

96. The **Chairperson** commended the presentations, which would nourish the debate within the Working Group on the Cairns Decision set up by the Committee on the previous day. He therefore suggested discussing the matter within the overall debate on item 13 due to take place after the examination of the nominations, unless Committee members had any technical or procedural questions.

97. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the **ICOMOS** presentation did not give adequate attention to the importance of the notion of Outstanding Universal Value, or to the role of States Parties in nominating sites. Neither was there sufficient linkage with the Global Strategy and the current *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Finally, it requested clarification on collaboration between **ICOMOS** and **IUCN** in the preparation of the two analyses, especially concerning cultural landscapes and mixed sites.

98. **ICOMOS** replied that the two organizations were aware of each other's work, and pointed to the analogies and similarities in their conclusions and recommendations.

Coffee break (a.m.)- 29 June 2004

99. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed pleasure at the finalization of the reports of **IUCN** and **ICOMOS** which, in its view, had greatly contributed towards progress made in the reflection on ways to improve the representivity of the List. Whilst recalling that the two Advisory Bodies wished to receive reactions from the Committee with regard to their work, it underlined the need to avoid mixing the debate on the content of the reports with that of the Global Strategy, so as not to lessen the scientific value, and proposed to find time for an in-depth debate on these two reports.

100. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, recalling that the two reports had been requested by the Committee four years earlier, stressed the importance of allocating enough time for a thorough debate on their contents, and considered that they should have not been presented simply as information documents, but as fully-fledged working documents.

101. The Delegation of **India** said that the reports provided a very good basis for the Committee's deliberations and concurred with the remarks made by the United Kingdom on the need to establish a link between the analyses and their implications for the States Parties.

102. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and added that, given the great importance of the item, additional time for its discussion could have been allocated at the expense of other items on the agenda or the work of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision.

103. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that it would be difficult to make a distinction between technical and substantive comments on the matter, and joined other previous speakers in requesting adequate time for a debate on the two reports.

104. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supporting the opinion expressed by the Netherlands, added that if it had known that the intention was not to have a debate until after examination of the nominations, it would not have agreed to the composition of the Working Group as proposed.

105. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the previous interventions for a separate examination of the two reports, and proposed that the debate take place in the plenary and not in the working group.

106. The Delegation of **China**, while sharing the view of other speakers that the subject was important and should be allocated sufficient time for its consideration, recalled that the Committee had already decided to amend the agenda, postponing discussion of item 13 until after the examination of the nominations. It suggested therefore, supported by the Delegation of **Lithuania**, that the Committee stick with that decision and hold the debate at a later stage.

107. The Delegation of **India** stressed the link between the analyses and the remit of the Working Group, and suggested changing the agenda once more in order to have a debate on the analyses immediately.

108. The **Chairperson**, recognizing the need that had arisen for a debate on the presentations made by the Advisory Bodies, said that consideration of items 9, 10A, 11 and 12 would be postponed until after the examination of the nominations. Item 10B, however, would be maintained as foreseen in the agenda for practical reasons.

109. After this clarification on the Agenda, the Chairperson decided to continue the debate on item 13 and specifically on the analysis presented by ICOMOS (*WHC-04/28.COM/INF.13A*)

110. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined the coherence of the analysis that distinguished between a thematic framework and a chronological framework. In its view, the ICOMOS report confirmed the Committee's opinion with regard to the particular case of cultural heritage, characterized by an imbalance in the number of sites inscribed on the List in favour of Europe, from the Middle Ages, but also religious monuments as well as western Christianity.

111. Along the same lines, the Delegation pointed out a disparity between the diagrams devoted to the analysis of cultural heritage of the different regions, considering that European heritage was given far greater attention. It strongly recommended to ICOMOS, if it did not want to be labelled as Eurocentrist, to extend the methods applied to Europe to the other regions and to carry out a relevant study in countries like China, India or Japan. Furthermore, it proposed to refine the analysis of categories such as those of Roman sites, that are found as far away as Asia, and evoked the possibility of a regroupment of great empires in a same category.

112. Finally, whilst requesting ICOMOS to complete the gaps in its report, the Delegation of Lebanon supported the recommendation for the establishment of activities such as regional workshops.

113. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** underscored the importance of regional and international cooperation in addressing the problems identified in the two analyses, and referred to a workshop held in its region to reflect on the issue of representivity in Latin America and the Caribbean.

114. The Delegation of **Benin** was pleased with the quality of the report that, notably on page 47, acknowledged the existence of gaps in the recognition of categories. Nevertheless, it proposed that the gaps be identified in the qualitative category, in order to better adapt capacity building strategies. Whilst finding the typological division satisfactory, it emphasized the need to propose a true problematic for reflection for the "vernacular" category in order not to succumb to Eurocentrism, and suggested that ICOMOS, for the "cultural itineraries" category, define its perspective so that States Parties may differentiate between, for example, the Silk Road and the Slave Road. Finally, together with the Lebanese Delegation, it supported the proposal to organize regional seminars to refine the categories for the less-represented regions in the List, such as Africa.

115. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, thanking the two Advisory Bodies for their very useful contribution, highlighted three distinct issues. Firstly, the apparent difference in the approach between cultural and natural heritage, with particular reference to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value. Secondly, the question of credibility: if a property was of Outstanding Universal Value and yet was not well managed, should it be inscribed on the World Heritage List, and possibly also on the World Heritage List in Danger, as a means of enhancing its protection? Finally, given the widespread concern at the ever-increasing number of sites inscribed on the List, perhaps consideration should be given to ways of "shortening" it.

116. The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the two Advisory Bodies for having produced the long-awaited studies on the Lists. It highlighted the issues of the definition of Outstanding Universal Value, the sustainability of inscription on the World Heritage List, and the proposed Action Plan, which it would be necessary to follow up. That could be done both through regional meetings and through organizing a special two-day session of the World Heritage Committee, in December, to look exclusively at those specific issues.

117. The Delegation of **India** stressed the need to further develop the sub-categories in which the cultural heritage had been classified at regional and sub-regional levels. On the study presented by IUCN, it said that the suggestion that 300 would be a reasonable figure in order to achieve complete representivity of the world's natural heritage on the List contradicted the previous statement that further scientific development might provide new perspectives as to what was significant.

118. The Advisory Bodies should assist the States Parties in filling the gaps identified by the studies, especially with regard to the revision of Tentative Lists, taking into account the observation that inscribing all the sites presently on the Tentative Lists would not improve the representivity of the World Heritage List.

119. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commenting on the presentations, observed however, that the approach taken by ICOMOS was too Eurocentric. The key was to ensure credibility and transparency in the process aimed at filling the gaps on the List, bearing in mind that there would have to be an upper limit at one point and that other protection frameworks complemented the *World Heritage Convention*. IUCN should work with the States Parties to undertake collaborative studies, and avoid at all costs a piecemeal approach.

120. The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the two studies took different approaches to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value, adding that it favoured the one proposed by IUCN. The problem had very practical implications, since it was necessary to set a target for the work of the Committee. The suggestion made by Portugal concerning a special meeting of the Committee on the issue was most appropriate.

121. The Delegation of **Colombia** emphasized the need for a regional approach and further collaboration between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. The categorization adopted for Latin America did not seem adequate.

122. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, disagreed with the statement made by ICOMOS that the workload did not affect the quality of the assessments and reiterated that its approach was too Eurocentric. It did appreciate the action-oriented nature of the ICOMOS report, though, and encouraged IUCN to follow suit. The Action Plan proposed by ICOMOS was welcome but existing instruments should not be forgotten. The revision of Tentative Lists seemed to be the priority in identifying the gaps on the World Heritage List, and it should be undertaken with the full involvement of the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO experts. It was necessary to avoid

frustrating States Parties who had worked for years to put together a nomination only to see it rejected.

123. Turning to the study prepared by IUCN, the Delegation noted that it referred to the new *Operational Guidelines*, which had yet to be approved, and joined the Delegation of India in expressing a certain skepticism as to the proposed ceiling of 300 natural heritage properties. The system of classification proposed by IUCN, moreover, was only one of the many available, which should have been taken into account to compensate for possible shortcomings. IUCN's approach to the scale of the properties should be reassessed, especially as far as small islands were concerned, relatively small areas that might well have Outstanding Universal Value.

124. The Delegation of Saint Lucia also objected to the total absence of consideration given to criterion (iii) in the analysis conducted by IUCN, on the grounds that beauty would not be scientifically measurable. On the contrary, there must be a methodology to assess beauty, and it was necessary to work together on that and other issues. The lack of an adequate bibliography was also noted, as well as consideration for the specific political issues related to transboundary sites. Finally, it raised the issue of the soundness of the Advisory Bodies' judgments on the criteria and called for an independent evaluation of their work.

125. The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** congratulating both Advisory Bodies on their reports, expressed its agreement with the idea of an upper limit, although it recognized that it would be difficult to set ceilings at that stage. It also commended IUCN for the recognition of the potential of South-east Asian marine areas for future inscriptions, and stressed the importance of scale, with specific regard to species conservation. On the ICOMOS study, it suggested that ICOMOS develop the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and avoid comparing different cultures, concentrating instead on regional contexts.

126. The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** emphasized the need to achieve a better balance in the List, recalling that its country, the largest in Africa in terms of area and extremely diverse in cultural and natural heritage, had only one property inscribed. It also stressed the urgent nature of protection measures with specific mention to the negative effects of the floods that had affected the archaeological site of Meroe.

127. The Delegation of **Oman** said that the lack of balance was due to the fact that countries had not done enough to identify and inscribe their sites. There was a need for awareness-raising and

capacity-building in under-represented regions and UNESCO should have recognized those problems. Sometimes assistance had been prevented or hampered by communication problems, especially when international experts did not speak the local languages, or even by lack of competence.

Tuesday, 29 June 2004 (afternoon)

128. The Delegation of **China** commended the reports presented by ICOMOS and IUCN, which constituted a basis for the discussion on the Global Strategy and the Cairns Decision, but stated that it would be impossible to provide reasonable technical comments on substantive reports in such a short time. It added that the study prepared by IUCN appeared based on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and used a multidisciplinary approach. On the issue of balance, it must be seen in relative, rather than absolute terms. It was important to ensure credibility through the appropriate protection of natural and cultural heritage properties, and that called for coordination between IUCN and ICOMOS. At that stage there would be no need to fix a ceiling to the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. On the other hand, including sites on the List was an effective way of enhancing cooperation and strengthening protection. With regard to the ICOMOS report, the Delegation found that it lacked balance and that more depth was required in the analysis of the Asian cultures, with particular attention to ethnic minorities. It would be necessary to organize regional expert workshops for further understanding of those issues.

129. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the various comments regarding the organization of regional workshops, which might contribute significantly to better identifying gaps on the World Heritage List, ideally in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. In that respect, technical and financial assistance would be essential. There was a particular need to further develop Tentative Lists and management plans, and there should be synergy between the States Parties and the Committee to ensure the follow up of its recommendations.

130. The Delegation of **South Africa**, congratulating IUCN and ICOMOS on their analyses, stressed that it was an open process nourished by continuous research and cooperation which would lead to an improvement in the representivity of the List. States Parties that had not submitted a Tentative List must be assisted as a matter of priority, in line with the conceptual

framework provided by the Global Strategy. In that regard, the definition of Outstanding Universal Value must be further developed in terms of both cultural and natural heritage. The Delegation expressed its concern regarding the sustainability of the World Heritage List, with particular regard to the well being of the communities living within or around the inscribed properties. Addressing that issue should be the next step in the development of the Global Strategy.

131. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, expressing appreciation for the studies presented by IUCN and ICOMOS, observed however that they needed to be harmonized, particularly as far as mixed properties were concerned. It also reiterated the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia on the need to streamline the nomination process and avoid insofar as possible the frustration of States Parties whose sites were rejected. The issue of which classification system to adopt should also be looked at by IUCN. The Delegation would be in favour of the meeting proposed by the Delegation of Portugal.

132. The Delegation of **Norway** joined previous speakers in noting a lack of consistency in the IUCN-proposed ceiling of 300 natural heritage properties to fill all the gaps in the World Heritage List, and its statement that new scientific research might open new perspectives in the understanding of natural heritage values. It also supported the Portuguese proposal to have a special meeting to address quantitative and qualitative issues related to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value. There was a need for collaboration between IUCN and ICOMOS.

133. The Delegation of **New Zealand** commented that clarifications on the meaning of Outstanding Universal Value would facilitate the harmonization of the two reports. It further observed that the grouping of regions within the same analytic approach would likely bring distortions, particularly in its part of the world. It supported the proposal to organize regional expert meetings, as well as the remark made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia on the issue of the scale of a property. It added that, as long as a property possessed Outstanding Universal Value, there would be no reason to establish any upper limit to the List.

134. The Observer Delegation of **Togo** congratulated China for its welcome, and concurred with the Delegations of Lebanon, Benin and Saint Lucia, declaring in favour of a better representation of the other regions and more particularly of Africa. It suggested that, in the framework of heritage, the notion of international solidarity was the driving force of the complementary analysis process that could underpin the ICOMOS report. Furthermore, it

recalled the need to avoid transferring the evaluation criteria of European heritage to that of the other regions and supported the idea of organizing regional seminars to identify the specificities of each region.

135. The Observer Delegation of **France** noted that ICOMOS' vision, as represented in the report submitted, is influenced by the European region experience that, more often than not, privileges the chronological approach, and indicated that the notion of heritage has greatly evolved in France, especially since the adoption of the *Convention*. In view of the weak representivity of the World Heritage List, it proposed that the reflection go beyond the framework of the States Parties to encompass a more regional framework, as both ICOMOS and IUCN very rightly recommended in their reports. As suggested by the Delegation of Portugal, it also supported the idea to organize regional workshops in association with the Advisory Bodies, in preparation for the organization of a more scientific meeting. Finally, France informed the Committee of its intention to update its Tentative List and invited its European neighbours to do likewise.

136. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** emphasized that nominations should not be seen as a bureaucratic process and stressed the need for the early involvement of, and assistance from the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, which would probably reduce the workload of the Committee at the later stage. It observed that transboundary sites were fully within the spirit of the *Convention*, and suggested that, besides reviewing Tentative Lists, the possibility of grouping distinct properties according to common themes should be explored.

137. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for their exhaustive reports, and drew the Committee's attention to the need to look into the Periodic Reports submitted by the various regions in order to assess which properties met the standards and requirements of World Heritage. The publication proposed by ICOMOS on a selection of 100 World Heritage properties was premature. On the other hand, an analysis of deferred and rejected nominations would provide useful insights.

138. The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled the importance, when adopting a classification system, of giving adequate consideration to local perspectives and their relation to global issues. It made reference in that respect to the Red Sea and the Suez Canal, whose importance could be better understood in the regional context and through dialogue with local experts. IUCN should produce further guidelines on the issue of habitats. The

improvement of the Tentative Lists seemed to be the way to proceed, but how to improve them was a moot point. The proposal put forward by IUCN regarding the publication of a World Heritage Atlas had to be discussed further among the various countries before it could be given support. The Delegation said that there seemed to be an imbalance among regions and themes. It was very important to work towards raising awareness in the less-represented regions. Countries must take action, but they needed technical and financial assistance. Concerning the typological frameworks proposed by IUCN in its study, deserts, and particularly the Sahara should be included, as well as the theme of great rivers. Desert landscapes had been the subject of a workshop held in Egypt that had stressed their great potential for World Heritage.

139. The Delegation of **Kuwait** pointed to the urgent need for awareness-raising, observing that not much had been done in that regard, as well as for technical assistance from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to States Parties without the necessary expertise.

140. The early involvement of the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of Tentative Lists and nominations was also advocated by the Observer Delegation of the **Philippines**, together with the idea of an independent evaluation of their work. It referred to a specific case concerning its country, which had received US\$30,000 from UNESCO for assistance in preparing a nomination. The activity had been implemented by the UNESCO Bangkok Office that had transmitted the nomination to the Centre, only to see it rejected as incomplete by the latter. Such unpleasant situations could be avoided if the Advisory Bodies were more involved in the nomination process.

141. The Observer Delegation of **Peru** stressed the great commitment that World Heritage imposed on States Parties, especially with regard to maintaining heritage values and addressing at the same time the legitimate expectations of the communities living within or around the properties.

142. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** agreed with several other speakers that the key to improving the representivity of the List was the revision of Tentative Lists. In that respect, both the top-down and the bottom-up approaches should have been considered. It mentioned the need to provide technical assistance to States Parties, to obtain an early reaction from the Advisory Bodies on Tentative Lists and to make those available through publications, including on the Internet. With reference to the pyramid-shaped scheme contained in the presentation by IUCN, the Tentative Lists should be placed just under the World Heritage List.

143. The Observer Delegation of **Iran** emphasized the importance of preserving the credibility of the system, and called for immediate action to restore the true spirit of the *Convention*. It added that the Cairns Decision should be reviewed and its current provisions should not apply to under-represented regions. Advisory Bodies should be given the means to assist States Parties, while the more advanced countries should be invited by the Committee to provide the necessary resources.

144. In reply to the observations made by the members of the Committee and Observer Delegations, **ICOMOS** expressed its gratitude for the advice they had provided. It also agreed with the timeliness of organizing regional workshops. On the suggestion made by some to integrate further the analytical approaches of ICOMOS and IUCN, ICOMOS drew the Committee's attention to the fact that cultural heritage lacked the classificatory structure of the natural heritage. It agreed, however, that working in close association would certainly be beneficial. ICOMOS shared the view of the Delegation of Benin that spiritual and vernacular heritage should be given more attention, as well as views expressed by other delegations on other specific issues such as the need for a better chronology for sub-regions such as China. ICOMOS was ready to provide increased assistance in the process of identifying the heritage. The concept of Outstanding Universal Value, on the other hand, was clearly defined in the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*, and was not easily changeable. At any rate, ICOMOS was fully ready to play its role, if adequate resources were made available.

145. **IUCN**, for its part, thanked all the speakers for their useful and constructive contributions. On the subject of the upper limit, it said that the proposed figure corresponded to their professional view, but that of course it might require adjustments. On the use of different classification systems, IUCN explained that in its analysis it had made reference to at least six, with a view to avoiding any possible omission. Deserts, in particular, would soon be the subject of a specific study. IUCN further explained that the analysis was supposed to provide advice to the States Parties, alongside thematic studies and regional meetings held in the past. The revision of Tentative Lists constituted, in the view of IUCN, a great opportunity. Some States Parties had produced remarkable Tentative Lists, and they could be used as references. Concerning the possibility that the Advisory Bodies could be involved, or might assist States Parties in the preparation of nominations, IUCN considered that that would not be appropriate if they were supposed to provide the Committee with independent advice.

146. The establishment of a methodology to measure the beauty of a natural site, in the eyes of IUCN, posed insurmountable problems, taking into account the intrinsic cultural nature of that quality. Perhaps an analysis of the characters of the properties that had been inscribed under that criterion might provide some insight.

147. IUCN added that it already worked closely with ICOMOS, despite some differences in approach, and noted that the recommendations proposed by the two Advisory Bodies were similar in substance.

Coffee break (p.m.) - 29 June 2004

ITEM 10B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/10B

148. The **Evaluator**, independent consultant Ms June Taboroff, presented the working document emphasizing that it was only a progress report, focusing in particular on the process and the criteria for the allocation of Emergency Assistance, providing information on funds granted, and recommending ways and means for improving efficiency, accountability, design and implementation.

149. The **Director of the Centre** added that it was only part of a more comprehensive evaluation in response to a request of the Committee. That report was due to be completed in the coming year. It would contain a performance assessment and proposals for increasing effectiveness, especially with regard to the limited funds available. He explained that Emergency Assistance had been hard hit by the recent budget cuts in the World Heritage Fund. Therefore, links should be sought with other systems for assistance, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and with NGOs, for which partnerships should be established.

150. The report would further elaborate on a risk preparedness strategy to meet future emergency needs. The latest information, which had been received the previous week, was that, as part of such a strategy, a Rapid Response Facility had been established with Vodafone International and the United Nations Foundation, in cooperation with Fauna & Flora International, a United Kingdom-based organization.

151. The Delegation of **Benin**, after having thanked the World Heritage Centre as well as the Evaluator for the work accomplished, observed that the

document submitted contained a serious criticism with regard to all the actors concerned – World Heritage Committee, States Parties, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies – and questioned the definition of emergency, the lack of monitoring, the use of funds and the impact of assistance. Thus, rather than redefining the strategy, there was more a need to define the notion of emergency, the respect of rules and to give a more important place to prevention.

152. In this regard, two fundamental questions arose. First of all, in paragraph 2.b of the draft decision it was proposed that the World Heritage Centre "undertakes in the coming year a full analysis of the international assistance procedure funded by the World Heritage Fund, to present to the Committee in 2005". Aware of the first evaluation made in 1998, did this imply that additional funds would have to be sought for a second evaluation? Benin was not of that opinion and considered that the available information should be examined and conclusions drawn. Furthermore, it judged that it was of prime importance to establish a preventive strategy. Secondly, was it really necessary to organize a seminar for the Centre, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies in order to present the results of the evaluation? A clear response to these questions seemed indispensable to ensure an efficient implementation of emergency assistance.

153. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Evaluator for her report. It would have been helpful if the terms of reference had been attached to enable an accurate assessment of the results of the evaluation. With regard to those results, the thorough review of Emergency Assistance contained useful recommendations for the Committee and the World Heritage Centre. Emergency Assistance and International Assistance had to be looked at in conjunction with each other, in line with the management review undertaken in 1998.

154. With regard to the criteria for providing Emergency Assistance to States Parties that were in arrears, the Delegation said that under normal circumstances such States Parties would not be eligible for receiving International Assistance, and it could thus, absurdly, become advantageous to let a property degrade to the extent that Emergency Assistance could be requested and granted.

155. It supported the recommendation to include the results of the Periodic Reports in the development of a strategy, as well as the recommendation on the importance of risk preparedness planning. However, it would like clarification on the recommendation on training, and on subparagraph 2a of the Draft Decision, which referred to discussing a set of proposals at a subsequent session of the Committee.

156. The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the Evaluator for an informative report and said that it supported the Draft Decision, provided that the cooperation referred to in its paragraph 3 with the Advisory Bodies and other international agencies also included cooperation with the States Parties.

157. The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its satisfaction with the report and thanked the Evaluator for her work. It agreed with the report's conclusions, with the exception of the implication that the Committee had not guided the granting of Emergency Assistance with a well-thought-out strategy. The Committee agreed with the need for improvement and the Delegation of Argentina proposed swift implementation of the recommendations with the oversight of the Committee. Implementation of the recommendations should be considered after completion of the full evaluation, and only then should a comparison be made with the means of assistance deployed by other organizations. It questioned, however, the need for training and also suggested the establishment of a drafting group for the decision.

158. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Evaluator for an excellent report, which flagged all the concerns of the Committee, and concurred with the comments of Benin, the Netherlands and Argentina. It gave the example of an Emergency Assistance request, the Rice Terraces of the Philippines, which had raised questions concerning the money being withheld by the UNESCO Regional Office, and parts of it used for the travel expenses of the Director of that office to the site, although he is not an expert. It endorsed the comments of the Delegation of Argentina concerning the immediate implementation of the recommendations and the establishment of a drafting group.

159. **ICCROM** thanked the Evaluator for her report, calling the Committee's attention to the need for better monitoring and accountability. It suggested that the Committee discuss the definition of Emergency Assistance, as the figures in the report showed an inconsistent use of funds. It mentioned the important link with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the question of funds allocated them.

160. Concerning risk preparedness, ICCROM questioned why a recommendation for training in risk preparedness would be aimed at the Centre and Advisory Bodies. It described its own activities in carrying out training activities in risk preparedness in the Dominican Republic and India and the preparation of training kits on the subject. Funds for that did not come from Emergency Assistance but from the budget for training. It would be useful for

the report's recommendation on training to be clarified.

161. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Evaluator for an excellent report and agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia that action had to be taken before the next Committee session. Furthermore, it recalled that, contrary to what was stated in the report, there was no April 2004 version of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

162. The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the findings and recommendations of the report and explained, with regard to the Emergency Assistance provided for the Rice Terraces, that US\$75,000 had been granted and decentralized to the UNESCO Bangkok Office, of which US\$29,000 had been allocated to missions of the Secretariat and consultants, leaving US\$46,000 for a stakeholders meeting. It stressed the need for a policy for directing assistance to the site and facilitating its removal from the Danger List.

163. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** thanked the Evaluator for her thorough report and commented that a drafting group should deal in particular with the granting of assistance to sites not on the World Heritage List or on the Tentative List. Given the limited funds available, priority should go to sites on the Danger List.

164. The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** said that it was disturbed to have understood that the granting of Emergency Assistance to countries in arrears was referred to as "having a free lunch". The issue of States Parties that were in arrears and requested such assistance had been discussed in 1989, and the payment of dues was not necessary in case of natural disasters. Emergency Assistance was not for the benefit of the State Party but intended to mitigate threats to the World Heritage site.

165. The Delegation of **Nigeria** commented that the State Party requesting and receiving Emergency Assistance should be informed on how to proceed with regard to accountability and provided with expert advice.

166. The Observer Delegation of **Belgium** associated itself with the previous speakers, whose remarks demonstrated that the concerns of the Committee were well founded. It drew the attention of the drafting group to Article 20 of the *Convention*, stipulating that funds allocated under this category must be used for the preservation of the properties and not for administrative expenses. It would be appropriate to avoid using the Fund, as is often the case, for management and administrative purposes.

167. The Observer Delegation of **Madagascar** indicated that its country had twice benefitted from Emergency Assistance following natural catastrophes and expressed its gratitude for this assistance, as well as for the independent evaluation provided. However, although the notion of emergency is of no cause for discussion in the case of a natural catastrophe, experience shows that the procedure is too lengthy and assistance is slow in coming. The country has had to delve into its own funds to "close the gap" of the site affected, then wait a long time before recovering the outlay. The Delegation would like the Committee to reflect on means to speed up the procedure and avoid this kind of situation.

168. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked about the conditions for the allocation of funds in the event of assistance being granted to countries in arrears, given the World Heritage Centre's lack of funds, and the possible negative consequences that that might have.

169. The Delegation of **India** referred to the relevant section of the report on World Heritage in Danger, and explained that India had received Emergency Assistance for a management plan for the site of Hampi. As fourteen properties had received such assistance and since the funds were already limited, it suggested creating a separate budget line for sites on the Danger List.

170. The **Evaluator**, in response to the questions raised about the recommendation on training, explained that it referred to training for staff of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies in best practices of disaster mitigation so that they could better assess and provide advice on requests for Emergency Assistance. The findings were only preliminary, a longer report was to be expected and a focal point should be established in the World Heritage Centre for the future handling of Emergency Assistance. She further elaborated on experiences in the World Bank, where there had been extensive evaluations of the emergency assistance that accounted for 20% of the Bank's lending. Rapid allocation of funds for humanitarian issues was justified, but in other cases it was considered better not to jump to quick solutions and instead to properly design assistance programmes and their follow-up. In conclusion, an average of two to three months was needed for approval of an Emergency Assistance request, which, although it could take longer, could not be considered to be particularly rapid.

171. **ICOMOS** said that when disasters struck, plans were needed and it referred to the case of Dubrovnik, where tiles were urgently needed to repair damage. Only scarce funds were available to

save monuments. Specialists should continue searching for solutions.

172. The **Chairperson** concluded that the report reflected many of the Committee's concerns, reiterating that Emergency Assistance was important, and although the budget for it was limited, its impact did not have to be. The Draft Decision needed to be rewritten, under the coordination of a Committee member. A drafting group was therefore established consisting of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia and Argentina.

ITEM 14. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

ITEM 14A TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 15 MAY 2004 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Document

WHC-04/28.COM/14^A

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14^A

WHC-04/28.COM/14A Rev

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14A add

173. The **Secretariat** presented the working documents, noting that document WHC-04/28.COM/14A Rev contained corrections to clerical errors observed by States Parties. It also presented orally a revised version of Draft Decision 28 COM 14A, replacing its paragraph 2 with the following text:

174. « 2. Noting also that the recently completed study of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN would contribute significantly to the discussion concerning the improved use of tentative lists as requested by the Committee in its Decision **27 COM 8A**, »

175. The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Committee had decided that all draft decisions and revised draft decisions should be presented in written form.

176. The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed that the agenda item be left open in order to incorporate discussions on Global Strategy under item 13.

177. The **Chairperson** agreed and suggested that the Committee continue with the rest of agenda item 14. He stated that in total 48 nominations were to be reviewed, including 30 new nominations of which 24 were cultural sites and 6 natural, as well as 7

extensions, 10 deferrals and 1 transboundary nomination. There was also one emergency nomination, and one proposed name change.

Tuesday, 29 June 2004 (evening session)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

178. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee about the proposed name change for Miguasha Park, which was adopted without debate (**28 COM 14B.1**).

179. The **Secretariat** then presented the list of five States Parties that had withdrawn their nominations (**28 COM 14B.2**). In response to an observation made by the Delegation of **Portugal**, it said that the omission of one of the withdrawn sites from the French version of the working document would be corrected in the final decision.

180. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the process of preparing draft decisions could be expedited if they were prepared by the Advisory Bodies themselves in collaboration with the Centre. Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.3** had been prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

181. Before going on with the first nomination, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for the floor to raise a number of general issues, including different standards used in the Advisory Bodies' evaluation of cultural and natural sites, and consistency in recommendations, in particular regarding management and serial nominations.

182. The Delegation of **India** also referred to evaluation processes and to the lack of time available to States Parties that might wish to clarify issues raised in the published evaluations.

183. **IUCN** described its evaluation procedures, recalling its founding principles that guided the rigorous evaluation process it undertook in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* in order to reach a recommendation, making full use of its expert network.

184. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Advisory Bodies to present the evaluations of new nominations.

Property	Hawar Islands
Id. N°	N 1126
State Party	Bahrain
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

185. IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that the revised recommendations in *WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Add* based on additional information had been prepared prior to the session.

186. The Delegation of **Oman** agreed with the proposed deferral of the nomination.

187. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it did not have the revised recommendations.

188. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Chile** noted that they too did not have the revised recommendations. They said that they would like to hear the opinion of the State Party concerned on the recommendations.

189. The Delegations of **Saint Lucia**, **Kuwait**, **India**, and **Oman** expressed concern that the recommendation imposed the idea of transboundary nomination as a requirement for inscription.

190. The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** informed the Committee that a transboundary nomination would be a complex issue to address with neighboring countries, and that it should not be a condition for inscription.

191. The Delegations of **Lebanon**, **Colombia** and **China** endorsed the IUCN recommendation for deferral.

192. The Delegation of **Benin** considered that the wishes of the States must not be ignored, as some may wish to reject the proposed initiatives. Care must also be taken not to delay the action, already well advanced, on the part of the State Party. Even if the State Party subscribed to the recommendation of IUCN, it was important not to create a precedent by subordinating a nomination proposal to the consent of other States. In this particular case, the authenticity of the site should remain the principal element to be considered.

193. The Delegation of **Portugal** pointed out that five States Parties had withdrawn their nominations after an unfavorable recommendation by IUCN. Others had not done so, and their nominations had been the subject of a revised draft decision. There

should be a standardized procedure for responding to evaluations.

194. The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification concerning the timeframe for deferral.

195. The Delegation of **St. Lucia** said that the nomination had merit on its own and that a transboundary nomination should not be a prerequisite once the integrity issues had been solved.

196. The **Chairperson** said that there was a clear sense in the Committee that a transboundary nomination should not be made a precondition for listing.

197. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that a transboundary nomination could be an option to be encouraged rather than a requirement.

198. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the remarks of the Delegation of Portugal. It proposed that the State Party should be given an opportunity to react at an early stage after an independent evaluation by an expert. Furthermore, it requested that documents should not be altered after they had been distributed.

199. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the idea of a transboundary site, and suggested the deferral of this nomination and that a decision be taken at the 29th session in this respect.

200. The Delegation of **Benin** considered that one could not defer the decision regarding this site without stating the reasons for this deferral.

201. The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concerns voiced by the Delegation of the Netherlands, but noted that should new information be made available it may be appropriate to change a draft decision.

202. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, referring to Benin's question to IUCN, suggested that one reason for deferral was to provide for a larger area.

203. The Delegation of **India** commented on the lack of opportunities to react to evaluations - previously, the Bureau had been a sort of filter.

204. The Delegation of **Nigeria** reminded the Committee that the site had been a Ramsar wetland site since 1997.

205. IUCN, noting that species did not respect national boundaries, said that it had not intended to impose a transboundary nomination as a condition.

206. The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, Oman, St. Lucia** and **Benin** asked IUCN to be more explicit on whether a transboundary nomination would be necessary for inscription of the site.

207. **IUCN** informed the Committee that the site as presently defined did not meet the criteria for inscription.

208. The Delegation of **Kuwait** asked whether any precedents existed for the imposition of a joint inscription by the Committee.

209. The Delegation of **Colombia** noted the similarity of the nominations by Bahrain and Portugal with regard to the size, shape and connectivity of the areas concerned.

210. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether it was an ecosystem issue or one of flora and fauna, and stressed that the site was quite important in the region.

211. **IUCN** said that there had been a number of transboundary cases, including the Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, and sites in Mongolia and Russia, Viet Nam and Laos. It would be happy to work with States Parties to avoid situations such as that of Iguacu, which came under two separate entries on the List.

212. The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** said that independent reports declared the site to be unquestionably of outstanding universal value.

213. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether IUCN gave any weight to such reports.

214. The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested deferring the nomination without giving a reason.

215. The Delegation of **Norway** reiterated the questions asked by Saint Lucia and the United Kingdom.

216. The Delegations of **Colombia, Portugal** and **India** suggested deferring the nomination and encouraging the State Party to consider accepting wording that would make a transboundary nomination optional.

217. The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated that the site was of importance as the habitat of several rare species.

218. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed an amendment to the revised draft decision reading "... to allow the State Party to consider an appropriate extension to the site".

219. The draft decision, as amended, was adopted.

220. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that working document *WHC-04/28.COM/14B, Add.* contained revised Draft Decisions on certain proposed nominations.

Wednesday, 30 June 2004 (morning)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUESDAY 29 JUNE EVENING)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra
Id. N°	N 1167
State Party	Indonesia
Criteria	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

221. IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that it recommended inscribing it on the basis of natural criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). In light of discussions held with the State Party with regard to the best way to address the serious threats to the property, it had proposed an alternative recommendation that would not involve its immediate inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

222. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the recommendation for inscription but wondered whether the proposed timescale of two years for the monitoring mission was realistic.

223. The Delegation of **India** said that it was reassured that IUCN had revised its earlier recommendation. It stressed that the threats mentioned by IUCN had to be placed in perspective. On the issue of illegal logging, the fact that impact was limited given the total surface area of the serial property must be taken into account. Furthermore, the planned road mentioned by IUCN was situated outside the proposed World Heritage property. Like the Delegation of the United Kingdom, it considered that the time frame suggested seemed inappropriate, and it did not agree with IUCN that the proposed mission should assess the need to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as the normal procedures set out in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, including consultation with the State Party concerned, should be followed.

224. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated IUCN and stated that it strongly supported the inscription

of the property. It asked the State Party to give its view on the recommendation.

225. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** said that it was pleased with the recommendation of IUCN to inscribe the property and affirmed its government's commitment to the conservation of the property. The level of threat needed to be assessed further to review the need to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The construction of the road, which was planned outside the site, was currently under review and the extent to which it might pose a threat to the site would be reviewed further. With regard to the issue of illegal logging, it was indeed a problem but one that had to be put in perspective given the size of the site. The Delegation also agreed that an action plan for long-term management needed to be elaborated and that a mission could be sent to the site within two years of inscription to evaluate the threat to it in cooperation with the State Party. The property was the first serial nomination in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its very large size, as well as the social and economic context of the country, presented special challenges for its conservation. It expressed the hope that it would be able to count on the support of the Committee and the international community in facing those challenges.

226. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the recommendation of IUCN but agreed with the concerns voiced by previous speakers with regard to the time frame for the mission. It fully supported the statement by IUCN in its evaluation that it was only possible to compare like with like.

227. The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the recommendation of IUCN in favour of inscription but also shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of India with regard to the possible inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

228. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the inscription.

229. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the nomination of the property and approved IUCN's last recommendation requesting an action plan, but doubted whether it was possible to send a mission within two years and consequently suggested a revision of the time frame.

230. The Delegation of **China** supported the recommendation for inscription and the proposal to allow for a more appropriate time frame.

231. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, whilst deeming that the property possessed all the qualities required

for inscription on the List, shared the concerns expressed by the Delegations of India and Saint Lucia and therefore proposed to wait a few years before undertaking a mission, thus allowing the time necessary for the implementation of an emergency plan. It furthermore requested that in paragraph 3 (ii) of the decision, the expression *urgent review* be translated into French as *révision urgente* and not *étude urgente* of the road project.

232. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its strong support for inscription and requested clarification from IUCN on the urgent measures to be taken by the State Party. On the issue of the road, it stated that although the planned location might be outside the proposed World Heritage property, it was still within the Leuser ecosystem and might thus affect the site.

233. **IUCN** pointed out that the Committee must realize that the site was one of the most threatened in the world and was in fact already subject to some degradation. Certain donor agencies had spent substantial amounts of money to try to avert the threats, with limited success. The threats were detailed in the working documents and required constant monitoring, which was why IUCN recommended a monitoring mission within two years of inscription. It referred to the case of the Galapagos Islands, where a similar procedure had been followed.

234. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the recommendation made by IUCN, including the proposed monitoring mission and time frame.

235. The Delegation of **Lithuania** also supported inscription and was satisfied with the commitment of the State Party to address the threats.

236. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the recommendation for inscription as well as the need to give more time to the State Party, especially since there seemed to be a need to educate the local communities on the importance of the conservation of the site. It therefore proposed extending the time frame for the mission to three years.

237. The Delegation of **Colombia**, whilst in favour of inscription, also pointed to the current level of threat and suggested that the Committee should therefore consider placing the property immediately on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as that could help mobilize the necessary international assistance.

238. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated the State Party and supported the recommendations of IUCN. It proposed the establishment of two plans. One, short-term,

followed by a mission during the second year, and the other for a longer term.

239. The **Secretariat** said that, although substantial international support had been given to sustainable development projects around the site, very little direct support had been given for conservation. The Committee might like to take the opportunity to consider how projects developed around World Heritage properties with the support of donor agencies could take into account the Committee's recommendations.

240. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted the willingness of the Committee to inscribe the property and proposed adopting the Draft Decision, which had apparently been proposed in consultation with the State Party.

241. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** stated that it disagreed with the assessment of the level of threat by IUCN and proposed that the envisaged mission should evaluate the level of threat in consultation with the State Party.

242. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, insisted that the concerned State Party may only take the floor when asked for precise information by the Committee.

243. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia to consider danger listing, as that would raise awareness about the conservation of the property.

244. The Delegation of **India** endorsed the point of order raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia but said that it would like to request the information from the State Party anyway. It had concluded from the information given by the State Party that further consultations were needed with IUCN and suggested that perhaps a system of regular reporting should be put in place. It also proposed revising paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision to include a reference to paragraphs 86-93 of the *Operational Guidelines* on danger listing.

245. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was concerned that the recommendation by IUCN might not be fully understood by the State Party and pointed to the imminent danger which demanded immediate action and an emergency action plan. That had to be part of the decision; otherwise, the Netherlands would support the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia for immediate danger listing. It therefore requested that the Delegation of Indonesia provide information on what immediate action the State Party intended to take to improve the conservation of the property.

246. IUCN reiterated that the State Party was in agreement on the existence of the threats although there might be a difference of opinion with regard to their level, and that the Draft Decision had been proposed in agreement with the State Party.

247. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** confirmed that it agreed that the threats existed and said that steps were already being taken to address them. It also agreed with the recommendation of IUCN to send a mission in two years to evaluate whether the site should be on the List of World Heritage in Danger according to the usual rules and procedures.

248. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there was consensus among the Committee to inscribe the property and proposed that a State of Conservation report be requested from the State Party by the 29th session instead of already recommending a monitoring mission. That would allow the Committee to reassess at that time the necessity of sending a mission.

249. The Delegation of **Chile** agreed that the site should be inscribed and proposed that since the discussion was focusing on the time frame and specific outcomes, the Committee should discuss the Draft Decision.

250. The Delegation of **India** agreed with the proposal tabled by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, since it addressed the concerns of the State Party, IUCN and the Committee.

251. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** agreed with that proposal and informed the Committee that it was willing to assist the State Party in its efforts to strengthen the conservation of the property.

252. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, said that during deliberations on nominations, observers were not allowed to take the floor.

253. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, concerned that the State Party was not in agreement with IUCN, recalled that the Committee was the sole judge as to the degree of severity of the threat being faced by the property. After having firstly envisaged an immediate inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it had finally decided to agree upon the solution put forward by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. Referring to the case of the nomination of Vienna, it recalled that if the recommendations of the Committee were not taken into account, it had the right to act in consequence.

254. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that it was the Committee that had the final say. It

proposed either extending the time frame to three years, or adhering to the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

255. The Delegations of **Colombia, Kuwait, Oman, New Zealand** and **Norway** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

256. The Delegation of **Benin**, while wishing to support the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, was not convinced that the time frame proposed was appropriate. It judged the proposal by the Delegation of Saint Lucia more precise and was willing to support it if that of the Delegation of the United Kingdom was not further clarified.

257. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the proposal by the United Kingdom as long as it would not prevent the Committee from considering danger listing at its 29th session based on the State of Conservation report presented by the State Party.

258. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.5** as amended by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

Property	Iulissat Icefjord
Id. N°	N 1149
State Party	Denmark
Criteria	N (i) (iii)

259. IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should be inscribed on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iii).

260. The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway** and **Oman** expressed their support for inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

261. Noting broad consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.8** adopted.

Property	Coiba National Park
Id. N°	N 1138
State Party	Panama
Criteria	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

262. IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and noted that new information presented to it by the State Party prior to the present session had been significant enough to warrant a change in its original recommendation. The information related specifically to a significant increase in the proposed size of the marine component of the property. However, the nomination papers did not reflect the

change. It recommended therefore that the nomination should be deferred until the new proposed national law establishing the national park had been approved and a revised, expanded nomination submitted for evaluation.

263. The Delegations of the United Kingdom, Saint Lucia, the Netherlands, Colombia, New Zealand and Argentina supported the IUCN recommendation.

264. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus in the Committee and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.10** adopted.

Property	Pitons Management Area
Id. N°	N 1161
State Party	Saint Lucia
Criteria	N (i) (iii)

265. **IUCN** presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should not be considered for inscription under natural criterion (iii), and that it be deferred in regard to criterion (i) until such time as studies could determine the exact nature of the property's volcanic origins.

266. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested additional information from IUCN with regard to the underwater aspects of the site and concerning the apparent inconsistency between the ICOMOS and IUCN interpretations of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value.

267. **IUCN** replied that it considered that the concept of Outstanding Universal Value must be viewed from a global perspective and that it attempted to apply the criterion as strictly as possible. Such were the requirements imposed by the *Operational Guidelines*. It repeated its recommendation that the inscription should be deferred and not rejected outright. In respect to the underwater component, it repeated the information contained in the evaluation report, noting that the principal underwater features supporting the nomination related to geological features and not biological values.

268. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought more information from the State Party on the question of the property's integrity.

269. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** informed the Committee that IUCN had assessed 15 variables for integrity, and had been satisfied with almost all of them. With regard to the institutional framework variable, the Delegation noted that the current framework, though interim, was fully functional and in the process of being formalized. Marine

sedimentation had been noted as an issue, but the problem was being comprehensively addressed. It corrected the IUCN evaluation, noting that only two hotels were located in the property, and not four. It concluded that, in its opinion, the conditions of integrity were fully met.

270. The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the State Party and expressed its concern regarding the evaluation procedures used by IUCN. It questioned the comparison of sites of very different size, as such comparisons were rather difficult and it was hard to see how meaningful conclusions could be reached. The underwater nature of the geological features should be taken into consideration.

271. The Delegation of **Benin** judged unsatisfactory the explanation provided by IUCN. At the present time, when the adoption of the regional approach is recommended, how to justify the fact that the aesthetic value of a property is recognized at the regional level but is no longer valid at the global level?

272. The Delegation of **India** said that it had found it hard to understand the rationale for IUCN's recommendation to defer. It appeared to be based on the lack of geological studies and on the scientific uncertainty on the origins of the site. The Delegation wondered what information was still required before a conclusion could be reached and expressed concern that the requisite studies might take a long time to carry out.

273. **IUCN** noted the difficulties in evaluating properties for criterion (i) and said that it was currently reviewing methodologies. It emphasized that there continued to be uncertainties as to the volcanic origins of the property's main features, and explained that it had proposed a deferral of the nomination until its volcanic origins could be properly assessed. Even if that issue was resolved, the nomination would likely not meet conditions required for natural criterion (i). IUCN also noted that the site had great natural beauty but that no clear framework existed under which that attribute could be objectively assessed. IUCN's recommendation had been based on previous decisions made by the Committee. In general, the Committee needed to be very cautious with natural criterion (iii), as there were only a small number of islands inscribed under it and the Committee had rejected several other proposals to inscribe islands under that criterion.

274. The Delegation of **India** said that the proposal for deferral was based on a lack of knowledge of the nature of the site's origins, and not on integrity issues. It asked for clarification as to whether the site was volcanic or not, and whether other features

under which the nomination had been prepared had been considered in IUCN's evaluation.

275. IUCN responded that it was necessary to consider the site in a comparative context, and that it was definitely a volcanic feature. The feature was, however, only a narrow manifestation of a large variation of volcanic features in the world. The comparative analysis in the evaluation report suggested that the site was not in the same league as other volcanic sites and was of only secondary interest to volcanic science. It stressed that the feature was so narrow as to be difficult to be considered important at the global level.

276. The Delegation of **Colombia** raised the issue of States Parties with no World Heritage properties and suggested that paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was somewhat perplexing given Saint Lucia's earlier comments on integrity. It requested further information from the State Party on the issue of the property's management status and on the government's commitment to conservation of the site.

277. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** described the measures taken by its government and referred the Committee to the relevant paragraphs in the evaluation report.

278. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the IUCN recommendation not to inscribe the site under natural criterion (iii), but questioned the recommendation with regard to criterion (i). The property had been nominated against the background of a globally recognized, important regional volcanic phenomenon. It referred to a recent World Heritage workshop in the Caribbean, where transboundary and serial nominations had been discussed as a possible means of identifying potential World Heritage properties in that region. Recognizing the regional importance of the volcanic phenomenon to which Saint Lucia's Pitons belonged, the Delegation suggested a possible strategy of a phased serial nomination, which could allow States Parties in the region to bring forward nominations at their own pace. It proposed that the Committee should inscribe the property under criterion (i), with the recommendation that the State Party produce an action plan within a year to clarify how it would deal with the management issues raised by IUCN. It also recommended that the State Party collaborate with the Centre to review the regional volcanic features of the Caribbean with the objective of developing a regional nomination based on the area's volcanic heritage.

279. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested a reaction from IUCN with regard to that proposal.

280. IUCN noted that there was merit in the proposal of considering a regional transboundary serial nomination based on volcanic heritage.

281. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

Wednesday, 30 June 2004 (afternoon)

**ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE
LIST (CONTINUED FROM WEDNESDAY 30
JUNE MORNING)**

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

282. The Delegation of **Portugal** had no objection to the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. However, paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision suggested the possibility of re-submitting the nomination as a cultural landscape. It requested more information from IUCN on the matter, and sought the opinion of the State Party on that option.

283. IUCN replied that the possibility of a cultural landscape nomination was a suggestion only and a proper opinion would need to come from ICOMOS. IUCN's field visit had revealed apparent possibilities for such a nomination, or, alternatively, for development as a Biosphere Reserve.

284. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that various options had been assessed before the site had been nominated, but experts had advised the State Party not to pursue a cultural landscape designation.

285. The Delegation of **Egypt** did not consider the cultural landscape proposal to be relevant. The proposal to consider the site as a potential Biosphere Reserve was the State Party's to consider. A transboundary nomination might warrant more attention, and the State Party should consider that option. However, the site should be inscribed on its own merits.

286. The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed that the property should be inscribed under natural criteria (i) and (iii) and did not consider that IUCN had clearly defended its evaluation. It repeated its concerns regarding the difficulty of carrying out comparative analyses, the absence of research, which had been

the grounds for proposing deferral, and the fact that, although the conditions for site integrity appeared to be met, the evaluation had concluded that that was not the case. It suggested that paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision should be modified accordingly, paragraph 5 should be deleted and paragraph 4 maintained.

287. The Delegation of **Oman** favoured inscription under natural criterion (i) and perhaps criterion (iii), subject to further studies.

288. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. In light of the discussion on the Global Strategy, it noted that the Committee had a duty to make the *Convention* more accessible to developing countries and small island developing states.

289. The Delegation of **Chile** supported inscription based on the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

290. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, returning to the question of integrity and management of the site, indicated a contradiction in the IUCN document: on the one hand, the State Party is congratulated for the management plan and, on the other the implementation of this plan is questioned. Furthermore, commitment of the population which is referred to is often a more effective component for the conservation of a site. Whilst supporting the proposal by the United Kingdom, the Delegation insisted that a transboundary extension should not be a condition for inscription.

291. The Delegation of **China** also supported the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom. The Committee should disregard IUCN's recommendation that Saint Lucia should consider a cultural landscape nomination.

292. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** disagreed with the comment on the conditionality of a transboundary nomination made by the Delegation of Lebanon, and suggested that the nomination should be deferred to allow for the development of a serial transboundary nomination that would better reflect the volcanic heritage of the Caribbean. It suggested that the title of the nomination should reflect the regional nature of the longer-term phased nomination.

293. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the inscription of the site, considering that it should be inscribed for its intrinsic merits. It moreover requested that IUCN respond to the issue of contradiction raised by Lebanon.

294. The Delegation of **India** said that the property warranted inscription based on its own qualities and that the State Party alone should decide whether or not it wished to pursue a serial transboundary nomination.

295. The **Chairperson** said that the Committee agreed that the property should be inscribed under natural criteria (i) and (iii) and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.11**, as amended, adopted.

Property	Cape Floral Region Protected Areas
Id. N°	N 1007 Rev
State Party	South Africa
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

296. **IUCN** presented the site and its evaluation report, a case that showed that a Committee decision to defer could facilitate the production of excellent nominations. IUCN recommended inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

297. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the Advisory Body's recommendation.

298. The Delegation of **Benin** underscored the evident qualities of the site and congratulated the State Party for the efficiency demonstrated in the preparation of the management plans and the establishment of other projects for the promotion of the site. Seeing that no objection was raised concerning the State Party nomination or the IUCN recommendation, it proposed that the site be inscribed by unanimity.

299. Decision **28 COM 14B.12** to inscribe the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) was adopted by acclamation.

300. The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its gratitude with humbleness, honour and excitement for the inscription of South Africa's sixth World Heritage site. It remarked upon the establishment of the innovative programme, CAPE (Cape Action for People and the Environment), associated with the Cape Floral Region and the site's excellent position in terms of tourism which could generate jobs and revenue.

Property	Paleohabitat of Tarnóc
Id. N°	N 667 Rev
State Party	Hungary
Criteria	N (i)

301. **IUCN** presented the site and its evaluation report and said that it was IUCN's third evaluation not recommending inscription under criterion (i).

302. The **Chairperson** said that the National Office of Cultural Heritage in Hungary had sent a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and asked that it be read out.

303. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the letter received on 25 June 2004 requesting “a suspension of the decision-making process” and a new evaluation by IUCN. He said that that would not be possible because no such procedure was provided for in the Committee’s *Rules of Procedure*.

304. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended the thorough job done by the Advisory Body and put two questions to the State Party concerned. The first concerned the recommendation to consider the site for designation under the UNESCO Geoparks programme, which, according to the Delegation, would serve the primary objective, namely, conservation. Secondly, if IUCN came to Hungary for another evaluation, what would then be put forward as new information?

305. The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** thanked China for hosting the 28th session and explained that to its knowledge the property had been evaluated for the Committee only once, in 1992. The second time, it had not been dealt with, as the dossier had been considered incomplete, whereas the present dossier contained a completely new nomination.

306. In response to the Delegation of the Netherlands, it stated that first, the recommendation to join the Geoparks initiative was an exciting one, but that the Delegation could not take a decision on that. In response to the second question, it referred to a 2002 IUCN study on geological history and the history of life on Earth, which called attention to the lack of fossil sites from the Miocene Era. The nomination in question could fill that gap, and a deferral would enable a comparative study, further discussion and a clearer understanding of the site’s Outstanding Universal Value.

307. The Delegation of **India** asked whether the site’s lesser diversity and smaller scale, as compared to similar sites in Canada, Australia and the United States, for instance, had played any role in the assessment. It said that fossil sites were rare and while they might not be of Outstanding Universal Value on their own, they were important for the larger picture. It wondered whether possibilities for serial transboundary nominations with similar sites in Europe could be considered.

308. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, following India’s comment, requested clarification on the possibility of overlaps with regard to the site’s biodiversity with the other sites mentioned in the comparison.

309. The Delegation of **Portugal** said that it supported the nomination as a complement to existing fossil sites on the World Heritage List. It asked whether a deferral would help further reflection about a systematic study.

310. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked upon the clear recommendation by the Advisory Body and requested IUCN to explain whether deferral would allow new insights concerning the site’s Outstanding Universal Value.

311. **IUCN** said that deferral was always an option and that if the Committee so wished, it would conduct another evaluation in addition to those carried out in 1986 and 1993. The latest evaluation had been carried out by a respected expert, who considered that the site was not of Outstanding Universal Value. Furthermore, many such sites existed, numbering perhaps in the thousands, and the site under discussion was not outstanding with regard to the Miocene period. A new evaluation would be costly, but IUCN would abide by the Committee’s decision.

312. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** remarked that following the IUCN evaluation, the Hungarian authorities had requested a new evaluation in a letter received by the World Heritage Centre on 18 June 2004.

313. The Delegation of **China** commended the Advisory Body on its work. At the same time, it appreciated the State Party’s confidence in the *Convention* and said that it would support giving it another chance to improve the dossier and the site’s management.

314. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** did not agree with that proposal.

315. The Delegation of **Argentina** questioned the Advisory Body’s statement that there were “thousands” of fossil sites. Given the interest of the site, and the time factor working against its conservation, the Delegation would support a deferral.

316. The Delegation of **Oman** said that it would support a deferral in response to IUCN’s flexibility.

317. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to page 9 of the English version of the working document (p.10 in the French version), and in response to the statement by the Russian Federation, asked whether the letter received on 18 June contained important new information for another evaluation, and whether it was worth envisaging a second opinion other than IUCN’s.

318. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the State Party's perseverance was exemplary, which no doubt would guarantee proper management of the site, and therefore it did not object to a deferral.

319. The **Chairperson** declared the decision to defer nomination of the Paleohabitat of Tarnóc in Hungary adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.13**)

Property	Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve
Id. N°	N 1023 Rev
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

320. **IUCN** presented the site and its evaluation report and explained that the site had been nominated under a different name in 2000, evaluated in 2002, withdrawn on the issue of the marine boundaries and was at that time recommended for inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

321. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Russian Federation and supported the inscription of the site. It asked **IUCN** whether the recommendation in the Draft Decision that a management plan should include a tourism strategy was meant to prevent or encourage tourism.

322. **IUCN** referred to paragraph 44 (b) (v) of the *Operational Guidelines* and explained that there were no significant threats to the site, but that in the future tourism and maintaining World Heritage values had to be considered with a view to mitigating impact.

323. The Delegations of **Lithuania, China** and **Norway** favoured inscription.

324. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support for inscription, but raised concerns about management in relation to the site's rich diversity.

325. The Delegation of **Nigeria** thanked **IUCN** and expressed its support for inscription.

326. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support, but also raised concerns about management, asking how the State Party was going to manage the site.

327. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** assured the Committee that the management plan would be ready before the arrival of the mission foreseen in the decision.

328. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, declared that the Natural System of "Wrangel

Island" Reserve of the Russian Federation was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv). (Decision **28 COM 14B.14**)

329. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** warmly thanked the participants at the meeting, the experts having examined the nomination, the Secretariat and Committee members. It underlined the importance that this inscription held for the population of the autonomous Republic of Tchouktches and for the economic development of the region.

Property	Western Caucasus (Extension to include the Teberdinskiy Reserve)
Id. N°	N 900 Bis
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

330. **IUCN** presented its evaluation report of the proposed extension of the Western Caucasus property in the Russian Federation to include the Teberdinskiy Reserve and said that it had been inscribed in 1999 under criteria (ii) and (iv), that the extension was proposed under all four criteria, and that its recommendation was not to approve the extension under any of the four criteria.

331. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** questioned Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.16**, given the **IUCN** recommendation in the working document in favour of a comprehensive assessment of all potential sites in the Western Caucasus.

332. **IUCN** said that the recommendation for a comprehensive assessment should indeed stand.

333. The Delegation of **India** asked whether **IUCN** was recommending a serial nomination for the site.

334. **IUCN** said that the region had a number of potential World Heritage sites that merited further study as possible components of a future serial nomination, and referred to paragraph 19 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

335. The Delegation of **India** observed that clearer guidelines were needed with regard to serial and transboundary nominations.

336. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked **IUCN** for its evaluation of the dossier and agreed that there was no need to recommend the extension of the site.

337. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.15** adopted and asked if there were any comments on the second Draft Decision relating to

the state of conservation of the existing Western Caucasus World Heritage site (Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.16**).

338. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the Committee had expressed its concern in 2001 and asked whether any new information had been presented by the State Party.

339. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** informed the Committee of the many difficulties encountered and recalled its willingness to propose the extension of the site even before having gathered the necessary information for the analysis of the situation concerning the integrity of the site already inscribed. It indicated that the report containing this information would be ready in February 2005.

340. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.16** adopted.

Property	Gough Island Wildlife Reserve (extension to include Inaccessible Island)
Id. N°	N 740 Bis
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	N (iii) (iv)

341. **IUCN** presented its evaluation report of the proposed extension of Gough Island Wildlife Reserve (United Kingdom) to include Inaccessible Island. The site had been inscribed in 1995 under criteria (iii) and (iv). It recommended extension of the site under the same criteria.

342. The Delegations of **China, South Africa** and **Colombia** expressed their support for extension.

343. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said it had no objection to the extension, but asked, in relation to tourism issues, how inaccessible Inaccessible Island was.

344. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the island was very inaccessible.

345. The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested renaming the property "Gough and Inaccessible Islands".

346. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the French version was incorrect and should read *Iles de Gough et Inaccessible*.

347. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether the extension involved more than one island.

348. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the extension involved one island.

349. **IUCN** said that Gough Island had been inscribed in 1995 and that the present extension concerned the inclusion of Inaccessible Island, which would make a total of two islands.

350. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether **IUCN** had actually visited Inaccessible Island.

351. The **Chairperson** declared that the extension to Gough Island to include Inaccessible Island of the United Kingdom was approved under existing criteria (iii) and (iv) (Decision **28 COM 14B.17**). The property would henceforth be known as Gough and Inaccessible Islands.

Property	Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Extension to include the Sector Santa Elena)
Id. N°	N 928 Bis
State Party	Costa Rica
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

352. **IUCN** presented its evaluation report of the extension of the Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Costa Rica) to include the Sector Santa Elena. The extension had been recommended by the Committee in 1999, at its 23rd session.

353. The Delegations of **Colombia, India** and **Saint Lucia** expressed their support for extension.

354. The Delegation of **Argentina** also expressed its support, in particular for paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision commending the State Party on its excellent work. It asked whether the site could be inscribed under criterion (i) as well.

355. **IUCN** said that the State Party had not nominated the property for inscription under criterion (i) and that the question was better directed to the Observer Delegation of Costa Rica.

356. The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported extension and congratulated the State Party on its work concerning legal issues.

357. The **Chairperson** declared that the extension to the Area de Conservación Guanacaste to include the Sector Santa Elena was approved under criteria (ii) and (iv).

358. The Observer Delegation of **Costa Rica** thanked the host country and local authorities, and the Committee for approving the Guanacaste

extension, which concerned one of the most important regions for conservation and management in Costa Rica and, indeed, the whole of Central America. The Delegation said that it was sure that the State Party would be happy to consider nomination under criterion (i) as well, as the area's geological formations were the oldest in the country.

Property	St. Kilda (renomination to include cultural criteria and extension to include marine area)
Id. N°	N/C 387 Bis
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

359. IUCN and ICOMOS presented their evaluation report of the mixed property.

360. The Delegation of **Egypt** said that while the Outstanding Universal Value of the natural aspects of the property was clear, it could not recognize any outstanding cultural value in its cultural aspects, and would appreciate clarification from ICOMOS on that point.

361. ICOMOS explained that the cultural value rested in a particular response of human activities to extreme conditions, and that the comparative analysis had confirmed that the property possessed cultural value of great interest.

362. The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party as a standard-setter in the management planning of heritage sites, and asked whether a management plan for the property had taken into account the extension and, if so, in what way the marine environment was managed, as it would be a useful example for other sites.

363. The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its support for the inscription of the property.

364. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, raising a methodology question, asked ICOMOS whether it would have made the same recommendation if the site had not already been inscribed for its natural values. In other words, must a mixed site obligatorily have both cultural and natural Outstanding Universal Values, or was it sufficient that a new cultural criterion be fulfilled to strengthen the recognition of Outstanding Universal Value on the natural side alone?

365. ICOMOS reiterated that the property represented a type of human settlement, whose inhabitants had subsisted on the bird population of the island. The property possessed cultural value that merited inscription in its own right.

366. The Delegation of **Nigeria** sought clarification as to whether the property was a fossil landscape, or an associative cultural landscape, whether it possessed any spiritual value, and whether it was an archaeological site. It asked what cultural value the property possessed, considering that the living population had evacuated the island in the 1930s.

367. The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed that the additional natural criteria were justified, endorsed the questions raised by the Delegations of Lebanon and India, and questioned the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed cultural criteria, particularly as it was a cultural landscape without a living community.

368. The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the Draft Decision and asked the State Party to make a statement.

369. The Delegation of **Benin**, on a point of order, observed that the United Kingdom could not be requested to defend a nomination at this stage. The questions put to the author of the nomination must refer to specific points.

370. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether the State Party considered the cultural criteria to be of Outstanding Universal Value.

371. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reiterated the point of order raised by the Delegation of Benin, considering that the question put by the Delegation of Lithuania remained insufficiently precise.

372. The Delegation of **Japan** asked whether the State Party considered that the property possessed Outstanding Universal Value in terms of the cultural criteria.

373. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the management plan had been revised in harmony with the revised nomination. The nominated property was a relict cultural landscape, one of the World Heritage categories recognizing the interaction between people and nature.

374. The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that while every site had some cultural value, the Committee must inscribe a site on the World Heritage List on the basis of its Outstanding Universal Value.

375. The Delegation of **Norway**, on a point of order, said that the State Party was not allowed to interpret the value of a nominated property.

376. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked ICOMOS to explain the phrase "human occupation in extreme conditions", which figured in its evaluation report.

377. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether it was the Advisory Body or the State Party that had suggested including cultural criterion (v), particularly because the nominated property was a relict cultural landscape. It encouraged the Committee to apply the same level of rigour to the nomination under discussion as it had to previous nominations.

378. **ICOMOS** said that in no case would vernacular architecture by itself be recognized as possessing Outstanding Universal Value. However, the particular cultural settings and human use could provide the context that gave the property, including its vernacular architecture, its Outstanding Universal Value.

379. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked the State Party to provide information as to how the population of the island had survived the challenging environment over the years and why that type of settlement system was worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List.

380. **ICOMOS** referred to the fragility of vernacular architecture and said that although the architecture on the island might not meet the cultural criteria, the property represented a certain type of human settlement of great interest. In response to the question posed by the Delegation of Lebanon, it explained that it was the link between culture and nature that was of significance and not the value of the vernacular architecture.

381. In response to the question raised by the Delegation of Colombia, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the islanders had managed to survive largely by subsisting on the bird population, and that the property offered an illustration of a unique and sustainable settlement system.

382. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription to extend the marine area. It also supported inscription as a cultural landscape representing close links between the natural and cultural aspects. A property of that nature would serve as an interesting case study for future nominations of relict cultural landscapes.

383. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that, while the natural criteria could be justified easily, the Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural aspects had yet to be clearly demonstrated, as the fragility of vernacular architecture and a sustainable settlement system did not constitute a valid basis for inscription.

384. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its support for the nomination, as the property

demonstrated inextricable links between nature and culture as was also the case for the Maori culture in New Zealand.

385. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** summarized the preceding statements, indicating that cultural and natural aspects of the property were closely linked, and that the Outstanding Universal Value of the natural criteria was not disputed. Following that reasoning, it asked whether the cultural criteria could also be of Outstanding Universal Value by default. If that was the case, the use of criterion (v) could be justified but if not, the argument for inscription under criterion (v) could not be sustained. Nonetheless, it supported the Draft Decision as it stood.

386. The Delegation of **India** expressed its concern that there were no clear guidelines concerning the definition and values of vernacular architecture in a hostile environment and suggested that the State Party should carry out a comparative analysis. The Committee could examine the re-nomination under cultural criteria at a later stage.

387. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Draft Decision as it stood.

388. The **Chairperson** said that it was difficult to form a consensus and suggested that the inclusion of the cultural criteria be reviewed at a later stage.

389. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, on a point of order, said that the Committee had not yet reached a decision on the inclusion of cultural criteria.

390. The **Chairperson** remarked again on the difficulty of reaching consensus, and suggested that a comparative study on relict landscapes should be prepared by the State Party.

391. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed, following the suggestion of the Chairperson, to defer the examination of the nomination to take into account new cultural criteria and to encourage the State Party to carry out a comparative study of the cultural values of the property for future re-examination.

392. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, sought to clarify the statement made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

393. The **Chairperson** explained that the Committee would endorse the natural criteria and at the same time it would recommend that the State Party should carry out a comparative study on relict landscapes in extreme climatic and remote

geographical conditions to be examined at a later stage.

394. The Delegation of **United Kingdom** asked whether the Committee was discussing a possible deferral, as the term had not been mentioned until that point.

395. The **Chairperson** said that consensus had been reached and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.19** adopted as amended.

Property	Tomb of Askia
Id. N°	C 1139
State Party	Mali
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv)

396. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

397. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the inscription on the World Heritage List of this property of Outstanding Universal Value, all the more so as a traditional management structure was established and functioning satisfactorily.

398. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the ICOMOS evaluation was a good basis for a decision and strongly supported the inscription of the site.

399. The Delegation of **South Africa** declared that the nomination was a very important one, representing a unique aspect of Africa's heritage. It expressed its full agreement with the inscription of the site.

400. The **Chairperson**, noting with satisfaction the consensus among the Committee members, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.20** adopted and the site inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Property	Koutammakou the Land of the Batammariba
Id. N°	C 1140
State Party	Togo
Criteria	C (v) (vi)

401. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

402. The Delegation of **Benin** remarked that these traditional houses bear witness to a unique architecture in Africa only to be found in Togo and Benin, and indicated that the name of the property was commonly associated with those of the builders. However, it regretted that ICOMOS had not retained criterion (i) with regard to this site.

403. The Delegation of **China** suggested that the site should be inscribed by acclamation.

404. Decision **28 COM 14B.21** was adopted by acclamation.

405. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** fully supported the inscription. However, it asked ICOMOS for more precise information about the application of criterion (vi), which was referred to in its evaluation of the nomination.

406. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, on a point of order, expressed the hope that ICOMOS would be able to answer the question raised by the United Kingdom. If the answer could not be given at that time, it would hopefully come at a later stage.

407. Taking the floor at the invitation of the Chairperson, Mme Aguigah, Minister of Culture of **Togo** and member of the Observer Delegation, expressed her satisfaction with the inscription of this property, the first Togolese site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. After having thanked the members of the Committee and the World Heritage Centre for the assistance provided in the preparation of the nomination dossier, she said that henceforth her country was committed to the implementation of the *Convention*. She then paid tribute to the Chairperson of the Committee for his work as well as the Director-General of UNESCO for the action undertaken in the framework of the Global Strategy to encourage States Parties to implement the *Convention*. She thanked the Chinese authorities for their welcome and also paid tribute to the members of the Advisory Bodies and to the Secretariat for the work accomplished. Togo, she said, was committed to maintaining the site in a perfect state of conservation, thanks to the management plan, and would preserve its authenticity and integrity in the future.

Property	Portuguese City of Mazagan (El Jadida)
Id. N°	C 1058 Rev
State Party	Morocco
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

408. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

409. The Delegation of **Portugal** quoted a Portuguese poem referring to the site. It declared that it was clearly of Outstanding Universal Value. In addition, it testified to cooperation between Morocco and Portugal and the Delegation mentioned the recent creation of a Portuguese-Moroccan Heritage Centre.

410. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, though having no objection to the inscription of the site, asked what exactly the Committee was inscribing, since the last recommendation of the Bureau, based on the ICOMOS evaluation, had been to extend the site and it did not appear that the site had in fact been extended.

411. The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked ICOMOS for its evaluation and endorsed the position expressed by Portugal in supporting the inscription of the site based on criteria (ii) and (iv).

412. The Delegation of **Benin**, supporting the recommendation for inscription, indicated that similar contacts had been established between Benin and Portugal, that had encouraged links of cooperation and friendship. It welcomed the deep heritage consciousness of the Kingdom of Morocco which were reflected in the ICOMOS recommendation.

413. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its deep gratitude to ICOMOS for its presentation of the unique site, and thanked Portugal for its words. It stressed that the site was a prime example of peaceful coexistence between Christians, Muslims and Jews, and for that reason it endorsed its inscription.

414. The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the site was indeed an example of cooperation. It took the opportunity to state its opinion that all delegations should be able to express their position before the inscription of a site by acclamation.

415. The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support for the nomination of the site and recalled with satisfaction that what had once been a synonym of conflict now represented an example of peace between nations.

416. The Delegation of **Oman** endorsed the ICOMOS recommendation and congratulated the Moroccan Government on its efforts.

417. Referring to the question posed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that the boundaries of the site had been modified with the inclusion of the fossils beyond the ramparts. It supported the consensus in favour of the inscription of this property on the List.

418. Responding to the question of the United Kingdom, **ICOMOS** said that new information had been received in May 2004 that had resolved the concerns of the Bureau.

419. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM14B.23** adopted.

420. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** thanked both the Committee for the inscription of this site, emphasizing its unique character and good state of conservation, and the World Heritage Centre for the invaluable assistance provided during the preparation of the dossier. It also thanked the Delegation of Portugal for the moving words pronounced upon this inscription that set the tone of the event for Morocans and emphasized the obligations that such an inscription implied for them. It assured that all necessary steps would be taken to protect the site, and felt certain that cooperation with Portugal would be reinforced thanks to this inscription. Finally, it warmly thanked the Chinese authorities for their welcome.

Thursday, 1 July 2004 (morning)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUESDAY 30 JUNE AFTERNOON)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Wine Village Terraces
Id. N°	C 1122
State Party	Cyprus
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (v) CL

421. **ICOMOS** presented the property and its evaluation report. It drew the attention of the World Heritage Committee to a recently published thematic study on vineyards which had been distributed to Committee members.

422. The Delegation of **Benin** wished to know if the evaluation of the site had lacked expertise or whether the site was not of Outstanding Universal Value.

423. **ICOMOS** explained that, in its view, the nominated landscape was typical but not of Outstanding Universal Value as there were many sites of a similar kind.

424. For the Delegation of **Lebanon**, this dossier was an example of an incomplete dossier that the Centre should perhaps have refused. The Delegation concurred with the ICOMOS recommendation, considering that there were many similar sites in the region, of which a number were still active.

425. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed reservations regarding the Draft Decision, as the lack of information in the nomination dossier did not necessarily mean that the site was not of Outstanding Universal Value. Although the State Party was not present, it would be interesting to know whether it intended revising and resubmitting the dossier.

426. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the members of the Committee had not been provided with a copy of the ICOMOS thematic study on vineyards. It would however not disagree with the inscription of the property.

427. The Committee adopted Decision **28COM 14B.38**.

Property	Umm er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a)
Id. N°	C 1093
State Party	Jordan
Criteria	C (ii)(iv) (vi)

428. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

429. The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated ICOMOS for the good work accomplished during the evaluation process and for maintaining a continuous dialogue with the State Party. It expressed its satisfaction at the nomination of a property of undisputed universal value, as attested to by its artistic, historic and spiritual significance, and supported wholeheartedly its inscription on the World Heritage List according to the criteria recommended by ICOMOS. In particular, the Delegation of Egypt stressed the importance of the property in the spread of monotheism in the region, including the spread of Islam, recalling that the Prophet Mohammed had been led to his mission following a fateful encounter with a monk at Umm Er-Rasas, during one of his voyages.

430. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, commenting on the change in the ICOMOS recommendation further to the late submission of additional information on the management plan by the State Party, requested supplementary clarification on the precise standards applied by the Advisory Body in that respect. It seemed that some sites were deferred for lack of a management plan, and others inscribed.

431. **ICOMOS** explained that management plans should reflect the actual management system on the site. When a property was well-managed, but a management plan did not exist, ICOMOS usually recommended inscription of the site and requested the elaboration of a proper management plan. When, however, management at the site level was not satisfactory, ICOMOS recommended deferral of the nomination to enable the State Party to improve the situation on the ground. Ideally, it would be preferable to have both sound management at the site and a proper management plan. We are currently in a transitional period and there were still some ambiguities to be resolved. However, the future *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* should provide much clearer indications to States Parties on this issue. ICOMOS recommendations, at any rate, were based on professional judgment taking into account

a number of different issues and knowledge of the site's conditions.

432. The Delegations of **Oman, China and Kuwait** thanked ICOMOS for its presentation and expressed their support for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List under the proposed criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

433. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, acknowledging the explanations provided by ICOMOS concerning management plans, asked when the management plan for Umm er-Rasas would be ready and in place. It also asked ICOMOS how it had come to be convinced of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, considering that in the evaluation document presented to the members of the Committee it had referred to the lack of a comparative analysis as an obstacle to the evaluation of the site.

434. **ICOMOS** explained that the State Party had not provided a time frame in the nomination document, and that the two monitoring missions recommended by ICOMOS were also meant to examine that issue. The additional information provided by the State Party after the preparation of the document to which the Delegation of the Netherlands referred, on the other hand, contained sufficient elements to establish the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in comparison to similar sites in the region.

435. The Delegation of **Chile**, supporting the inscription of the property, expressed the hope that the State Party would abide by the commitments made and ensure the implementation of sound management at the site. It added that the case bore no relation whatsoever to that of the property of Saint Kilda, examined by the Committee on the previous day.

436. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that in the preceding few years, the presence of a management plan and comparative analysis had been considered a condition for the inscription of properties on the List. Given that there had been no time for proper consultations within the ICOMOS panel of experts due to the late submission of the management plan, which had not been provided to the Committee for its consideration, the Delegation expressed its concern as to how ICOMOS had reached its conclusions.

437. The Delegation of **India** said that clear guidelines on the requirements of a comparative analysis would be welcome, and agreed with the Delegation of Chile on the difference between the case of Umm er-Rasas and that of Saint Kilda.

438. Replying to the Delegation of the United Kingdom, **ICOMOS** explained that many of the experts involved in evaluating the property were familiar with the site and considered it to be of Outstanding Universal Value. However, insufficient information had been provided in the original nomination file. When additional elements had been transmitted by the State Party, ICOMOS had finally been convinced that the property deserved inscription.

439. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the inscription of the property on the List under criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

440. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the revised recommendation of ICOMOS, observed a certain lack of consistency. In particular, it noted that management plans could have been at the stage of drafts, completed or completed and implemented. The ICOMOS recommendation did not require the completion of the management plan, which in the view of the Delegation was an essential step towards its implementation on the ground. It suggested, therefore, including some wording to that effect in the text of the Committee's decision.

441. The Delegation of **Colombia**, supporting the inscription of the property, requested clarification on the issue of inappropriate conservation methods that, according to the report prepared by ICOMOS, were still being used at the site.

442. **ICOMOS** reassured the Committee on that point, explaining that recent information provided by the State Party had confirmed that Portland cement was no longer in use at the site.

443. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the inscription of the property, taking into account the additional information provided by ICOMOS and the declarations of Egypt, and was certain that ICOMOS had understood the messages addressed to it with regard to the evaluation procedure for management plans.

444. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the property on the List, and recommended that continuous dialogue be maintained between ICOMOS and States Parties throughout the evaluation process. However, it was the Committee that eventually had to take a decision, and the latter had not been provided with the additional information that had led ICOMOS to modify its original recommendation. It was an issue that must be addressed in the future.

445. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the inscription of the property and was satisfied with the

clarifications provided by ICOMOS on the management plan and Outstanding Universal Value.

446. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** questioned the need for two consecutive monitoring missions to the site, as proposed in the ICOMOS recommendation, since it would appear that good management was already in place. It suggested, instead, that the Committee should request the State Party to provide, within one year, the complete management plan of the property.

447. **ICOMOS** explained that the two proposed missions were meant to monitor implementation on the ground of the new management plan that was being finalized.

448. The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription of the property and suggested adopting the Draft Decision as proposed.

449. The **Secretariat** read out the text of the decision **28 COM 14B.22** as amended and adopted by the Committee.

450. The Observer Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Committee for its decision, which was most encouraging for those working on the site. Jordan would indeed keep its commitments in line with the recommendations made by the Committee.

Property	Royal Exhibition Building and Carleton Gardens
Id. N°	C 1131
State Party	Australia
Criteria	C (ii)

451. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

452. The Delegation of **Lebanon** questioned the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It felt that the architecture presented no innovative aspects, and that the integrity was compromised by the presence of a new building in the middle of the garden. With regard to the buffer zones, it considered that the four avenues that surrounded the building were not sufficient and did not share the ICOMOS view in this respect.

453. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the need to place the property in a broader framework. It recognized, however, the rarity of the building, irrespective of whether it displayed specific innovative architectural features. It supported the deferral of the nomination, but recalled the need for consistency, especially taking into account the

decision made by the Committee on the inscription of the Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia).

454. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its concern as to the process followed by the Advisory Body which had led to the recommendation to defer inscription. It was necessary to maintain consistency to ensure fairness and justice in the evaluation of properties. The Delegation asked whether the State Party had any information to provide with regard to the recommendation by ICOMOS that the property be re-submitted as a serial transboundary nomination encompassing other similar sites from other countries. It also requested clarification as to the level of legal protection in place for the proposed buffer zone.

455. The Delegation of **Portugal** stressed the importance of the International Exhibition Movement and the fact that the proposed property was the only extant building representing that phenomenon, and supported its inscription on the List. It requested further clarification from ICOMOS on whether the property had Outstanding Universal Value of its own. If so, then it could be examined on its own merits. Could the State Party provide more details about the comparative analysis?

456. **ICOMOS** explained that the nomination did not really make the case with respect to the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, hence the recommendation for deferral.

Coffee break (a.m.) - 1 July 2004

457. The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of New Zealand on the communication process between the State Party and the Advisory Body. Until what date, in the evaluation process, could a State Party provide information effectively to ICOMOS?

458. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** provided information about the comparative analysis and legal protection. The proposed building, the only surviving example of 21 built worldwide, conformed to the standards set for exhibition halls at the time of its construction, and in that respect it truly embodied the innovations introduced by the Exhibition Movement. Concerning legal protection of the buffer zone, there were provisions in place for the entire area adjacent to the nominated property which took into account heritage values at the local, federal and state level. In addition, a legally-binding management plan covering the entire buffer zone formed part of a general Urban Planning Instrument at the federal level.

459. The Delegation of **India** said that the nominated property had the potential for inscription,

given that it was the only surviving example of its kind. The nomination could therefore come back as a serial proposal, especially if the time frame considered for the Exhibition Movement was extended beyond 1915.

460. **ICOMOS** pointed out that there were still in existence examples of exhibition halls other than what were known as "Halls of Industry". If the timescale was extended to, say, 1945, then many exhibition buildings in North America could be included.

461. The Delegation of **Norway** recalled the comments provided by the World Tourism Board (ITB) and the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) on the overall importance of the nomination and asked ICOMOS for further clarification.

462. **ICOMOS** confirmed that TICCIH had also been consulted.

463. The Delegation of **Egypt** considered that the explanations provided by ICOMOS and the State Party were satisfactory, and suggested that more time should be allowed for the State Party to present a better case.

464. The Delegation of **Kuwait** said that, as suggested in the presentation made by ICOMOS, the property had Outstanding Universal Value, and proposed its inscription on the World Heritage List.

465. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supporting inscription under criterion (ii), recalled that the area now occupied by the new Melbourne Museum had always been intended for temporary buildings. It further stressed that the recommendation of ICOMOS was not consistent with previous conclusions reached by the Committee regarding, for instance, Hawar Islands (Bahrain) and the Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia), when the possibility of the State Party considering a transboundary nomination had been evoked. Finally, cultural properties should be assessed for authenticity, not integrity.

466. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the immediate inscription of the property, with a recommendation to look into the possibility of a subsequent serial nomination. The important testimony to the industrial heritage would improve the representivity of the List.

467. The Delegation of **Oman**, in the light of the preceding statements, supported the inscription of the property on the List.

468. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that, as clearly shown by the presentation, the site had Outstanding Universal Value both for its intrinsic artistic quality and its link with the Exhibition Movement, and supported its inscription on the List.

469. The Delegation of **Lebanon** shared the view of the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

470. The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property under criterion (ii).

471. The Delegation of **Benin** was perplexed with regard to the ICOMOS evaluation.

472. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its frustration at the overturning of the Advisory Bodies' recommendations, which seem to be changed always in the same direction, namely, in favour of inscription. The Committee had been too generous, and that had an impact on the credibility of the whole system. If, however, the Committee decided to inscribe the property, while recommending a future serial nomination, it should at least extend the time horizon of the possible future serial site beyond the 1815-1915 period recommended by ICOMOS.

473. The **Secretariat** read out the text of revised Decision **28 COM 14B.24**, which was adopted by the Committee.

474. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** made a short statement, thanking the Committee for its support.

Property	Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom
Id. N°	C 1135
State Party	China
Criteria proposed	C (i) (ii)(iii)(iv)(v)

475. The Vice-Chairperson (Nigeria) took the chair.

476. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

477. The Delegations of **India, Oman, Colombia** and **Nigeria** expressed their full support for the inscription of an exceptional property which would enrich the World Heritage List.

478. The Delegation of **Egypt**, underscoring the extraordinary quality of the well-preserved site, commended the State Party on the large buffer zone proposed. It supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

479. The Delegation of **Japan**, supporting the inscription of the nominated property, emphasized the particular artistic quality of its ancient wall paintings, dating from the period between the third century BC and seventh century AD.

480. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the inscription of the property on the List and suggested, in view of the similarity of the two sites, to proceed directly with the examination of the nomination relating to the Complex of Koguryo Tombs, submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

481. Responding to the comments of Benin, **ICOMOS** explained that the nomination of the Complex of Koguryo (Democratic People's Republic of Korea - DPRK) had come as a deferred property, and was therefore due to be examined at a later stage, according to the agenda. However, it drew the attention of the Committee to its recommendation to China that the possibility of a future joint transboundary nomination of the Koguryo culture.

482. The Delegation of **India** said that it would agree to the Committee discussing the nomination submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea before it discussed the property nominated by India (Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park).

483. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, emphasizing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, regretted that the ICOMOS evaluation did not do justice to it.

484. The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List under the proposed criteria. (Decision **28 COM 14B.25**)

485. The Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS, recognizing the great honour and responsibility deriving from the inscription. It stressed the importance of protecting the cultural diversity of humankind and assured the Committee of the full commitment of the Chinese authorities to protect the heritage site for present and future generations. Finally, it expressed the hope that the nomination put forward by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would be successful, and said that China intended to cooperate with the latter in the future to explore the possibility of a joint transboundary nomination of the Koguryo culture.

Thursday, 1 July 2004 (afternoon)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM THURSDAY, 1 JULY MORNING)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Complex of Koguryo Tombs
Id. N°	C 1091
State Party	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

486. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report noting that it was a serial nomination, and was, in addition, linked to the recently inscribed property in China, Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom.

487. The nomination had been deferred by the Committee at its 27th session (**Decision 27 COM 8C.19**). All relevant remaining technical issues had since been resolved. Those tombs that the ICOMOS evaluator had reported not being able to enter, were tombs that had yet to be excavated.

488. Additions to the site in the form of new monumental sculpture was intended to enhance the presentation of the site, and was not represented by the State Party as being original, ancient artifacts from the site.

489. With regard to the Committee's previous suggestion that a comparative study (with similar sites in China) could be necessary, ICOMOS remarked that such a study was no longer required, as the corresponding sites on the Chinese side of the border had already been nominated and inscribed on the World Heritage List.

490. It recommended to the Committee that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv).

491. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that, contrary to what was stated in the documentation before it, there were in fact 30 tombs in the nominated area.

492. The Delegation of **China** supported inscription, noting that it was the first nomination from the State Party.

493. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported inscription, and suggested that areas for cooperation between the

State Party and China could include excavation and conservation, in particular protection from environmental threats.

494. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, and inquired about the inclusion of risk preparedness measures in the property's management plan.

495. The Delegation of **Japan** supported inscription and congratulated the State Party on submitting an important nomination of a site of outstanding universal value.

496. The Delegation of **Oman** supported inscription and commended the cooperation between the State Party and China in the preparation of the two nominations.

497. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** welcomed the nomination and supported inscription.

498. The **Chairperson** noted that there was consensus in the Committee in favour of inscription and congratulated the State Party, declaring Decision **28 COM 14B.33** adopted, as amended to correct the number of tombs listed in the table.

499. The Observer Delegation of the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea** thanked the Committee and confirmed its commitment to conservation of the inscribed property, and to cooperation with UNESCO, China and the rest of the international community in the safeguarding of the site. It congratulated the Government of China on the inscription of the Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom.

500. The **Chairperson** noted that it was the first inscription of a property in the State Party on the World Heritage List.

501. **ICOMOS** clarified that the Complex of Koguryo Tombs (DPRK) was inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), while the Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom (China) was inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v).

Property	Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park
Id. N°	C 1101
State Party	India
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)(v) (vi)

502. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report, explaining why it had revised its recommendation.

503. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its appreciation for the efforts made in preparing the excellent management plan for the property, and supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

504. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked ICOMOS for its explanation and supported the inscription of the property on the List.

505. The Delegation of **Lebanon** strongly supported the inscription of the property on the List.

506. **ICOMOS** said that, of course, all management plans had to be monitored in their implementation, but that that one in particular, being new, required special attention. The property in question had in the past been managed by two different institutions. The Archaeological Survey of India had been in charge of the archaeological areas, while the Temples were looked after traditionally by the religious authorities. A single combined system had been introduced, and it was expected that some time would be necessary until it could become effective.

507. The Delegation of **Norway** supported the inscription under criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) and suggested that a decision to that effect be taken by acclamation.

508. The Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi). (Decision **28 COM 14B.26**) .

509. The Delegation of **India** made a short statement emphasizing the strong awareness of the local community of the importance of the property and the need to preserve it as a means of maintaining its own cultural identity.

Property	Pasargadae
Id. N°	C 1106
State Party	Islamic Republic of Iran
Criteria proposed	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

510. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

511. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, commending the presentation made by ICOMOS, asked why criterion (vi) had not been considered for the property, given its close association with Cyrus the Great and the major historic events that had marked the establishment of the first Achaemenid Empire.

512. **ICOMOS** confirmed that, in that perspective, Pasargadae had symbolic significance that might merit inscription under criterion (vi).

513. The Delegation of **Egypt** emphasized the artistic, historical and symbolic importance of the property, already recognized at the time of Alexander the Great, who was said to have paid his respects to the tomb of Cyrus and ordered its restoration. It therefore supported its inscription on the List.

514. The Delegation of **Colombia**, endorsing the proposed recommendation, asked whether the management plan for the property had taken into account the concerns of the local community and the risks presented by floods.

515. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that the local community had indeed been part of the decision-making process leading to the management plan, which also addressed the risk of floods.

516. The Delegation of **India**, expressing its appreciation for the large number of outstanding properties being nominated from the Asia region, supported the inscription of the property on the List.

517. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, joining previous speakers in supporting the proposed inscription of the site on the List, recalled that the Committee had requested the Advisory Bodies to assess the nominated properties against all criteria, and not just those proposed by the State Party. The Committee had also agreed not to consider new criteria at the time of the inscription of a property.

518. The Committee adopted the decision as proposed. (Decision **28 COM 14B.27**).

519. The Observer Delegation of **Iran** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS for their support, and stressed the close link of Pasargadae to the moral legacy of Cyrus the Great, and particularly to his message of tolerance and recognition for cultural diversity.

Property	Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range, and the Cultural Landscapes that surround them
Id. N°	C 1142
State Party	Japan
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

520. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

521. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Lithuania** supported inscription on the List under the proposed criteria.

522. The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the inscription of the property, which testified to the spread of the Shinto and Buddhist religions in the region.

523. The Delegation of **Oman** commended ICOMOS for the beautiful presentation of the property, which was obviously of Outstanding Universal Value in many respects. It thanked Japan for its cooperation with ICOMOS and, joined by the Delegations of **Portugal** and **China**, supported inscription under criteria (iii) and (iv).

524. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its appreciation for the excellent presentation by ICOMOS, and suggested that in the future the ICOMOS evaluations might include the name of their authors, as was the case in evaluations presented by IUCN.

525. **ICOMOS** explained that its reports were not the work of a single individual, but combined observations and contributions from a variety of sources. It would therefore be impossible to identify a single author of an evaluation.

526. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia, but expressed its reservations on the overall evaluation process. It would return to the issue at the end of the debate under the present agenda item.

527. The Committee adopted the decision as recommended by ICOMOS and inscribed the property of the Kii Mountain Range on the World Heritage List. (Decision **28 COM 14B.28**)

528. The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its gratitude to ICOMOS for its contribution, which was greatly appreciated.

Property	Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly
Id. N°	C 1145
State Party	Kazakhstan
Criteria	C (iii) CL

529. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

530. It drew the Committee's attention to the quantity of scientific research and documentation that had been undertaken in respect of the nominated property and the quality of the analysis of that documentation, which had established the Outstanding Universal Value and authenticity of the site.

531. It commended the site management plan, but recommended that the road intersecting the site should be moved to the periphery of the buffer zone, and that priority should be given to advancing the joint Norwegian-Kazakhstan project for the conservation of the site.

532. It recommended to the Committee that the nominated property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criterion (iii).

533. The Delegation of **Nigeria**, speaking in support of inscription, said that Tamgaly was an interesting site and asked whether absolute dates for it had been scientifically established.

534. The Delegation of **Lithuania** also supported inscription. It commended ICOMOS on its comprehensive evaluation of the nomination, and thanked Norway for its assistance to the State Party in preparing the site management plan.

535. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** also supported inscription, but noted that ICOMOS appeared to be applying inconsistent standards with regard to its recommendation for the inscription of Tamgaly, while recommending that the site of Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape in Azerbaijan should be deferred pending a comparative analysis.

536. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **China** supported inscription.

537. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.29** adopted.

538. He congratulated the State Party and asked the Secretariat to send the Committee's congratulations to the Government of Kazakhstan.

Property	Vegaøyan -- The Vega Archipelago
Id. N°	C 1143
State Party	Norway
Criteria	C (v) CL

539. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

540. It underscored the significance of the continuity from the Stone Age until the present time in the occupational use of the site for the sustained production of eiderdown. It was a traditional occupation that had resulted in a long-evolved cultural landscape consisting *inter alia* of in- and out-field systems, a tradition of building houses for both humans and for ducks from driftwood, and

other elements associated with the sustainable harvesting of eider duck down.

541. Historical documentation for the site was continuous from the eleventh century, and archaeological evidence had provided credible proof of the continuous use of the site for the past 10,000 years.

542. It recommended to the Committee inscription of the nominated property under criterion (v), and made several recommendations for the improved safeguarding of that fragile landscape in Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.45**.

543. The Delegation of **Benin**, joined by the Delegations of **Lithuania**, **Oman**, **China**, the **Netherlands** and **New Zealand**, supported the inscription.

544. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported inscription, noting that it was a nomination of a cultural landscape giving evidence of a unique culture which had survived for thousands of years in extreme circumstances through innovative and sustainable adaptation to the environmental and natural resources available therein.

545. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked for further explanation of how the property met the criterion of Outstanding Universal Value.

546. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported inscription and commended ICOMOS on a comprehensive and perceptive evaluation.

547. The Delegation of **India** spoke in support of inscription and expressed satisfaction that a nomination of such a long-endangered community had been brought before the Committee. It asked whether the property could be considered under natural criteria.

548. **IUCN** said that although the nominated property had high natural values, they were not of such outstanding universal significance as to qualify the site for World Heritage inscription. **IUCN** and **ICOMOS** had undertaken a joint evaluation mission to the site and had agreed to recommend its inscription as a cultural landscape under cultural criterion (v).

549. **ICOMOS** said that the occupation use of the site was unique, of extremely long duration, and exceptionally intact in all of its features.

550. The Delegation of **India** took note of the long continuous occupation of the site and supported inscription under the criterion proposed by

ICOMOS. It added that India, too, had long-surviving traditional communities.

551. The **Chairperson**, noting the consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.45** adopted.

552. The Delegation of **Norway** thanked the Committee, and introduced the representatives of Vegaøyan, who were present. It noted that the most recent previous inscription of a site in Norway had been 19 years previously.

Thursday, 1 July 2004 (evening session)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM THURSDAY 1 JULY AFTERNOON)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (Extension to include the Imperial Palace of the Qing Dynasty in Shenyang)
Id. N°	C 439 Bis
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

553. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report noting that it was a serial extension to an already-inscribed property.

554. It underscored the intercultural form and character of the Shengyang Palace, combining Han, Manchu and Tibetan elements, and recommended the extension of the inscribed property to include the Shengyang Palace under existing criteria (iii) and (iv), and the inscription of the entire property (original plus extension) under additional criteria (i) and (ii). It did not recommend inscription under criterion (vi), as no evidence for the criterion had been provided in the nomination document.

555. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported inscription, noting that it was a “marvellous property” in terms of both the architecture and the history it represented. It also commended the

Chinese Government on its admirable record in the sustainable conservation of the already-inscribed Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties.

556. The Delegations of **Chile, Japan and Kuwait** supported inscription.

557. The Delegation of **India** supported inscription and congratulated the Government of China on putting forward the nomination.

558. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported inscription, and asked whether the State Party had agreed to the revised name of the property.

559. The Delegation of **China** said that it had agreed to the revised name.

560. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, but asked for clarification as to the criteria under which the property would be inscribed.

561. **ICOMOS** explained that its recommendation was to inscribe the property under four cultural criteria: (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and that those criteria, if accepted by the Committee, would apply to the serial inscription as a whole.

562. It noted that it had recommended that the State Party should re-examine the size and boundaries of the original property, with a view to extending its buffer zone.

563. The **Chairperson** noted that there was a consensus in the Committee in favour of inscription and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.30** adopted.

564. The Delegation of **China** expressed the thanks of the Government of China to the Committee.

Property	Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (Extension to include the Liaoning Tombs)
Id. N°	C 1004 Ter
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

565. The Vice-Chairperson (Nigeria) assumed the chair.

566. **ICOMOS** introduced the property, which had been nominated by the State Party under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (vi), noting that it was a serial extension to an already-inscribed property.

567. It noted that the proposed extension would include three additional tombs. It had considered

whether the proposed nomination would be more appropriate as an extension of the Ming and Qing Palaces inscribed property, or of the Ming and Qing Tombs inscribed property, and had concluded that an extension to the Tombs would be more appropriate.

568. It recommended to the Committee the inscription of the extension to the property under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (vi).

569. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** spoke in favour of inscription.

570. The **Chairperson**, noting that there was consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.31** adopted by acclamation.

571. The Delegation of **China** expressed the thanks of the Government of China to the Committee.

Property	Brihadisvara Temple, Thanjavur (Extension to include the Great Living Chola Temples)
Id. N°	C 250 Bis
State Party	India
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

572. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report, noting that it was an extension to an already-inscribed property.

573. It noted that the proposed extension to the Brihadisvara Temple, if accepted by the Committee, would create a serial property consisting of “living temples” visited by up to 60,000 people on certain days. The nomination dossier reflected very well the “living” character of the property, explaining its intangible spiritual and philosophical values, as well as its tangible architectural and historical values.

574. The property was well managed in a coordinated effort of the Tamil Nadu State Department of Religious Endowments and the Archaeological Survey of India.

575. During the evaluation mission, the **ICOMOS** evaluator had recommended that the boundaries of the property should be extended to include the tank (water reservoir) associated with the temples, and that recommendation had been accepted by the State Party. Although the temples were located in an urban area, there was no specific development risk to the property.

576. It recommended to the Committee the inscription of the proposed extension to the property

under existing cultural criteria (ii) and (iii), and the further inscription of the extended site under the additional cultural criteria (i) and (iv).

577. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Benin** supported inscription.

578. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription, and asked **ICOMOS** whether it considered that criterion (vi) should be added to the nomination.

579. **ICOMOS** replied that as the State Party had not proposed inscription under criterion (vi), it had not evaluated that criterion. It would, however, be open to such a proposal and suggested that the State Party could consider the possibility at a later date.

580. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the inscription under the criteria recommended by **ICOMOS**.

581. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.32** adopted by acclamation.

582. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus) Station
Id. N°	C 945 Rev
State Party	India
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

583. The Chairperson resumed the chair.

584. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report, noting that the nomination had been deferred by the Bureau at its 23rd session.

585. It recommended that the property should be inscribed under cultural criteria (ii) and (iv) only. However, it called attention to the importance of the Fort Precinct as the buffer zone, and suggested that the State Party could consider nominating an extension of the property to include the entire Fort Precinct (in which case additional criteria would be applicable).

586. It also suggested that the State Party should consider using the former and still commonly-used name, Victoria Terminus, as the name of the property on the World Heritage List (while retaining the new name, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus, as the official administrative name) in memory of the fact that the Terminus had been built to commemorate

the Jubilee of Queen Victoria. That was, however, a suggestion, and not a condition for inscription. ICOMOS would not insist on the use of the name Victoria Terminus, if the State Party did not so wish it.

587. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported inscription, but did not support changing the name from that suggested by the State Party.

588. **ICOMOS** reiterated that it did not insist on the name change.

589. The Delegations of **Egypt, Nigeria, Oman** and the **Russian Federation** supported inscription.

590. The Delegation of **Chile** supported inscription and asked the State Party what it thought of the ICOMOS recommendations.

591. The Delegation of **India** said that the Government of India preferred to keep the name as proposed, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus Station.

592. The Delegation of **Benin** requested that the property be inscribed by acclamation.

593. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that ICOMOS provide information relating to the concerns expressed with regard to the professional competence of the companies carrying out restoration work at the site. It insisted that the decision should contain a clear indication of the need for the employment of qualified personnel to effect the restoration work.

594. **ICOMOS** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon.

595. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the concerns being expressed had already been reflected in the Draft Decision.

596. The **Chairperson** noted that there was consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription and declared Decision **28 COM 14B.34** adopted.

597. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government and people of India, and remarked that the inscription paid tribute to the genius of the architect, Frederick William Stevens, and underscored the significance of Mumbai as a place of past and present international exchange. It also described the conservation protocols in place, which would ensure the safeguarding of the heritage values of the property.

Property	Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	C 1081 Rev
State Party	Mongolia
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv) CL

598. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report, and noted that the nomination had been deferred by the Committee at its 27th session (**27 COM 8C.27**).

599. The nomination clarified the symbiotic links between nomadic society, its symbolic culture, and its religious and administrative fixed institutions. It was a nomination of an evolving cultural landscape, which over time had supported large empires.

600. It recommended to the Committee that the nominated property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under cultural criteria (ii), (iii), and (iv).

601. The Delegations of **China, Lithuania** and **Norway** took the floor in support of inscription.

602. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported inscription, and thanked ICOMOS for its assistance to the State Party and for the comprehensive nature of its evaluation.

603. The Delegation of **India** supported inscription and congratulated the State Party on its efforts to nominate the property for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

604. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription and endorsed the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS. It commended the State Party and ICOMOS on the preparation of the nomination dossier and site management plan.

605. The **Chairperson**, noting the consensus among the Committee in favour of inscription, declared Decision **28 COM 14B.35** adopted.

606. The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Committee and all those who had assisted the State Party in the preparation of the nomination dossier. It assured the Committee of its commitment to the conservation and safeguarding of the inscribed property, noting that it was the first inscription of a Mongolian cultural property on the World Heritage List.

Property	The Madriu-Claror-Perafita Valley
Id. N°	C 1160
State Party	Andorra
Criteria	C (v) CL

607. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

608. It presented the heritage values of the nominated property, which included pastoralism, summer settlement and terraced fields, iron smelting, paths and tracks, communal land ownership since the thirteenth century, and the spiritual heart of Andorra.

609. In its analysis of the needs of and threats to the property, ICOMOS identified access as both the most pressing need for the inhabitants of the site and the most immediate threat to the conservation of the heritage values of the valley, if the need were met by the construction of a road.

610. With regard to the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property, ICOMOS was of the opinion that it did possess Outstanding Universal Value as a microcosm of an ancient land management system in the Pyrenees, and could qualify for inscription under cultural criteria (v), but not (iv).

611. It drew the Committee's attention, however, to the fact that formal legal protection for the nominated property was not yet fully in place, although the necessary legal and administrative processes were already underway.

612. It recommended to the Committee that it defer inscription of the property until legal protection for the site was in place, and the five attendant actions contained as recommendations in Draft Decision **28 COM 14B.36** had been acted upon.

613. **IUCN** explained that it had worked with ICOMOS on the evaluation of the nomination, motivated by the fact that it concerned a cultural landscape. There had been a joint ICOMOS-IUCN evaluation mission to the site. The IUCN component of the evaluation underscored the need for further research on the natural heritage of the nominated property and, particularly, the need for a comparative analysis of other mountain cultural landscapes in Western Europe.

614. IUCN's evaluation of the property had reinforced the ICOMOS recommendation to the Committee to defer inscription. In addition to the need to see protection legislation in place and operational, IUCN had recommended that a comparative analysis be conducted.

615. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the recommendation to defer inscription, and supported the IUCN recommendation for a comparative analysis. It endorsed the proposal by

other members of the Committee that ICOMOS evaluators should be identified by name in the evaluation documents submitted to the Committee, in line with IUCN practice.

616. The Delegation of **Argentina**, supporting the eventual inscription of the property, requested more information regarding the legal protection regime applicable at the site.

617. The Delegation of **Benin** requested the State Party and ICOMOS to indicate the date at which the full protection legislation of the property would enter into force.

618. The Observer Delegation of **Andorra** explained that a law, in draft form, would protect natural heritage, but did not apply directly to this property, listed under the category of cultural landscapes, and the law for the cultural heritage of Andorra entered into force on 17 July 2003 and was being implemented. It would take between 6 to 12 months before it was fully in place, after which the management body could begin to apply the management plan for the property.

619. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed the opinion that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was "obvious," and underscored the significance of the survival of the ancient structure of communal land management. It proposed three options to the Committee: (i) immediate inscription of the property with the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS; (ii) referral of the nomination back to the State Party until the system of legal protection was in place and operational, and (iii) deferral of the inscription should another ICOMOS-IUCN mission, or comparative study, be deemed necessary by the Committee.

620. **ICOMOS** said that a second ICOMOS mission to the site would not be required.

621. **IUCN** said that a second IUCN mission to the site would not be required.

622. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked ICOMOS whether the site did or did not have Outstanding Universal Value.

623. **ICOMOS** said that it did.

624. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested clarification regarding the studies for the completion of the inventory of the invertebrates mentioned in the evaluation, and requested prior to inscription.

625. **ICOMOS** said that its five recommendations were not pre-conditions for inscription.

626. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to the reason for deferral of inscription. Was it because of considerations of legal protection, or because of the need for a comparative study?

627. **ICOMOS** said that it was because legal protection was lacking - if legal protection were in place, **ICOMOS** would have recommended inscription.

628. **IUCN** said that legal protection was needed, as was a comparative analysis.

629. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed the opinion that in light of the views of the Advisory Bodies, referral back to the State Party with the request for re-submission the following year would be the preferred course of action.

630. The Delegation of **India** inquired as to the time frame for the comparative analysis proposed by **IUCN**.

631. **IUCN** said that it would take approximately one month, and encompass similar sites in Western Europe.

632. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed the opinion that consideration of inscription should be referred back to the State Party for one year, in order for legal protection to be put in place and the recommended comparative study to be conducted.

633. The Delegation of **India** asked why a comparative study was necessary if **ICOMOS** was already convinced of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

634. **IUCN** said that it felt a comparative study would be useful in establishing the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

635. **ICOMOS** said that, as far as it was concerned, no comparative study was necessary to establish the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It expressed the view that as the property had not been nominated under natural criteria, only under cultural criteria, it was up to **ICOMOS** to evaluate Outstanding Universal Value.

636. The Delegation of **India** expressed the opinion that in light of **ICOMOS**'s positive evaluation of Outstanding Universal Value, the property should be inscribed with the recommendations of **ICOMOS**.

637. The Delegation of **Argentina** spoke in support of inscription with the **ICOMOS** recommendations with regard to the need to ensure formal legal protection.

638. The Delegations of **Colombia** and **New Zealand** supported inscription.

639. The **Chairperson** asked whether any Committee members opposed inscription.

640. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed the opinion that any inscription as a cultural landscape should satisfy **IUCN**.

641. **ICOMOS** reminded the Committee that cultural landscapes were inscribed under cultural criteria and as such the **ICOMOS** evaluation of the property in question must be definitive.

642. The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Norway** spoke in favour of referral.

643. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the **ICOMOS** recommendation was for inscription or referral.

644. The Delegation of **Chile** said that procedure was key in the consideration of nominations, and supported inscription.

645. The Delegation of **Benin** failed to understand why this dossier had been presented to the Committee since it was incomplete, as the requirements for legal protection were not yet in place.

646. The Delegation of **South Africa** requested clarification from the State Party about the status of legal protection of the property.

647. The Observer Delegation of **Andorra** explained that in terms of the law which entered into force on 17 July 2003, the property was listed under the category of cultural landscapes. However, what remained to be clarified was the modalities for application of the law to the property in question, and this could only be achieved following ongoing consultations between the inhabitants and respecting the delays for entering into force of the law.

648. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed the opinion that as generic protection was already available, there were two options before the Committee: to inscribe the property immediately, or to refer it back to the State Party for re-submission when the legal process had been completed.

649. **ICOMOS** clarified that it had recommended either deferral or referral.

650. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported referral.

651. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported inscription.

652. The Delegation of **Chile**, on a point of order, asked for a vote.

653. The Delegation of **Benin** reminded the Committee that a majority of two-thirds was necessary if the decision to inscribe the property was put to the vote.

654. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would have preferred a decision to refer the property back to the State Party, but in consideration of “horizontal equity”, it would be in favour of inscription.

655. The **Chairperson**, noting that the majority was in favour of inscription, declared the decision inscribing The Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape, under culture criterion (v) adopted, as revised to incorporate the five ICOMOS recommendations contained in the paragraphs pertaining to the property in document *WHC.04/28.COM/14B Rev.* (**28 COM 14B.36**)

656. The Observer Delegation of **Andorra** thanked the Committee and gave assurances that the procedure for legal protection would be conscientiously implemented.

Property	Ensemble of the Novodevichy Convent
Id. N°	C 1097
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria proposed	C (i) (iv) (vi)

657. **ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the nomination of the Ensemble of the Novodevichy Convent in the Russian Federation and recommended inscription under criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

658. The Delegations of **China, Lithuania, Oman, India, Egypt, Colombia, Kuwait** and **Benin** supported the inscription of this property.

659. The **Chairperson** then declared the Novodevichy Convent inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **28 COM 14B.46**).

660. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked the Committee for this decision. It underscored this momentous occasion and warmly invited the Committee members to visit the property.

Friday, 2 July 2004 (morning)

**ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE
LIST (CONTINUED FROM THURSDAY 1
JULY EVENING)**

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	C 1076
State Party	Azerbaijan
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (vi) CL

661. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

662. It said that the property appeared to have potential Outstanding Universal Value, but that that could not be established at the present time because the site had not been fully explored or completely documented.

663. Remarking that a comparative analysis of rock art sites was a difficult but necessary undertaking, it recommended to the Committee that inscription of the property be deferred until further research had established without doubt its Outstanding Universal Value and had enabled the State Party to re-examine the proposed boundaries of the site with a view to protecting its integrity.

664. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, noting that ICOMOS recommended examination of the property be deferred until an appropriate analysis could be effected, observed that there were numerous other comparable sites and that an in-depth study would be difficult. It drew attention to the difference that existed between inventory and comparative study and cited the case of the Japanese cultural site of Mount Kii inscribed by the Committee yesterday, where no inventory had been made, but where a comparative study had enabled a better evaluation. Finally, it requested clarification regarding the ICOMOS evaluation in this regard, and wished to know whether a rock art specialist of the region had participated in the study of the dossier and the evaluation mission.

665. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether ICOMOS would be prepared to recommend

inscription of the property under the single criterion (iii). It also asked the State Party to comment on the current state of knowledge research concerning the site.

666. **ICOMOS** declined to say whether the nominated property could be inscribed under criterion (iii) alone, stating that its recommendation was to defer inscription pending further research.

667. The Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan** informed the Committee that considerable research had been undertaken on the site since 1939, under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and more recently by Italian and Azerbaijani scholars. The results of that research had been published, albeit mostly in the Russian language.

668. The Delegation of **Egypt** concurred with Lebanon concerning the impracticality of requiring that a comparative study of rock art sites be undertaken prior to consideration of the property for inscription. The property had Outstanding Universal Value and Egypt was in favour of immediate inscription.

669. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that scholarship concerning the site had been extensive, albeit in Russian, and that the level of knowledge about the site appeared to be comparable to that concerning Tamgaly. In its evaluation, ICOMOS appeared to indicate that the property could have Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (iii).

670. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the opinions expressed by the United Kingdom. It asked whether ICOMOS considered the boundaries of the property as submitted by the State Party to be acceptable.

671. **ICOMOS** explained the ICOMOS evaluation process and reiterated that it had no recommendation regarding the criteria under which the site could be nominated at that time. With regard to the property's proposed boundaries, it considered the boundaries (as recently amended by the State Party) to be acceptable.

672. The Delegation of **Japan** informed the Committee that Japan had completed an inventory of the cultural landscape site of Mount Kii prior to nomination.

673. The Delegation of **India** supported deferral of inscription based on an inadequate definition of the extent and, therefore the integrity, of the property, and requested the State Party to provide additional information concerning the spatial integrity of the property nominated. It did not, however, consider a

full comparative study of other rock art sites to be necessary.

674. **ICOMOS** said, in reply to the United Kingdom, that the ICOMOS evaluator sent to the site was a member of the ICOMOS Rock Art Committee.

675. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested ICOMOS to communicate the name of the evaluator(s) and proposed that the Committee formulate a decision to this effect. With regard to the examination of the property, it noted that the site had been excavated and inventoried and wondered whether the deficiency of the evaluation was not linked to a linguistic problem or a lack of competence or knowledge. Numerous sites had been inscribed without a comparative study and the Delegation questioned the need for one in this particular case.

676. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported deferral.

677. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the suggestion by Lebanon that, in future, ICOMOS evaluations should include the names of the evaluator(s). It returned to the issue of the evaluation of the nomination by the ICOMOS Rock Art Committee, and asked, again, for clarification as to the criteria under which ICOMOS had evaluated the property.

678. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported deferral of inscription, pending further research.

679. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the large number of engravings on the site was an indication of its potentially Outstanding Universal Value. The amount of research would not be the determining factor, but rather whether the research undertaken to date had led to an analysis of the site which would allow the Committee to evaluate its Outstanding Universal Value.

680. The **Chairperson** remarked that it appeared that further analysis would be necessary before the property could be inscribed.

681. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was in favour of immediate inscription.

682. The **Chairperson** remarked that there appeared to be no consensus for inscription.

683. The Delegation of **India** supported deferral, stating that more information would be required before inscription.

684. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thought inscription of the property should be deferred and requested a better evaluation from ICOMOS.

685. The **Chairperson** said that the Committee appeared to be moving towards a consensus for deferral.

686. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported deferral, also noting the Committee's need for more information – in English or in French.

687. The **Chairperson** summed up, noting the need for further study of the site; evaluation of the site by Russian-speaking experts; identification of the ICOMOS evaluator(s) by name, and re-examination of the boundaries of the nominated property to ensure the safeguarding of the site's integrity.

688. **ICOMOS** reiterated that what was necessary for a reconsideration of the nomination was not merely additional research, but analysis of that research.

689. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 14B.37** adopted, deferring the nomination of Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape.

Property	Kuressaare Fortress
Id. N°	C 1125
State Party	Estonia
Criteria	C (iv)

690. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

691. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its support for the inscription of the property.

692. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recognized the regional importance of the property but doubted that the site was of Outstanding Universal Value. It said that properties of that kind could be found all over Europe, and referred to the Committee's discussion on Bremen in Germany.

693. The Delegations of **Norway**, **Oman** and **Kuwait** supported the inscription of the proposed property.

694. The Delegation of **Lebanon** questioned, as did the United Kingdom, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It noted the absence of a conservation and management plan, remarking however that this did not prevent inscription, yesterday, of the Wrangel Island Reserve in Russia.

695. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the comments of the United Kingdom and said that good

state of conservation itself was not sufficient grounds for inscription.

696. The Delegation of **Colombia** sought clarification as to whether there were other castles of a similar nature in a good state of conservation.

697. **ICOMOS** confirmed that the property was indeed an excellent and well-preserved example of a kind of Bishop's Castle in the region.

698. The Delegation of **Norway**, following up the question raised by the Delegation of Lebanon, asked **ICOMOS** whether it was satisfied with the conservation plan being prepared by the State Party.

699. **ICOMOS** expressed its satisfaction with the plan, which would be implemented by a single organization.

700. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** echoed the concern expressed by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Lebanon. It asked whether the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had been clearly demonstrated, particularly since there were many similar properties in Europe.

701. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported inscription of the proposed property while acknowledging the points made by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

702. The Delegation of **India** said that the property was well-preserved but that its Outstanding Universal Value was not obvious.

703. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, referring to the definition of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, on page 102 of the French version (and page 84 of the English version) of the **ICOMOS** evaluation document, questioned the meaning of the following sentence: "The reservations to some of the interventions should be assessed given the real and historical situation in Estonia".

704. **ICOMOS** explained that the upper part of the castle had been restored. While the reconstruction had been subject to criticism, **ICOMOS** considered that it was part of Estonia's cultural and historical heritage.

705. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, referring to page 84 of the **ICOMOS** evaluation report, asked whether it would strengthen the nomination if it included the historic town of Kuressaare, as the report noted that the fortress formed an integral part of the ensemble which had been built to a seventeenth-century town plan. It recommended deferring the nomination with a recommendation to that end.

706. The Delegation of **Norway** asked what were the differences between the Kuressaare Fortress in Estonia and the Portuguese City of Mazagan (El Jadida) that had been inscribed the previous day, as both were cases of fortifications.

707. **ICOMOS** said that the historic town of Kuressaare would make a good ensemble, but it was the State Party which had preferred not to include the town in the nomination. In response to the Delegation of Norway, **ICOMOS** explained that the Moroccan case was a historic town which was included in the citadel area, while the Kuressaare Fortress was separate from the town. **ICOMOS** concurred with deferring the nomination.

708. The **Chairperson** recommended deferring the nomination.

709. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B. 39**.

710. The Delegation of **India**, on a point of order, sought clarification as to whether the State Party intended extending the area of the property to include the town of Kuressaare.

711. The **Chairperson** noted that the State Party was not present and asked the Secretariat to convey the decision of the Committee to the State Party.

Property	Dresden Elbe Valley
Id. N°	C 1156
State Party	Germany
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) CL

712. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report and noted that the State Party had provided supplementary information in December 2003 concerning the management system of the site.

713. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, whilst acknowledging the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, requested clarification from **ICOMOS** regarding the meaning of "pressures in favour of change" in the recommendation formulated for criterion (v), on page 84 of the evaluation report. It furthermore recommended to examine the possibility of including criterion (vi), as the property was representative of the drama and reconstruction of an entire town and people.

714. **ICOMOS** explained that the statement on criterion (v) referring to urban development had been included to assist the conservation effort for the property. Concerning criterion (vi), **ICOMOS** agreed that it was relevant to the property in view of the historic event, but the property had been nominated primarily as a cultural landscape and not as a town

centre, which was why it had not included criterion (vi).

715. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property as it was a good example of urban cultural landscape with a long and complex history.

716. The Delegation of **Chile** supported the inscription of the property and commended ICOMOS on recognizing the importance of the valley's cultural and natural aspects.

717. The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription. It asked ICOMOS to clarify its position concerning management plans: in one case, the Estonian authorities had been encouraged to finalize the conservation plan for the Kuresaare Fortress after its inscription, and in another case the management plan for the Etruscan Necropolises of Cerveteri and Tarquinia in Italy, which ICOMOS recommended for inscription, had not been completed. Only a good management system existed for the Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany. ICOMOS seemed to value the effectiveness of management systems above management plans.

718. **ICOMOS** replied that a commission had been established to implement the management plan of the properties as a direct result of the ICOMOS assessment mission.

719. The Delegation of **India** wholeheartedly supported inscription of the property and hoped that other States Parties would be able to learn from Germany's experience in preparing the nomination dossier.

720. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the nomination and also favoured the proposition by the Delegation of Lebanon concerning the possible inclusion of criterion (vi).

721. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the Draft Decision, particularly given the important historic event associated with the property, which had been heavily reconstructed. It supported the proposal by the Delegation of Lebanon concerning the possible inclusion of criterion (vi).

722. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the property and suggested that the Committee should seek the opinion of the State Party concerning the inclusion of criterion (vi).

723. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** appreciated the comments made by the United Kingdom and Lebanon and stated that it would welcome the inclusion of criterion (vi).

724. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that the Committee had decided not to add new criteria during its session and that the Advisory Bodies would need to evaluate any additional criteria.

725. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed the inclusion, in the Committee decision, of a recommendation that the adoption of criterion (vi) be examined in the future.

726. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and stated that, while it considered that the criterion (vi) was appropriate, this would have to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies.

727. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.40** with an amendment to recommend that the State Party should consider a possible inclusion of criterion (vi) in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

728. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government of Germany, which had started to prepare the nomination dossier in 1989. Quoting a poem, it emphasized the beauty of the property and invited the members of the Committee to visit the site.

Property	Bingvellir National Park
Id. N°	C 1152
State Party	Iceland
Criteria	C (iii) (vi) CL

729. **ICOMOS** and **IUCN** presented the site and their evaluation report.

730. The Delegation of **Lebanon** firstly, wished to know whether the problem relating to the new road project, referred to in the recommendation of the ICOMOS evaluation report, was current. It also questioned the feasibility of the projects for closing the parking area to the east of the property and the demolition of a cement bridge mentioned in the same recommendation

731. **ICOMOS** explained that, after extensive consultations with the State Party, it had become clear that the road would be constructed outside the proposed area and was therefore no longer a conservation issue. Concerning the recommendation to replace the steel and concrete bridge over the Öxará River with a bridge of lighter construction, ICOMOS emphasized that it was a recommendation and not a condition. The idea had been to harmonize the structure with the landscape as the structure had a substantial visual impact on the open environment.

732. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the inscription of the property and remarked that it could be extended in future to form part of a serial nomination with other Ping sites, such as those situated in the Isle of Man.

733. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property and commended the State Party on completing a management plan for it. It further underlined the importance of the property, which helped understanding of the prehistoric period.

734. The Delegation of **Norway** supported the nomination and emphasized the importance of the property, as it was one the oldest free parliaments, signifying the role of democracy.

735. As the Observer Delegation of **Iceland** requested the floor, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, on a point of order, said that States Parties should intervene only if they had objections to raise.

736. The Delegation of **China** supported the point made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and also expressed its endorsement of the Draft Decision.

737. The Delegation of **Benin** wondered whether it was wise to replace the bridge by a lighter structure, as recommended by ICOMOS, considering the large number of visitors to the property.

738. The Delegations of **Portugal** and **India** supported the inscription of the property.

739. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B 41**.

740. The Observer Delegation of **Iceland** thanked the Committee and the Chinese authorities on behalf of the Government of Iceland and said that the property was Iceland's first on the World Heritage List. It reassured the Committee of its intention to follow up ICOMOS's recommendations and also thanked the Nordic countries for their cooperation.

741. The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of Iceland and stated that the Committee had thus far in this session inscribed five properties on the World Heritage List from States Parties previously without any World Heritage sites.

Property	The Incense and Spice Route and the Desert Cities in the Negev
Id. N°	C 1107
State Party	Israel
Criteria	C (iii) (v) CL

742. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

743. The Delegation of **Lebanon** questioned first of all, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property because of its size, as it represented a small section of a route which stretched over 2,000 km. The comparative analysis, which was barely three pages, did not contain information on the part proposed for inscription, and made no reference to the other sites in the region. In its evaluation, ICOMOS justified the lack of information by the inaccessible nature of the region. This argument was rejected by the Delegation making a comparison with an Ecuadorian site proposed in the context of the Route of the Incas programme, and which standing alone did not succeed in convincing of its Outstanding Universal Value. Secondly, the Delegation questioned the integrity of the property, which underwent much reconstruction work in the 19th century. Notably, it cited the example of a door rebuilt on the model of another door of another town. Invoking paragraph 24 of the *Guidelines* it recalled the criteria, in particular for authenticity, to which a site must comply to be able to aspire to Outstanding Universal Value. It finally requested what management measures had been established in provision of an inscription, although this aspect may be considered as secondary in view of the tolerance shown to date by the Committee in this respect.

744. **ICOMOS** pointed out that its evaluation report was not accurate in stating that the State Party had not provided a comparative analysis. Furthermore, ICOMOS itself had faced difficulties in finding comparable examples. Concerning the integrity of the site, it said that although certain aspects of reconstruction had been of concern, it was not considered to be a major issue. On the management plan, the recommendation was to prepare a detailed work plan and the management plan had already been prepared by the State Party.

745. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reiterated that the comparative analysis was only three pages and contained little information.

746. The Delegation of **Egypt** endorsed the statements made by Lebanon and expressed alarm concerning military training taking place within the nominated area, as safety would be an issue for the management of the site and its archaeological content as well as for visitors. It wondered whether ICOMOS had received that information and further questioned the authenticity of the property.

747. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked on what basis ICOMOS had justified the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as it was not clear whether enough research had been undertaken to

demonstrate its value. It called for consistency in the approach taken by ICOMOS on nominations, and referred to the nomination of the Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape in Azerbaijan, where ICOMOS had recommended deferral due to insufficient research on the interpretation of rock art.

748. **ICOMOS** explained that the assessment of the site's Outstanding Universal Value had been made considering the route as a whole, and not individual settlements and monuments.

749. The Delegation of **Kuwait** stated, for the information of the Committee, that the long incense route went through the desert which had been controlled by the Romans and not because the traders had wanted to avoid the Romans.

750. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed deferring the nomination, which should be further strengthened in line with the ICOMOS recommendations to put in place an archaeological strategy for the whole site and also for each of the major towns, to have active management of Haluza and to take steps to consolidate those parts of the site which had been excavated, as well as to amplify existing management plans.

751. The Delegation of **Japan** commented that comparative analysis was one of the crucial components of any nomination dossier and asked the State Party to specify its plans for the preparation of a comparative analysis for the property.

752. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** explained that it had already provided information concerning the management plan prepared by national experts which included an archaeological strategy. Concerning Haluza, the archaeological excavation was being back-filled to be consolidated. It emphasized that management planning was an ongoing process which had to be carried out in the context of town planning schemes.

753. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, on a point of order, indicated that the response of the State Party should include only elements of information on the comparative study.

754. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** replied that the existing comparative analysis had referred only to those sites in the Negev Desert which were inhabited, and which were grouped together near the Mediterranean Sea.

755. The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed deferring the nomination in light of the lack of information provided by the State Party. It noted that the evaluation report should be re-written to contain new information.

756. The Delegation of **India**, having recognized that only certain sections of the trade route were being nominated, asked ICOMOS whether further research would highlight any other sites that would merit inscription on the World Heritage List.

757. **ICOMOS** said that the location of the settlements was explained by the need to manage the incense trade and that the nominated areas were part of the inhabited sections which had led to the growth of towns. ICOMOS was of the view that further research would not provide much additional information.

758. The Delegation of **Oman** disagreed with the remark made by ICOMOS and, supported by the Delegation of **Portugal**, suggested referring the nomination back to the State Party in order to obtain more information.

759. The **Chairperson** summed up, saying that the Committee decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to obtain additional information on the comparative analysis.

Friday, 2 July 2004 (afternoon)

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM FRIDAY 2 JULY MORNING)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

Property	Etruscan Necropolises of Cerveteri and Tarquinia
Id. N°	C 1158
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (i) (iii) (iv)

760. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report and highlighted the excellence of the management plan that had been submitted recently by the State Party and would serve as a good example in Italy.

761. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, without denying the beauty of the property, requested ICOMOS to clarify the Outstanding Universal Value. However important the built remains of the property, there was no question of inscribing the museums, modern

buildings of no particular interest, contained therein. Given these conditions, could one still speak of Outstanding Universal Value? Finally, taking into account the late submission of the management plan, it might be preferable to defer examination of the nomination.

762. **ICOMOS** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the State Party had originally nominated the property to include the Caerean Archaeological Museum in Ceveteri and the National Archaeological Museum in Tarquinia. However, the *World Heritage Convention* did not provide for nominations of movable property. According to ICOMOS, the nominated property possessed Outstanding Universal Value as it was one of the earliest urban societies in the region that introduced classical influences from Greece. Concerning the question of a management plan and the timing of a nomination of a property, ICOMOS considered that lack of a management plan itself was not a reason to make a recommendation against inscription.

763. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the inscription of the property. It asked whether those paintings that had been removed could be restored to their original setting and remarked that it was a modern trend to develop on-site interpretation centres.

764. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recognized the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and supported its inscription. Having stated the importance of monitoring the property, it remarked that the management system was effective.

765. The Delegation of **Japan** supported the inscription of the property and commented that the management system for the property was well established.

766. The Delegation of **India** took note of the comments made by the Delegation of Lebanon and congratulated the State Party on the excellent nomination. It remarked that the management system for the property was well developed.

767. The Delegations of Colombia, China, Saint Lucia, Portugal, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Nigeria, Argentina and Kuwait supported the inscription.

768. The Delegation of **Portugal** referred to the earlier discussion on the relevance of the museum and movable objects and suggested that the Committee should insert the following text in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision: “underlining, nevertheless, the extraordinary value of the

collections to the understanding of the two necropolises”.

769. The Delegation of **Nigeria** recalled that the *Convention* did not provide for the nomination of movable objects.

770. The Delegation of **Colombia**, while supporting the Draft Decision, remarked that there had to be a formalized procedure for assessing the adequacy of a management plan for a nominated property.

771. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the point made by the Delegations of Portugal and Colombia and said that the museums were an integral part of the property. It noted that lack of funding for establishing museums was often a problem in the Latin America region.

772. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.43**, as amended.

773. The Delegation of **Italy**, in expressing its emotion and gratitude to Committee members and ICOMOS, gave historical clarifications concerning the property, vestige of early urban civilization. It noted with pleasure that the majority of speakers were familiar with the property and its museums and explained that the delay in the preparation of the management plan was linked to the desire to define a new model, which could then be made widely available. In this regard, it indicated that Italy would organize in 2005 an international conference on the establishment of management plans. Concerning the museums, the Delegation acknowledged that it was a general problem, but taking account of the rules in force, the vestiges benefitted from the same protection at the national level as the rest of the site. To conclude, the Delegation warmly thanked the Chinese Government and the Chairperson of the Committee for their welcome and kindness and congratulated the authorities for the splendour of the centre in which the meeting was being held.

Property	Kernavė Archaeological Site (Cultural Reserve of Kernavė)
Id. N°	C 1137
State Party	Lithuania
Criteria	C (iii) (iv)

774. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

775. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the inscription of the property.

776. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, after having obtained confirmation that a part of the town of

Kernavė made up the buffer zone, asked whether the management plan could adequately protect the site from urban development.

777. **ICOMOS** confirmed that a management plan for the property had been developed by the State Party.

778. The Delegation of **Chile** supported the inscription of the property and remarked that Lithuania was under-represented on the World Heritage List.

779. The Delegation of **Benin** supported inscription of the property for both its historical depth and its typology, considering that it would contribute towards creating links between Europe and Africa.

780. The **Chairperson** asked that the Delegations wishing to make interventions in favour of the nomination, namely, the Delegations of Oman, Norway, Nigeria, New Zealand, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Lebanon, Japan, India and Colombia, be noted.

781. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recommended, with regard to criterion (iii), to include in the draft decision, a reference to the need to monitor urban development.

782. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.44**.

783. The Delegation of **Lithuania** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS and, referring the property as one of the most sacred sites in Lithuania, renewed its commitment to safeguarding it.

Property	Dečani Monastery
Id. N°	C 724
State Party	Serbia and Montenegro
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

784. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

785. The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property, particularly since the State Party had resubmitted the nomination after having defined a buffer zone and provided adequate protection for the site.

786. The Delegation of **India** supported the nomination but made a reference to the difficult political situation.

787. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its support for the nomination and underlined the need

to conserve some of the mural paintings of the property.

788. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the nomination did not include a comparative analysis and asked ICOMOS to clarify the value of the site, as it considered that the value possessed by the property was not universal.

789. **ICOMOS** explained that the comparative analysis of the property had been thorough and had been assessed by an appropriate expert. As the World Heritage site of Studenica Monastery represented the first phase of the Byzantine traditions, the nominated property, representing the final phase, thereby completed the chronological sequence for the Byzantine period on the World Heritage List. It explained that the paintings made the site of Outstanding Universal Value.

790. In conclusion, it noted the comments made on the assessment of management plans by the Advisory Bodies and undertook to include this aspect in the future.

791. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 14B.47**.

Property	Varberg Radio Station
Id. N°	C 1134
State Party	Sweden
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

792. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

793. The Delegations of the **United Kingdom**, the **Russian Federation**, **Norway** and **New Zealand** expressed strong support for the inscription of the industrial heritage site.

794. The Delegation of **Lebanon** considered that the examination of the dossier raised serious questions. In particular, the radio station in question was not the only representative example of this particular category of industrial heritage, since examples also existed in Norway, and the United States of America, and this one was not exceptional in itself. This type of radio station, of which there remained little trace in the world, represented that era but it was impossible to affix the symbol of communication on one building. A serial nomination would be more appropriate.

795. **ICOMOS** said that there were different sites relating to the development of communication technology and systems, and that the present site could indeed be the first in a serial inscription. It

expressed the opinion, however, that the site in itself was of Outstanding Universal Value.

796. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** referred to the importance of technological development and said that it was of the view that it was not worth waiting for a serial nomination to be submitted for the site to be inscribed.

797. The Delegation of **Nigeria** questioned the terminology used by ICOMOS in describing the site as 'functional industrial heritage'.

798. **ICOMOS** said that the station was potentially functional and could still be used in case of emergency.

799. The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked whether the property could be considered as a monument in the strict sense of the *Convention*. It questioned the exact nature of the object proposed for inscription, noting that neither the instruments used by the station, nor an ensemble of movable property, nor an information network could be inscribed on the List.

800. **ICOMOS** said that the concept of monument was not limited to monumental structures but could also cover the functioning of a transmitter of a message.

801. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed the opinion that as it was the first example of industrial heritage, much more documentation was needed in the form of a comparative study in order to provide the Committee with sufficient elements for a decision.

802. The Delegation of **Benin**, sharing the feelings of the Delegations of Lebanon and Colombia, thought that the property under examination was defined as a « monument » but that that definition was being stretched to the extreme. It remarked that there were no elements that suggested an exceptional monument and that there was no basis for Outstanding Universal Value. In its opinion, the protection of this property fell more within the competence of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

803. The Delegation of **India** recalled that industrial heritage was not a frequently used category. India had always supported innovative nominations, which were watersheds in the development of the World Heritage List. It asked whether the property should be inscribed with a recommendation for a future serial extension, or whether the nomination should be deferred to allow for consultation on a possible serial nomination.

804. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the recommendation of ICOMOS to inscribe the site and congratulated ICOMOS on its excellent presentation. The fact that the nomination could be the first in a series should not penalize it if the property had Outstanding Universal Value in its own right.

805. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, on a point of order, said that it was not up to ICOMOS to define a "monument."

806. The Delegation of **Argentina** emphasized that in the case of industrial heritage one should not expect to find monumental architecture in order for such a site to qualify as a monument. If the Committee wished to fill the gaps in the List, it should recognize that there were biases in the conventional definition of "monument."

807. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that it was not the first industrial site to be inscribed and had no objection to inscription. It would also support a serial nomination, and the Committee could still include a recommendation to that effect.

808. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would be happy to participate in such a serial nomination in due course.

809. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed that, in that case, the nomination should be deferred to allow for preparation of a serial nomination.

810. The Delegation of **Norway** said that the site was an outstanding example and asked whether the State Party had undertaken a comparative analysis.

811. The Observer Delegation of **Sweden** informed the Committee that the station functioned whenever needed by the armed forces. In its comparative study, it had identified approximately twenty stations constructed worldwide but Varberg Radio Station was the only one remaining. It was important as the only example of a long-range transmitter of Morse signals.

812. The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for elaborating on the issue of the comparative study.

813. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** clarified its earlier statement. It had not intended to imply that the property should not be inscribed at the present session.

814. The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that in a previous case during its present session it had taken the position that a serial nomination should not be a condition for inscription.

815. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed support for the nomination.

816. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had already expressed support for the inscription but with a recommendation for a possible future serial extension. It is therefore not a condition for inscribing.

817. The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that there was no consensus in the case. Furthermore, it was of the opinion that the building of the 1920s was very modest and that the particular site did not meet the criterion of Outstanding Universal Value. It would feel very uncomfortable about inscription.

818. The Delegation of **India** requested clarification on the Committee's recommendation. At the present session, the Committee had inscribed sites that on their own did not have Outstanding Universal Value but would have in the context of a serial nomination.

819. **ICOMOS** said that the nomination itself was based upon a recommendation of the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) that the value of the site was scientific and that it had Outstanding Universal Value in its own right. Nevertheless, an association with other sites was also possible.

820. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed strong support for the nomination. It recalled that the Committee had already inscribed several sites with recommendations for future serial inscriptions.

821. The Delegation of **India** stressed that it did not want to hold up the inscription but that for the future it would not want to see a string of independent inscriptions but a single serial inscription.

822. Upon the Chairperson asking whether any member had an objection to inscription, the Delegation of **Egypt** declared that, in its view, the site had no Outstanding Universal Value.

823. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the vote would be on inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv) with a recommendation on a serial extension.

824. The **Chairperson** said that no member of the Committee had asked to move to a vote, and he therefore declared the decision to inscribe Varberg Radio Station on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) with the recommendation to look into the possibility of a future serial nomination adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.48**).

825. The Observer Delegation of **Sweden** thanked the Committee for its decision and said that

representatives of the owner of the site and the local authority were present.

Property	Liverpool - Maritime Mercantile City
Id. N°	C 1150
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv)

826. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report. It informed the Committee that a harbour development project was under preparation that could affect the value of the site and that it recommended that the Government of the United Kingdom should monitor new developments carefully and provide clarification of the 'Pier Head' and 'Fourth Grace' development project.

827. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed support for the nomination. It said that Liverpool had been the major port of the British Empire and once one of the most cosmopolitan ports in the world. It had been a melting pot of ethnic and racial groups that had lived together in racial and cultural tolerance, rare in many parts of the world.

828. The Delegation of **Lebanon** emphasized the importance of the City of Liverpool both historically and with regard to heritage. However, it considered that in the present case the Committee was confronted with the same problem that had occurred two years previously for the inscription of Vienna. Much time, energy and lengthy negotiations were necessary to avoid that skyscrapers foreseen at the site of that City did not exceed a certain height. At that time, the removal of the property from the List had even been envisaged and the representatives of the United Kingdom were very firm with respect to that question during debates. It was important to remember past experience in order to avoid losing once again much time to repair errors made. For all these reasons, the Delegation questioned the appropriateness of inscribing Liverpool when a development project on the actual site was under discussion.

829. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** wished to be informed by the State Party and by ICOMOS of the exact progress of this project.

830. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the development project was the result of a competition for what was at present a parking area. The project had not been finalized, no planning permission had been formally submitted, and no funding had been secured for the development. The project was already under revision. It assured the Committee that if Liverpool were to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, it

was a factor that would certainly be considered in any evaluation of an eventual project.

831. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked why no comparison had been undertaken with the harbours of Rotterdam or Amsterdam and said that the reference to the Beatles in the ICOMOS evaluation related to the intangible heritage of Liverpool. As to the comments made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation stated that it was turning things upside down. The Committee should wait to see the results of the project development in order to have the assurance that the site's Outstanding Universal Value would not be affected.

832. The Delegation of **South Africa** asked ICOMOS how the particular legacy of the slave trade impacted on the value of the site.

833. **ICOMOS** said that there was a museum in Liverpool dedicated to the slave trade within the boundaries of the proposed site.

834. The Delegations of **Oman**, the **Russian Federation** and **Japan** supported the inscription of the site.

835. The Delegation of **Benin** concurred with the opinion expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon with regard to past experience, and welcomed the intervention of South Africa, that associated the memory of Africa to this inscription. On this subject, it remarked that the ICOMOS evaluation text was very concentrated on the British Empire and that the draft decision should make a particular reference to the « African » origins of the slaves, which would be all the more appreciated as 2004 was the International Year for the Commemoration of the Combat against Slavery and its Abolition. Over and above the inscription of the site, it was the defence of human values that was affirmed, and an honouring of the memory that was achieved, and therefore the draft decision should be an echo of this.

836. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the recommendation of ICOMOS and the statement of the Delegation of Benin.

837. The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the inscription but stated that the project should not be accepted. He was sure, however, that the elders of Liverpool would not tolerate the kind of intrusion the Committee was discussing.

838. The Delegation of **Portugal** remarked that Lisbon should also be included in a comparative study and that that very week a study meeting was taking place in Lisbon on ports and related

intangible values. As to the reference to the case of Vienna made by the Delegation of Lebanon, the Delegation observed that World Heritage inscription had helped Vienna find an appropriate solution, and that, having heard the State Party, it could support inscription.

839. The Delegation of **Norway** accepted the declaration of the State Party and supported the inscription. It proposed, however, strengthening the text in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision as to the recommended monitoring of urban development processes.

840. Invoking the inscription of Vienna, the Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that at that time, the State Party had given assurance that it was not aware of all the details of the project, whereas a building permit was granted barely a few weeks following the inscription of the property. Following the intervention of the World Heritage Centre, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, the height of the building had been revised whilst the general opinion was that a building should not have been constructed on that site. Therefore, the Delegation recommended that Committee members be very vigilant regarding this question because once inscribed it was too late to act.

841. The Delegation of **China** requested clarification on the legal protection of the area.

842. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** informed the Committee that the whole site was under planning guidelines and that a comprehensive management plan had been prepared.

843. The Delegation of **New Zealand** stated that the possibility of such a development should not prevent its inscription.

844. **ICOMOS** recalled that in the case of Vienna the building permit had already been given but that the Committee had not been aware of that at the time of inscription. The Committee could either refer the nomination back and request the plans for the development project, or inscribe the site with a strong recommendation on the new development. It said that ICOMOS was not against development as such, but it should be in line with the character of the place.

845. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its complete agreement with Lebanon. As there appeared to be a majority for inscription under specific conditions, the Committee could simply remove the site from the List if the conditions were not met.

846. The **Chairperson** proposed that the site be inscribed under the condition that any development was in harmony with the historic character of the site.

847. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it admired the creativity of the Delegation of Saint Lucia but asked who would determine whether or not the project was in harmony with the character of the site. If it were the Committee deciding, then it would come back to the Committee in any case, and the Committee could, without any problem, refer the nomination to the next session.

848. The Delegation of **Norway** said that it understood the position of the Delegation of the Netherlands but observed that the project might never be built and that it therefore agreed with the position expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

849. The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the Committee could inscribe the site and then, if needed, could inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

850. The Delegation of **Lebanon** shared the point of view of the Delegation of the Netherlands, regretting the absence of a legal framework, which would greatly simplify the situation.

851. The Delegation of **Norway** asked what building guidelines were in place for the area in question.

852. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that there were guidelines governing the height of buildings to guarantee that new development was in harmony with the historic surroundings. It confirmed that the project would of course be submitted to the Committee and that the City of Liverpool had already consulted ICOMOS.

853. The Delegation of **Norway** found the guidelines acceptable.

854. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that all building permits and urban plans mentioned the protection of the area in which construction was foreseen. This mention was general and practically without effect. The only way to control construction consisted in limiting the height.

855. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked ICOMOS whether it knew what it would not want to see to happen in Liverpool and if so, whether it could be written into the recommendation.

856. **ICOMOS** said that it was not so simple but, as a general rule, new buildings should not be higher than existing ones.

857. The **Representative of the Director General** said that the Committee had the full right to express its opinions and that the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS would have the technical capacity to assess any future project proposal and present it to the Committee.

858. The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City, United Kingdom, on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) with recommendations as discussed, adopted (decision **28 COM 14B.49**).

859. The representative of **Liverpool City Council** thanked the Committee for its decision, citing a text by John Lennon. He assured the Committee that its observations and recommendations would guide the city's development process.

Property	The Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen
Id. N°	C 1087
State Party	Germany
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)(vi)

860. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

861. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that at the last session, the proposal had been returned to the State Party for a comparative study on Town Halls. This had been carried out, but it would not be sufficient to prove that Bremen possessed Outstanding Universal Value. Without doubt the property was of regional importance but it was difficult to attribute universal value to it.

862. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon. It expressed surprise that no reference was made to the Hanseatic cities already on the World Heritage List and that the site should be considered as an extension to them.

863. The Delegation of **Oman** expressed strong support for the nomination.

864. The Delegation of **Norway** considered the site to be of Outstanding Universal Value but asked whether it could be said to be of Outstanding Universal Value in comparison with other medieval town halls already on the World Heritage List.

865. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** informed the Committee that a study of other town halls had been undertaken in a broader European context and had been revised by two external

experts. It started to describe the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

866. Calling for a point of order, the Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that the State Party refrain from expressing in favour of its own property.

867. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed satisfaction with the study and peer review and supported the nomination.

868. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the nomination on the basis of its continuous use as a seat of local authority.

869. The Delegations of **Lithuania, Egypt and Japan** supported the inscription.

870. The Delegation of **Kuwait** agreed with the Delegations of Oman and Colombia.

871. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported inscription and proposed that the property could be re-nominated as a serial property together with other German cities already inscribed on the List.

872. The Delegation of **India** did not share the enthusiasm for inscription and asked if no way could be found to inscribe the site in connection with other sites already on the World Heritage List.

873. The Delegation of **Nigeria** made reference to other properties already inscribed at the present session that did not compare favourably to Bremen. Accordingly, it supported the inscription.

874. **ICOMOS** said that the comparative study undertaken by the State Party had been very convincing. It also referred to the value of the Roland Statue as being highly significant with an important spiritual meaning. It confirmed that a number of experts had been convinced of the values of the nominated site. As to a serial nomination, Bremen Town Hall could not be immediately associated with other Hanseatic towns.

875. The **Chairperson** proposed that the Committee adopt the Draft Decision with a recommendation to the State Party that it considers a serial nomination in the future.

876. The Delegation of **India** repeated that it had proposed including the site among similar Hanseatic cities already inscribed in the State Party.

877. Whilst reiterating its doubts as to the universal character of the property, the Delegation of **Lebanon** said that it would go along with the majority decision.

878. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to whether the Committee was adopting the proposal of the Delegation of India.

879. The **Chairperson** said that a majority of the Committee was in favour of inscription.

880. The Delegation of **India** restated its position that a recommendation should be added to the decision regarding a serial nomination.

881. The **Chairperson** declared the Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen, Germany, inscribed under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi) with a recommendation that the State Party consider the possibility of re-nominating the site, together with other Hanseatic cities already inscribed in Germany (Decision **28 COM 14B.50**).

882. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee for the inscription.

Property	Val d'Orcia
Id. N°	C 1026 Rev
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (iv) (vi)

883. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report, informed the Committee that it had recently received additional information from the State Party and said that it could recommend inscription on the World Heritage List.

884. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked why the additional information had not been included in the addendum to the working document. The Committee could not accept oral information.

885. **ICOMOS** answered that the information did not change the recommendation as such but was a response to certain observations expressed by ICOMOS on the comparative analysis. Additional comparative research had been undertaken by ICOMOS and the only comparable site was the 'Beemster Polder' in the Netherlands.

886. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its satisfaction and support for the nomination.

887. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** accepted the response of ICOMOS but insisted that new information should have been submitted to the Committee in writing.

888. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the nomination.

889. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported both the statements of Saint Lucia and Nigeria.

890. The Delegations of **New Zealand, India** and **China** supported inscription.

891. The **Chairperson** then declared the decision adopted to inscribe the Val d'Orcia, Italy, as a cultural landscape under criteria (iv) and (vi) (Decision **28 COM 14B.51**).

892. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed its pleasure and pride to see this magnificent property inscribed on the List and indicated that it was the same landscape that could be found in numerous Italian Renaissance paintings, notably those of Leonardo de Vinci. This landscape had remained identical over the centuries and that was what gave it its unique character. Artistic life in the region of the property was very active and in constant evolution.

Property	Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture
Id. N°	C 1117 Rev
State Party	Portugal
Criteria	C (iii) (iv)

893. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

894. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed support for the nomination and recalled the importance of the site in connection to Latin America.

895. The Delegations of **Lithuania, Egypt, Benin, China, Nigeria** and **Oman** supported the inscription.

896. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked about risk management as regarded the impact of the new airport on the island.

897. **ICOMOS** said that any airport had an impact but it was necessary for the development of the island. Assurances had been given that impact would be limited to the extent possible.

898. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the inscription and referred to the fact that Argentina also had that type of site where there was a close interaction with the land.

899. The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that it had a 'problem' with the Outstanding Universal Value of the site but that for the sake of unity it would accept inscription before having tasted the excellent wine of the island.

900. **ICOMOS** reiterated the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated site, in particular regarding the way the walls divided the area into small fields and allowed production in harsh conditions.

901. The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture, Portugal, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criteria (i), (iii), (iv) and (v) adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.52**).

Property	Muskauer Park / Park Muzakowski
Id. N°	C 1127
State Party	Germany/ Poland
Criteria	C (i)(iv)

902. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report.

903. The Delegations of **Colombia, Egypt** and **Lebanon** expressed support for the nomination.

904. The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Muskauer Park / Park Muzakowski, Germany/Poland, on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape under criteria (i) and (iv) adopted. (Decision **28 COM 14B.53**).

905. He expressed his appreciation for the transboundary nomination and the close collaboration established between the States Parties concerned.

906. The Observer Delegations of **Poland** and **Germany** expressed their gratitude for the inscription of the cultural landscape, stressing the fact that it was a symbolic inscription that built and reinforced cooperation between the two countries in precisely the same area that had been the theatre of the beginning of two World Wars.

Property	Luis Barragán House and Studio
Id. N°	C 1136
State Party	Mexico
Criteria	C (i)(ii)

907. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report and informed the Committee that it had received information that the whole site was now legally protected.

908. The Delegation of **Colombia** referred to the enormous importance of the property for the architecture of Latin America, and, supported by the Delegations of **Egypt** and **Chile**, expressed strong support for its inscription.

909. The Delegation of **Argentina** emphasized the importance of the work of the architect Luis Barragan.

910. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the inscription and requested ICOMOS' opinion on the idea of a serial nomination, which it thought appropriate.

911. **ICOMOS** said that a serial nomination of the work of Barragan could indeed be envisaged.

912. The **Chairperson** declared the decision to inscribe the Luis Barragan House and Studio, Mexico, adopted under criteria (i) and (ii) adopted, with the recommendation that the State Party should examine the possibility of a serial extension of the work of Barragan (Decision **28 COM 14B.54**).

913. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** and the Director of the Fundación Luis Barragán thanked the Committee for the inscription and informed the Committee that it would look into the possibility of presenting a serial extension of Barragan's work.

Property	Bam and its Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	C 1208
State Party	Islamic Republic of Iran
Criteria proposed	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

914. The **Chairperson** explained the procedures set out in paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines* under which the Bureau could waive the normal deadlines for properties proposed on an emergency basis. At its session the preceding Sunday, the Bureau had approved the waiver of the deadlines, and had recommended that the Committee should consider the inscription of the property. Two Draft Decisions were proposed, one for inscription on the World Heritage List, the other for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

915. **ICOMOS** presented the site and its evaluation report of Bam and its Cultural Landscape, noting the request of the State Party for a modification to the name as originally proposed.

916. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that the Committee found itself faced with a particular case, and stated its full support for the inscription of Bam and its Cultural Landscape simultaneously on the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger.

917. The **Committee** decided unanimously to inscribe Bam and its Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List (Decision **28 COM 14B.55**) and on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **28 COM 14B.56**).

918. Taking the floor, at the invitation of the Chairperson, the Observer Delegation of **Iran** thanked the Committee as well as the Secretariat and the different NGOs consulted in the framework of the preparation of the nomination dossier of the property. It indicated that a conservation specialist would be appointed and assured the Committee that the property would be managed and preserved for the benefit of all humanity.

Sunday, 4 July 2004 (morning)

**ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE
LIST (CONTINUED FROM FRIDAY 2 JULY
AFTERNOON)**

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

919. The **Chairperson**, noting the 'typhoon devil' that had cleaned and freshened the air the previous day, hoped that the delegates would be similarly refreshed after their Saturday break.

920. The **Secretariat** announced that a representative of UNESCO's Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs had now joined the meeting and would be available should any legal questions arise.

921. The Observer Delegation of **Denmark** took the floor on behalf of the Danish and Greenland Home Rule Governments, and the Municipality of Ilulissat, to thank the Committee for its decision to inscribe Ilulissat Icefjord on the World Heritage List. Although for unforeseen reasons its arrival had been delayed and it had not had the pleasure of being in the room during the IUCN presentation, it expressed its appreciation for the Advisory Body's work. The Home Rule Government, in close collaboration with the Municipality of Ilulissat, would ensure that the recommendations of the Committee and of IUCN would be implemented as soon as possible. The Delegation concluded by inviting everyone to visit Ilulissat.

922. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Indonesia, who had also not been able to make a statement following the inscription of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra.

923. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** thanked the Committee for its deliberations and decision to inscribe the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra on the World Heritage List. It thanked IUCN for its hard work and presentation, and concluded by thanking the Government and people of China for their warm welcome and hospitality.

924. The **Chairperson** noted that several Committee members had asked for time to address general issues surrounding the nomination process, and he therefore opened that debate.

925. **ICOMOS** wished to take the opportunity to acknowledge the hard work of the ICOMOS team that had prepared the evaluations for the Committee and the presentations over the preceding days. It was also grateful for all the comments made by Committee members during that period, and for any other comments that might be made in the days to come. It underlined the importance of improving communication between the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, so that the working methods of the Committee would be transparent and clear.

926. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that nominations were the culmination of often years of effort by States Parties, and that the hopes and aspirations of communities and sometimes nations rested on such work. It was therefore very important to ensure that the evaluation process was transparent and equitable. The Delegation highlighted the issue of consistency that it believed had been absent during the previous days of discussions: consistency of assessment of Outstanding Universal Value, of presentation in the nominations, in application of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (including application of the criteria), consistency in the Committee's decision-making, and consistency in process. For the sake of the credibility of the *Convention*, it was important for those issues to be addressed. When the revised *Operational Guidelines* came into effect, such problems would be compounded if not resolved. It would be important to put in place transitional arrangements for the introduction of the new *Operational Guidelines* and inform all States Parties. It seemed from the documents distributed that there was already some confusion about which version of the *Operational Guidelines* was in force. The Delegation said that they had prepared a Draft Decision for the consideration of the Committee which addressed those points, as well as others raised by other Committee members.

927. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred with most of the observations made by the United Kingdom. It added that it was important that the Committee always take its decisions on the basis of expert knowledge and sound argumentation. When it had joined the Committee, it had waived the right to bring forward new nominations during its mandate, so that it could speak freely. In relation to decisions on inscription, it reminded the Committee of a maxim, "If in doubt, leave it out" and suggested that it was sometimes wise to be tough and wait until

missing information had been supplied before inscribing a site. The Delegation also commented on the need to be clear about what was expected concerning management plans: was the western experience with management plans an unnecessary imposition on traditional cultures which already had management structures in place, but little documentation? The Delegation also commented on the importance of delegations receiving the necessary documentation in sufficient time -- six weeks before the meeting as required -- if they were to consult the necessary experts before coming to the Committee session. Recalling the Delegation of Lebanon's comments at a previous meeting, the Delegation of the Netherlands noted that it was the Committee that took decisions, based on expert advice, and Committee members should be able to consult their own experts in addition to the Committee's Advisory Bodies. With regard to the often excellent presentations, it asked that a means be found to make them available to Committee members before the session. Finally, it asked that the Committee set aside time in the future to discuss the concept of outstanding universal value. It seemed from the presentations by the Advisory Bodies that there were two concepts: outstanding universal global value, and outstanding universal regional value, based on sites that were only representative of a theme. At the present Committee session, sites of different orders of outstanding universal value had been inscribed. Committee members had observed the difference between nominations presented by IUCN (using standards of outstanding universal global value); and those presented by ICOMOS, whose outstanding universal value was presented in a regional context.

928. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** endorsed most of the comments expressed by the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. It noted that the credibility of the World Heritage List depended on the credibility of the Committee, of the Centre and of the Advisory Bodies. There were many improvements that could be made to all three organs, but one issue was crucial: State Parties should not put forward sites for inscription while they were members of the Committee. It is of course obvious that such a measure could not be adopted immediately, since the governments of Committee members might already have made plans to propose nominations and Committee members must be therefore able to make informed decisions before proposing their candidature for a seat in the Committee. It had prepared a draft decision on that proposal and would explain the rationale behind it when the debate takes place. It further noted that such a measure should not apply to Committee members with no properties on the World Heritage List.

929. The Delegation of **Lebanon** shared the concerns of previous speakers, and thought that the Committee found itself in an increasing crisis situation, probably ransom of the success that had cost several decades of work of the *Convention*. The States Parties were more and more active and often subject to local and national pressures, resulting in the presentation of numerous candidatures and, if care was not taken to guard against this tendency, the credibility of the List was likely to suffer. An inflation of the sites for which Outstanding Universal Value was not evident would perforce depreciate those for which the value was uncontested. This question, that merited serious examination, concerned the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation supported the draft decision presented by the Delegation of the United Kingdom with some modifications. Furthermore, it thought, as did the Delegation of Saint Lucia, that Committee members should not be allowed to submit other nominations, because one cannot be both judge and jury. It was for this reason that, in spite of an ongoing dossier of which examination was deferred, Lebanon undertook not to present any sites during the course of its mandate, which gave the Delegation greater independence.

930. The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the United Kingdom for its efforts to improve the decision-making process, and agreed with the draft decision.

931. The Delegation of **Argentina**, while concurring with the statements of the United Kingdom and Saint Lucia, underlined the importance of respect for deadlines. The deadlines established for the evaluations had not been respected. Concerning the substance of the evaluations by the Advisory Bodies, the Delegation observed that in the Latin America and Caribbean region, the shortcomings of nominations noted by the evaluations were due to lack of resources, not lack of goodwill or knowledge. Countries of the region should enlist the financial support and aid of those countries with greater financial resources. The Delegation, while noting that its comments were intended as constructive criticism, observed that some nominations seemed to have been rushed through the process, not taking the rules into account. It had the impression that some of the additional information requested from the State Party had been submitted after the deadline.

932. The Delegation of **Portugal** said that although the *Convention* established a set of rules for the inscription of sites, the concept of heritage was an evolving one. The moment was one of change, in which new ideas of contemporary heritage, industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, serial and transboundary nominations called for new approaches. The recent decision to abolish the

Bureau was still being evaluated. During this period of transition, the Committee should be prepared for an evolution in its procedures. Echoing the concerns expressed by Argentina, the Delegation recalled the problems of financing nominations, which involved a large number of people and resources. A Committee decision not to inscribe a site was a great frustration for the people concerned. There was a clear need to revise the procedures and technical aspects of the Committee's work. The Delegation called for an extraordinary session of the Committee to examine those issues.

933. The Delegation of **Egypt** said that while it appreciated the suggestions of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, it looked forward to seeing them in written form so that they could be studied.

934. The Delegation of **Norway** supported the points raised by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia and other delegations, and asked to see the proposed Draft Decision referred to. In the decisions taken during the previous week, there existed inconsistency regarding different nominations. It noted that the decisions of the Committee had been based on the evaluations, not on an examination of the actual nomination dossiers.

935. The Delegation of **Oman** commended the Draft Decision of the United Kingdom, as it placed a number of the concerns voiced by Committee members in a clearer framework. The draft decision covered information that Committee members would need in order to take appropriate decisions. The proposals made by Portugal should be considered in a more general framework.

936. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the previous speakers, and in particular with the content of the Draft Decision proposed by the United Kingdom about the evaluation of nominations. It also expressed support for the spirit of the statement of the Delegation of Saint Lucia, but not with its proposal to ask Committee members to refrain from proposing new sites for inscription on the List. It also specified that it was not always necessary to have a management plan *per se*, but that where exemplary management plans existed, they could be used as models for other nominations. The Delegation agreed that the process of presenting nominations was a costly one.

937. The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the United Kingdom for its draft proposal and agreed with most of the points raised. However, it disagreed with the views expressed by Saint Lucia and Lebanon in which they advocated a rule preventing Committee members from presenting nominations of properties in their own State. With a six-year Committee term of office, it would be difficult to prohibit a State

Party from submitting nominations. It was a subject that should be considered at greater length at another time.

938. The Delegation of **China** wished to raise five points based on the discussion that had just taken place. First, it thanked the members of the Committee that had spoken in favour of improving the Committee's decision-making process, and supported all those points which would improve the credibility of the *Convention*. Second, it agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia concerning the coordination of the three organs of the *Convention*. Every possible means should be found to achieve coordination and harmonization. Third, since the Committee's decision in Cairns, some Committee members had willingly waived their right to present nominations, and the Delegation extended its heartfelt thanks to them. Fourth, in the face of the limited resources available to the Centre, Advisory Bodies and the Committee, the Committee did need to retain a limit on nominations. It was important to resolve that issue by enhancing the capacity of the Committee to better implement the *Convention*, and by enhancing the capacity of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Last, it supported the position advanced by the United Kingdom, but would like time to study the Draft Decision.

939. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that its Draft Decision, which had been partially circulated, was still in draft form, and recommended that the Committee should assign a drafting group to finalize the text.

940. **IUCN** said that it had taken note of the constructive comments of the Committee members, for which it expressed its thanks. It considered that there was clear guidance in the *Operational Guidelines* (paragraph 6(i)) as to what constituted Outstanding Universal Value. In interpreting that concept, IUCN was guided by its global strategy assessments (reported earlier to the Committee) and by its thematic studies. The credibility of natural World Heritage sites in the eyes of many external audiences lay in part in the rigorous interpretation by the Committee of Outstanding Universal Value. As an example, it cited Shell's and ICMC's (International Council on Metals and Mining) "no-go" commitment to avoid working in natural World Heritage properties. IUCN agreed with several members of the Committee that it was in the interests of all that the right nominations should be brought forward. Therefore, in relation to natural heritage, it suggested that States Parties use IUCN's global analysis and thematic studies in the preparation of Tentative Lists. Furthermore, both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should encourage best practice in the preparation of those Lists, and exemplary lists should be circulated.

While acknowledging that it was the Committee itself that must organize its work, it noted that the abolition of the annual Bureau meeting did make it more difficult for the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties to iron out any misunderstandings before the Committee made its final decision: that issue should be addressed if the Advisory Bodies and States Parties were to have full confidence in the process. Finally, IUCN underlined the importance of finalizing the global strategy documents of both Advisory Bodies as soon as was possible. It noted, however, that a number of the issues raised, such as management plans, had already been addressed in the revised draft of the *Operational Guidelines*. The general point, it stressed, was to encourage more effective dialogue between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, and the States Parties.

941. **ICOMOS** agreed with the statement of IUCN. In a time of transition, there was a need for consistency. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre had already been working for several years on revising the *Operational Guidelines*, which everyone expected to be finalized soon. As the *Operational Guidelines* included a definition as to whether a nomination was complete, it was not necessary to have special guidelines on that point. In most nominations there was always something missing, and it would not be desirable to paralyze the system with bureaucratic procedures.

942. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** called the Committee's attention to the ethical dimensions of its work. The protection of heritage had become a multi-million dollar industry. The Advisory Bodies were not-for-profit organizations, and, as such, could be viewed as susceptible to the special interests of consultancy firms, and other individuals and organizations that might have a special interest in seeing the Advisory Bodies reach a certain conclusion. In the interest of the credibility of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, it urged the Advisory Bodies to maintain their high level of credibility.

943. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** agreed with many of the points raised by Committee members. It urged the Committee to consider four points in its draft decision: Firstly, it should strongly recommend that the *Operational Guidelines* be finalized and approved as soon as was possible; secondly, Tentative Lists should receive a formal evaluation by the Advisory Bodies; thirdly, given the confusion about the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, between the "best of the best" and "representative of the best", the Committee should conduct a substantive debate on the issue, and finally, Committee members should hold back from presenting nominations during their terms of office,

in order to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest.

944. The Observer Delegation of **Italy**, noting the many sound ideas in the draft decision promoted by the United Kingdom, concurred with the position stated by ICOMOS: the Committee should not paralyze its work with bureaucratic constraints, such as management plans. If a good management structure existed, but not necessarily a management plan *per se*, States Parties should not be penalized. There should be a certain margin of flexibility in the procedures. New procedures for nominations were also necessary, as were capacity-building measures for countries that were under-represented on the World Heritage List.

945. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its commitment. It was in the middle of a reform process, and it would not be "plain sailing" until some of its procedures had been worked out. He asked the Committee to establish a drafting group for draft Decision **28 COM.14.57** in order to prepare a final version of the United Kingdom proposal.

946. The Delegation of **India** expressed its great concern as to the lack of clarity in some of the decisions that had been adopted the previous day by the Committee, and asked the Chairperson to spell out the elements of each decision when adopting.

ITEM 15 STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

ITEM 15A PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/15A

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (proposed by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) (C 148)

947. The **Chairperson** explained that informal consultations have taken place with the aim of achieving consensus on the issue under discussion. Expressing his personal gratitude to all who had contributed to bringing a very positive result, and in particular the Italian Ambassador Francesco Caruso, who continued his remarkable diplomatic efforts initiated at the last General Conference of UNESCO in the interest of the safeguarding of the World's cultural and natural Heritage. He proposed that the Draft Decision, which had been circulated in the

room be adopted unanimously and without discussion.

948. The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.31** by consensus.

Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N475)

949. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

950. The Delegation of **Benin** requested information regarding cooperation with Chad and Sudan, the need for which was evoked in paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision, and wished to know whether the protocol agreement had been signed between IUCN and the State Party.

951. The **Secretariat** said that cooperation between the Central African Republic, Sudan and Chad had been requested by the Committee at its 27th session following reports of poaching pressures originating in those two countries. Since no new information had been received on the issue, it recommended that a reference to the need for such cooperation should be included once more in the decision.

952. **IUCN** informed the Committee that the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of the Central African Republic had been delayed but that it would continue to work closely with the State Party on the conservation of natural heritage, including the Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park.

953. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.1**

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N227)

954. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and explained that the poor security situation in the country had meant that the mission requested by the Committee at its 27th session could not take place.

955. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that it would be helpful to reiterate the mission's objectives, and queried the feasibility of the time frame for it. It asked for UNESCO be placed ahead of the Advisory Body in references to joint missions, and suggested that the Secretariat use the agreed-upon formula.

956. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.2**

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (N137)
Virunga National Park (N63)
Garamba National Park (N136)
Salonga National Park (N280)
Okapi Wildlife Reserve (N718)

957. The **Secretariat** introduced the working documents along with the revised Draft Decision provided that morning. It noted that the security situation had deteriorated considerably, especially in the east of the country, where an army mutiny had broken out. The main continuing problems included the presence of armed groups in and around the properties, and illegal encroachment and mining activities. In Kahuzi-Biega National Park, serious setbacks to recent improvements had resulted in the looting of the Park headquarters and its occupation by armed groups. It also reported that with prices for the mineral colombo-tantalite rising again, a fresh increase in illegal mining activity was to be feared. In Virunga National Park, armed groups were making it impossible to consolidate any gains that might have been made in the preceding months. In June, a World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)/Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN) mission had been ambushed, a guard killed and guard posts looted and destroyed. Encroachment near the Rwanda border into prime gorilla territory was allegedly on the orders of Rwandan military commanders. However, recent action by the World Heritage Centre, diplomatic missions and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) seemed to have led to a halt in deforestation. In Garamba, poaching continued and at least six northern white rhinos (of an estimated total population of only 30) and over 1,000 elephants had recently been killed. The poaching was reported to be from Sudan and focused on the ivory trade. Two ICCN park guards had been killed in an armed encounter with Sudanese poachers in May.

958. The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre provided additional information on the high-level fund-raising conference concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo due to be held in September 2004 at UNESCO Headquarters.

959. The Delegation of **Benin**, qualifying the situation being experienced by the Democratic Republic of Congo as a human and African tragedy, supported the Draft Decision and suggested adding the Okapi National Park to the list of national parks to be evaluated, cited in paragraph 9.

960. The Delegation of **South Africa** shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of Benin with regard to the human and natural tragedy taking place

in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and thanked the Centre and IUCN for their attempts to mediate solutions.

961. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed concern that the recommendations in the Draft Decision would not be sufficient to achieve the desired objectives. Actions needed to be taken at different levels. It suggested that the Centre should work with other international conventions such as CITES and with other United Nations agencies. It noted that the September conference on the Democratic Republic of the Congo would be an opportunity for the international community to cooperate in finding solutions to the challenges faced by the properties.

962. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its solidarity with the State Party, and noted that it experienced similar difficulties of conflict in protected areas. In such situations, it was difficult for a government to give high priority to conservation issues.

963. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for appropriate mention of regret over the loss of park wardens' lives in the conflict to be included in the decision.

964. The Observer Delegation of **Belgium** indicated that its country was organizing an exhibition at the Conference for the Conservation of Natural Heritage of the Democratic Republic of Congo that would be held in September at UNESCO Headquarters. It hoped that countries would respond positively to the request for financial support and that they would send high-level representatives to the Conference. In view of the situation in the national parks in question and the priority that UNESCO had accorded to them, Belgium had decided to concentrate its extrabudgetary contributions on biodiversity protection in Central Africa. The Delegation furthermore voiced concern about the reduction in the number of staff specialised in natural heritage and evoked with regret the departure of Mr Natarajan Ishwaran, thanking him for the devotion with which he had directed the Natural Heritage Section at the Centre.

965. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the Democratic Republic of the Congo conference was one of the Centre's most important projects. He thanked the United Nations Foundation for having contributed US\$3 million towards the DRC project. Given the government commitment to cooperate with international organizations, UNESCO had decided to host the September meeting for the mobilization of funds and the organization of an exhibition. He noted the financial support of Italy and Belgium. With regard to the staffing issue raised by the Observer Delegation of

Belgium, he assured the Committee that recruitment processes were underway.

966. The **Chairperson** noted the work of the Centre in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and said that much remained to be done. He declared Decision **28 COM 15A.3** adopted, as amended.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N9)

967. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document. It noted that the State Party had provided a report on 25 May, indicating that wildlife numbers had increased and that the re-demarcation of the park boundaries was complete. The report did not, however, include any maps nor did it provide further information with regard to the benchmarks set by the Committee for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

968. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.4** without discussion.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N155/257)

969. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document.

970. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.5** without discussion.

Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N573)

971. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been presented, which meant that the State Party had not provided the information on the issue of stolen vehicles repeatedly requested by the Committee. It suggested that IUCN provide further comments with regard to the delays in the planned mission to the property.

972. **IUCN** said that it was in communication with the State Party but that due to logistical difficulties, had not yet been able to carry out the mission. It would soon reschedule it and would report back at the next Committee session.

973. The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested that IUCN and the Centre organize a mission as soon as possible and that this be contained in the decision.

974. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed concern over the lack of response to the Committee's request to the State Party on the fate of the vehicles purchased with International Assistance funds. Specific measures should be taken if the

State Party did not reply to the request by a certain deadline.

975. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.6** adopted.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N25)

976. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document, noting that no new information had been received since its preparation.

977. Decision **28 COM 15A.7** was adopted without discussion.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N684)

978. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and provided further details on its recommendation to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

979. **IUCN** informed the Committee that the ten-year General Management Plan referred to in the working document had been completed and was due to be approved in June. For the preceding two years, the security situation on the ground had been unchanged, management facilities had been deployed and tourism had picked up again. **IUCN** noted that a number of threats remained that required management to limit their impact. It commended the Uganda Wildlife Authority for its strong commitment to the protection of the property and supported the recommendation to remove it from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It highlighted the case as a success story for the *World Heritage Convention*.

980. The Delegation of **Benin**, whilst thanking the Advisory Body and the Centre, remarked that the majority of properties in danger were situated in Africa. It recommended that at the occasion of the first session of the Committee to be held in sub-Saharan Africa during the coming year, the Centre envisage the launching, jointly with the African Union authorities and other new African structures, an initiative aimed at studying the means to reverse the tendency. It furthermore recommended that the Centre collaborate with the African group at UNESCO to pursue these objectives.

981. The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the State Party on its work and said that it fully supported the Draft Decision.

982. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that this remarkable success demonstrated that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in

Danger was not a punishment, but a way of helping the State Party to safeguard its heritage.

983. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.8**

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N8)

984. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and announced that no new information had been received since its preparation.

985. The Delegation of **Colombia** remarked that the property had received a considerable amount of aid and that the State Party should make an effort to make more information available.

986. The **Secretariat** responded that the State Party had indeed provided a good deal of specific information on improvement of the state of conservation of the property. However, no written confirmation had yet been received regarding its commitment to ensure a minimum flow of water to the property.

987. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that more precise indications on requirements for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger would be useful for the State Party, and expected **IUCN** and the Centre to provide clear advice in that regard.

988. The **Secretariat** replied that improved conditions at the property were mostly due to more favourable weather conditions over the previous two years. A few successive years of drought might once again lead to a critical situation. Without minimum water provision assurances from the State Party, there were no guarantees that the property's integrity would be maintained.

989. **IUCN** added that additional commitment from the State Party was indeed required on the issue and that recent high rainfall showed the ability of the ecosystem to recover if adequate water flows were ensured.

990. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the United Kingdom's proposal and said that the Draft Decision request was beyond the capacity of the State Party. It recommended that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

991. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated the need for the State Party to be clearly informed on what was required from it in order to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation did not suggest

removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

992. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the Committee should keep recommendations in general terms. In that case, however, the recommendations should be re-drafted with specific information for the State Party on what was required to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

993. The **Chairperson** agreed that the State Party should have clear recommendations. He suggested that IUCN and the Secretariat re-phrase the text and declared Decision **28 COM 15A.9** adopted, as amended.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N338)

994. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and highlighted the cooperation of the State Party with the United Nations Foundation and UNESCO.

995. **IUCN** noted that it had received recent reports that Bodo militant camps in and around the Park had been removed and that tourism was being actively promoted again, which was a positive sign after two decades without tourism. It asked the State Party to confirm that information. It recommended a monitoring mission to further investigate the situation and evaluate the damage to the property in collaboration with the State Party.

996. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.10** adopted.

Everglades National Park (USA) (N76)

997. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and informed the Committee that no additional information had been received. It corrected a typographic error in the original report from the State Party in paragraph (b) on page 17 (English version) and page 18 (French version) of the working document – year 2116 should read 2016.

998. The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked the Centre whether the Park must remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger until 2016.

999. The **Secretariat** suggested that the State Party should provide additional information on the revised deadline.

1000. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it had noticed that in most Draft Decisions there were provisions commending

States Parties on their efforts and congratulating them on their actions, but that no such provision was made regarding Everglades National Park, despite the fact that the State Party had made considerable efforts and invested over US\$8.3 billion to address the threats to the site. It explained that its Government had viewed the List of World Heritage in Danger as a tool that could help States Parties take purposeful action and mobilize necessary support. The Observer Delegation suggested that once the Committee was convinced that the State Party was making a concerted effort to deal with the threats, it should remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It presented an addition to the Draft Decision for consideration by the Committee.

1001. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the State Party had answered only parts of the questions raised. It had indeed carried out a great deal of work, but it was not yet clear what the State Party needed to accomplish before the property could be removed the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1002. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded the Committee that it was the Committee's responsibility to draft decisions and not the State Party's.

1003. The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that it was IUCN's responsibility to identify the necessary conditions required to suggest removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1004. **IUCN** commended the State Party on its detailed report and considerable efforts to work with all sectors and stakeholders to restore the natural ecosystem. It recommended that IUCN, the Centre and the State Party work together to identify benchmarks and the steps the State Party needed to take before the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to report on those issues to the Committee at its next session, in 2005. As things stood, it would be inappropriate to give a time frame for the possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1005. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for IUCN's recommendation to be integrated into the final decision.

1006. The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for its tremendous effort and declared Decision **28 COM 15A.11** adopted as amended.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N260)

1007. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and announced that no new information had been received since its preparation.

1008. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for clarification of the expression “conflicts between wildlife and humans”.

1009. **IUCN** said that the expression was commonly used to refer to threats to wildlife because of agricultural activities.

1010. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.12** adopted.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N196)

1011. The **Secretariat** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

1012. The Delegation of **Lebanon** was pleased with the clarity of the proposed decision, that spelt out to the State Party the exact actions to be undertaken for the site to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and requested the Centre and IUCN to use equally clear formulations in future state of conservation reports.

1013. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed surprise that the closure of the legal loopholes allowing the extraction of timber from the property had not been included in the Draft Decision.

1014. The **Secretariat** reported that it had received information that the loopholes had already been removed.

1015. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15A.13** adopted.

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)

1016. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission had taken place from 31 May to 4 June 2004 and that the mission report was being finalized. It noted that the State Party had carried out commendable conservation work on the property since 1998 in collaboration with partners such as the Governments of Japan, the United States of America and the Netherlands. Further conservation issues would need to be addressed, such as updating the existing management plan, establishing a national legislative and administrative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage in Benin, intensifying restoration and conservation of the site and developing site interpretation.

1017. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, greatly concerned by the report presented, asked that the Secretariat revise paragraph 3 of the decision so as to include the conclusions of the mission.

1018. The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1985, when the property had obtained its World Heritage status. It expressed its serious concern at the situation and asked why more effort could not have been spared for the conservation of the property.

1019. The **Secretariat** said that the effort required to restore earthen architecture of the kind represented at the site was complex, requiring constant attention, particularly given climatic conditions with high precipitation.

1020. The **Chairperson** noted that on-site conservation was being undertaken.

1021. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** considered that the Draft Decision should be revised to include more detailed recommendations on activities to be undertaken and benchmarks.

1022. The Delegation of **Colombia** also suggested that the Draft Decision should be revised to specify details of the restoration and presentation work to be undertaken and to refer to the need for regular maintenance.

1023. The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed regret that 19 years after the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, serious conservation problems remained, and called for more coordinated regional and international efforts for the safeguarding of the property.

1024. The **Chairperson** also encouraged international cooperation for the conservation of the property.

1025. The Delegation of **Benin** congratulated the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies who had permitted its country to dispel the threats that weighed on the property. It approved the modifications that the Delegation of Lebanon proposed to paragraph 3 and requested that paragraph 2 of the decision also be modified to thank the Governments of Italy and Japan for their financial and technical assistance. It encouraged donor countries to continue to provide extrabudgetary contributions.

1026. The **Chairperson** thanked the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and international stakeholders for providing assistance to the State Party and called for continued effort in that regard.

He declared the decision **28 COM 15A.14** adopted, as amended.

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

1027. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no further information since finalization of the working document.

1028. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the Draft Decision would need to refer to the management and conservation plan to be prepared under Emergency International Assistance.

1029. The Delegation of **Lebanon** concurred with the observations made by the United Kingdom. Furthermore, it judged incoherent, in the French text, the sentence that recommended taking flood measures in Timbuktu, and requested that the formulation be modified.

1030. The **Chairperson** declared the decision **28 COM 15A.15** adopted, as amended.

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

1031. The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the Committee to the new information provided by the State Party to the effect that the roofing of the storage facilities had been repaired and the general legal reform system put in place, which opened up the possibility of preparing a conservation plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session and set as one of the conditions for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1032. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, formerly responsible for the property, explained that the [problems being faced by this site originated from the years following Algerian independence. The craftsmen who, worked at Tipasa at that time have remained at the site, and the second generation now lives there. He then informed the Committee of the activities that had been carried out at the site over the past two years.

1033. The Observer Delegation of **Algeria**, referring to the excursion organized yesterday by the Chinese authorities, expressed his emotion after the visit to Tong-li, that reminded him of Venice, therefore Italy, and consequently of Tipasa. It hoped that Tipasa would soon be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger and twinned with Tong-li.

1034. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the site of Tong-li in Suzhou was not inscribed on the World Heritage List.

1035. The Delegation of **Benin** requested that the information provided by the Secretariat be included in the draft decision. It recalled that in Africa, the problems of relocating of populations inhabiting a site were extremely frequent.

1036. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the word “substantial” could usefully be deleted from paragraph 2 of the revised Draft Decision.

1037. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the points made by the Delegation of Benin and congratulated the State Party on its efforts in safeguarding the property. It suggested removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1038. Referring to the conservation issues (a) – (e) as set out in the working document, the Delegation of **Colombia** pointed out that the recommendations of the Secretariat’s mission in September 2002 had been partially implemented by the State Party. The Draft Decision could include a list of those activities that would need to be undertaken. Furthermore, the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1039. The Delegation of **China** asked why the Secretariat had prepared a revised Draft Decision.

1040. The **Secretariat** explained that paragraph 1 of the revised Draft Decision acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party. The revised version did not reflect the comments made by the Delegations of Benin and Egypt suggesting the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It asked the Committee to clarify its position.

1041. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested the Centre to establish a list of all that remained to be implemented, indicating priorities, and once they were implemented, to propose to the Committee the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1042. The **Chairperson** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon and asked the Secretariat to make the necessary amendments.

1043. The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated its wish to congratulate the State Party on progress made in safeguarding the property and expressed its support for removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1044. **ICOMOS** indicated that it was not within its competence to tell the Committee to remove or not the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, but for the Committee to decide.

1045. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, noting that the State Party concerned had not requested the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, invited it to state its position. It considered, however, that it would be wiser to wait until the next session of the Committee in view of the fact that the inscription was only made in 2002.

1046. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested amending paragraph 4 of the revised Draft Decision to enable the Committee to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 29th session.

1047. The Observer Delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Delegation of Egypt for its proposal, with which it fully concurred, but requested that the decision comprise a very firm recommendation.

1048. The **Chairperson** said, to sum up, that the Committee could either remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger with a list of recommendations, or discuss the possibility of removal at its 29th session in 2005.

1049. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reiterated that as the property had only been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2002, it would not have resolved all its problems in two years. It suggested to wait another year for removal from the List, thus giving Algeria an additional year to resolve all the problems.

1050. The Delegation of **Nigeria** called the attention of the Committee to the reasons for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. If the Committee was satisfied that the danger no longer existed, then the property could be removed from that List, but if the danger remained, it should stay on it.

1051. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, supported by the Delegations of the **Netherlands, New Zealand** and **Norway**, suggested retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1052. The **Chairperson** declared the decision **28 COM 15A.16** adopted, as amended.

1053. The Vice-Chairperson (Nigeria) took the Chair.

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C90)

1054. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1055. The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Secretariat and promised to submit to the Centre a state of conservation report by 1 February 2005.

1056. The **Chairperson** declared the revised Draft Decision **28 COM 15A.17** adopted.

Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C1130)

1057. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document. Security problems in the region had delayed the implementation of activities under the Emergency International Assistance request for the establishment of a site management coordination unit and the development of a management plan for the property.

1058. The Chairperson declared the decision **28 COM 15A.18** adopted.

Sunday, 4 July 2004 (afternoon)

ITEM 15A PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (CONTINUED FROM SUNDAY 4 JULY MORNING)

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/15A

Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

1059. The **Secretariat** said that the State Party had suspended the project to construct a new market, notwithstanding the legitimate expectations of the local community. Taking that into account, it referred to the revised Draft Decision that suggested removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1060. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to the visit to the site in December 2003 and commended the national authorities on their strong commitment to safeguarding the site.

1061. The Delegation of **China** commended the State Party on its efforts in preparing a conservation plan for the property and its decision to suspend the project to build a new market. It supported the revised Draft Decision.

1062. The Delegations of **Japan, Egypt and Kuwait** supported the revised Draft Decision.

1063. The Delegation of **Benin** was delighted with the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and congratulated the Sultanate of Oman for the work accomplished.

1064. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was concerned that the management plan had not been finalized and suggested that the revised Draft Decision should be amended to request a state of conservation report to be submitted to the Secretariat in that regard. It suggested amending paragraph 4 of the revised Draft Decision to substitute “concrete” with “positive” and “the establishment of” with “the implementation of”.

1065. The Delegations of **Portugal, Nigeria, the Netherlands, Argentina, Norway, India, Colombia** and **Saint Lucia** endorsed the revised Draft Decision.

1066. The **Chairperson** declared the revised decision **28 COM 15A.19** adopted, as amended.

1067. The Delegation of **Oman** expressed its appreciation at the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Historic town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

1068. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1069. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the State Party for additional information concerning the state of conservation of the property.

1070. The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** informed the Committee that a conservation plan had been established, which was to be approved by the Ministry of Culture. The authorities of Yemen also intended establishing a heritage house in Zahid, and they were preparing a meeting in November 2004, with the assistance from the World Heritage Fund, to discuss the conservation issues of the site. It expressed the commitment of its Government to improving the safeguarding of the property.

1071. **ICOMOS** commended the authorities of Yemen for taking appropriate conservation measures and hoped that the results of such work would bear fruit in the near future.

1072. The **Chairperson** declared adopted Decision **28 COM 15A.20**.

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

1073. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1074. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the Draft Decision should request the State Party to submit a state of conservation report for examination by the Committee at its 29th session. In addition, it was important for all sections of UNESCO to work together in a concerted way.

1075. The Delegation of **Lebanon** did not understand the meaning of the sentence in paragraph a) of the report, according to which « the problem caused by the road construction did not fall under the responsibility of UNESCO.” Once a property was listed as World Heritage, obligatorily it fell under the responsibility of UNESCO.

1076. **ICOMOS** said that, unfortunately, the local situation in the field of cultural heritage conservation within which UNESCO had tried its best to operate was very difficult.

1077. The Delegation of **Benin** also requested explanations from ICOMOS concerning the last sentence of the report, which it found unclear.

1078. Referring to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for clarification as to the details of the recommendations of the UNESCO mission.

1079. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, returning to the question of UNESCO’s responsibility with regard to the road construction, did not accept the proposed formulation, in spite of the explanations provided by the Secretariat.

1080. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** informed the Committee of the actions undertaken by the Centre, on the one hand, and by the Cultural Heritage Division on the other. UNESCO was fully concerned by the issue of the road and had informed the Afghan authorities, but however, did not wish the population of Jam to be penalized. A solution must be found, an alternative access for the inhabitants.

1081. The Delegation of **Lebanon** declared its satisfaction with the information provided by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, but requested that the Draft Decision be modified to include these new elements.

1082. **ICOMOS** said that the minaret was not in immediate danger of collapse.

1083. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** confirmed that the property received financial

assistance from Italy and Switzerland that had been used to carry out more exact recordings, environmental studies and archaeological excavations, and similar to the activities carried in the Bamiyan Valley through financial assistance from Japan.

1084. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Assistant Director-General, but found this information worrying. It was not for private societies to carry out this work and at the least, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies should be consulted.

1085. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** indicated that the missions sent by UNESCO to the site were not commercial missions but missions comprising international experts who were very familiar with the country, and were part of the ICOMOS network. However, all information gathered by these different missions should be included in the state of conservation report of Jam, to be presented at the 29th session.

1086. The Delegation of **Benin** thanked the Delegation of Saint Lucia for its vigilance and was pleased that the Assistant Director-General had recognized that the report did not contain all the necessary information. The Committee members should be well informed beforehand.

1087. The Chairperson declared the decision **28 COM 15A.21** adopted.

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

1088. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage had undertaken a mission to the site from 29 May to 4 June 2004 in order to meet and assist the relevant Afghan authorities in the preparation of the Master Plan, with the contribution of the National Research Institute of Cultural Properties. In accordance with the recommendation of the mission, the Afghan authorities would establish a planning commission to oversee the process.

1089. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** sought clarification concerning the issue of de-mining, as referred to in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

1090. The **Secretariat** said that the relevant decision adopted at the Committee's 27th session had also mentioned the issue.

1091. **ICOMOS** emphasized that de-mining was only one of the many difficulties that the site was facing and remarked that the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger

had had a positive effect in mobilizing international effort, enabling the implementation of a number of conservation activities.

1092. The Delegation of **Japan**, speaking with reference to the personal experience of the expert who had undertaken the mission to the site in June 2004, said that development pressure was clearly one of the factors affecting the property. The provincial and municipal authorities were committed to the conservation of cultural heritage. The fact that certain construction projects that could have affected the World Heritage property had been halted was one of the examples of international assistance that warranted continuation.

1093. The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the Draft Decision needed to specify the measures needed for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1094. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the first meeting of the International Coordination Committee for the Safeguarding of Afghanistan's Cultural Heritage (ICC) had been postponed on grounds of security. It had been due to discuss the establishment of zoning and management plans as priorities, based on the model used for Angkor in Cambodia.

1095. The **Chairperson** declared the decision **28 COM 15A.22** adopted as amended.

Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)

1096. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the state of conservation of the property had greatly improved, largely due to concerted international support.

1097. The Delegation of **China** supported the Draft Decision that, if adopted, would remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and said that progress had been made thanks to international cooperation.

1098. The Delegation of **Benin** congratulated the Cambodian authorities for the immense efforts and sacrifices made, as well as efforts made by other States Parties. However, it could see no logical follow-up between the report presented and the text of the decision. It approved the content of the decision, but requested that the text of the report be revised as it found the content lacking in clarity.

1099. The Delegation of **Lebanon** was pleased with this third success, recalling that Angkor had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in

1992, immediately after its inclusion on the World Heritage List. But because of this, the property had passed from the List of World Heritage in Danger to the list of «developing sites». It requested clarification regarding a sentence in the report concerning the tourist development project that it qualified as siblylline.

1100. The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its satisfaction at the progress made and acknowledged the international solidarity behind the conservation of the property. It also commended the authorities of France for hosting the Second Intergovernmental Conference on the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor from 14 to 15 November 2003.

1101. The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party but said that there remained a number of outstanding conservation issues.

1102. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the Draft Decision and said that the case was a successful example of shared responsibility and common heritage.

1103. The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the Draft Decision.

1104. The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the donor countries and said that some of the Delegation had had the honour of visiting the site.

1105. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the Draft Decision and remarked that the case was a success story. It underlined the importance of establishing an overall strategy for the management of the site as the rescue stage was over in terms of the state of conservation of the property, and requested the State Party to explain its plans in that connection.

1106. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the State Party to conduct regular monitoring and to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of the state of conservation of the site.

1107. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the Draft Decision.

1108. The **Chairperson** declared the decision **28 COM 15A.23** adopted.

1109. The Observer Delegation of **Cambodia** expressed its gratitude to the Secretariat and to the members of the Committee. It was happy to see its country rewarded for the work accomplished in perfect osmosis with the International Coordination Committee (ICC) and the international community as a whole. It informed the Committee of the latest decree, in June 2004, taken by the Cambodian

Government relating to the combat against illicit construction work in Angkor Park.

1110. The Observer Delegation of **France** expressed its pleasure that, as it had hoped, the decision had been adopted. In Angkor it saw an exemplary example of outstanding international cooperation. APSARA was responsible for the preservation of the monuments but also for resolving all the problems relating to the restoration of the property itself, such as the problems of water, roads and high tourist visitation, considered as a positive element in the case of Cambodia. The removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger is a tribute paid to the country that has worked for ten years on its restoration.

1111. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** confirmed the high importance of this decision. He was present at the Committee session in Santa Fé, in 1992, when the site was inscribed simultaneously on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. Angkor was a concrete example of what the Committee could do for a threatened site. All efforts were combined to assist the Cambodian authorities in drafting a law, to create the APSARA, to make an inventory of the Museum and to reduce illicit traffic. Heading the UNESCO Office in Pnomh Penh was an excellent director, Mr Etienne Clément, specialist in illicit traffic, and on the podium of the 28th session, Anne Lemaistre, who came to the Centre to replace Sarah Tichen, who worked for many years on Angkor with Azzedine Beschouch, former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The results obtained at Angkor demonstrated that the Centre was right to inscribe Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

1112. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that as part of the implementation of an Emergency Assistance Grant from the World Heritage Fund, a workshop had been held on site from 7 to 11 June 2004 to elaborate a site management plan. The issues identified at the workshop had included the threat to the integrity and authenticity of the property posed by rural development pressures and *ad hoc* construction work at the site, and the fact that the Hampi Development Agency had not been functioning as expected.

1113. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, noting the construction of a very big commercial centre adjacent to the property, mentioned in the report, was not referred to in the decision text, whereas it constituted a serious threat for the property,

requested information from the Secretariat and ICOMOS.

1114. The **Secretariat** said that the revised Draft Decision took account of the comments on the Visitor Centre made by the UNESCO mission of May 2003.

1115. The Delegation of **Benin** was not satisfied with the response of the Secretariat. The site was threatened, thus the Draft Decision should take this into account. Furthermore, in paragraph 4 of the decision, the State Party was requested to establish a management plan "as soon as possible". How could this delay be explained ?

1116. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there appeared to be three different management plans all in simultaneous preparation or operation by different agencies working at the site. It was concerned that the existence of multiple management plans would lead to confusion and possibly improper implementation. The three plans should be merged into a single comprehensive plan from which all concerned would work and that suggestion should be incorporated into the revised Draft Decision.

1117. The Delegation of **India** explained that the Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) had prepared an outline for a management plan, but that it had not been elaborated with any specific detail. The School of Architecture and Planning was preparing a comprehensive management plan that would, when officially adopted, become the authoritative management plan for the property. With regard to the commercial centre, it was a multi-purpose visitor centre which would have some commercial functions, and it had been built following a feasibility study which had indicated a need for such a facility to function as a "traffic node" to control visitor traffic.

1118. The **Chairperson** declared the revised decision **28 COM 15A.24** adopted as amended.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

1119. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the World Heritage Committee of a range of activities undertaken to safeguard the property. In order to understand the situation, the World Heritage Centre had commissioned a work survey from the University of Venice IUAV, which had covered two out of several monument zones. With regard to the fire which had broken out at Swayambunath in September 2003, the damage had been repaired by local artisans using traditional materials, but it was to be regretted that the UNESCO recommendations regarding fire prevention had not been acted upon by

the State Party despite the availability of Emergency Assistance from the World Heritage Fund. He informed the Committee of the results of the stakeholder workshop held on site from 3 to 7 May 2004, and the subsequent work underway to prepare inventories of all seven monument zones that formed part of the property. That work would result in a proposed revision of the boundaries of the monument zones as well as the development of an action plan. The Director also mentioned that a comprehensive policy review was underway addressing the issue of finances, site management and responsibilities.

1120. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the State Party had refused to have this very important site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that the Committee had had to threaten its delisting in order to convince the State Party, which, in the end, had a positive effect. The Delegation considered that the boundaries of the site had to be redefined, because within its initial delimitation the property no longer had Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore, it proposed modifying the wording of paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, and redefining the criteria. Finally, it drew attention to the use, which it considered very awkward, of the expression "residual value of the site" and proposed its assistance to the Secretariat in revising paragraph 4 of the recommendation.

1121. The Delegation of **Portugal** welcomed the fact that some progress had at last been made in safeguarding the property. Referring to page 31 of the state of conservation report, it sought further information from the Secretariat as to why the State Party had stressed that "the different UNESCO experts should not have given conflicting advice and that better coordination could be exercised by the appointment of a single technical advisor". With regard to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, it requested information and clarification about the details and role of the aforementioned "international technical advisor".

1122. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that a number of experts had worked on the state of conservation of the property and there had been perhaps a "superimposition of opinions" rather than "conflicting advice". The proposal to appoint an "international technical advisor" was intended to ensure oversight of the coordinated implementation of the Committee's recommendations with regard to the property, and the organization of periodic meetings of an international working group of experts to advise on the conservation of the site.

1123. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that, at its previous session, the Committee had asked the

World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in consultation with the State Party to organize a mission to Kathmandu Valley to assess the remaining World Heritage value of the property. It recalled that at its present session, the Committee was supposed to consider whether or not to remove the property from the World Heritage List after examination of the mission report. Having regretted that the previous request had not been implemented by the Centre, it further asserted that, with its current state of conservation, the property could not remain on the World Heritage List. It supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon to redefine the borders in order to renominate the monuments.

1124. The Delegation of **Benin** questioned the urgency of the assistance referred to in paragraph 6 of the decision, eight months after the disaster. In the case where the delay was due to a problem of the State Party in formulating the request, it invited the Secretariat to provide its assistance.

1125. The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** renewed its Government's commitment to safeguard and conserve the monuments of the Kathmandu Valley. It informed the Committee that the Government was in the process of re-defining the boundaries of the seven monument zones, as requested by the Committee at its 27th session. Furthermore, more effective management mechanisms for the property as well as an action plan had also been prepared. According to the State Party, Pratappur Shrine within the Swayambunath Monument Zone had been repaired using traditional techniques and materials. It explained that the conservation problems at the site had arisen from rapid population growth and urban development. It appealed to the Committee to be realistic and objective in its assessment and expectations with regard to Nepal's capacity to implement its recommendations.

1126. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its satisfaction that the State Party had repaired the fire damage at Swayambunath. The core issue was that of the changing character of the Valley itself, and that the Committee had two options: it could remove the property from the World Heritage List and then re-inscribe it under different criteria and with different boundaries, or it could require the definition of the boundaries of the seven inscribed monument zones. It asked the State Party to provide enough information for the Committee to be able to examine the remaining value of the property at its 29th session.

1127. The Delegation of **Benin** was still uncertain, in spite of the explanations provided by the State Party, whether or not it had received any Emergency Assistance.

1128. The Delegation of **Portugal** recommended that the property should be retained on the World Heritage List but the Committee must give clear instructions as to the need to redefine its boundaries.

1129. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that there had been no improvement in the conservation of the property since 1998, and that decision **27 COM B.52** had not been implemented. Given that the requested mission had not taken place, it considered that the Committee did not have the necessary information to decide what action to take with regard to delisting, re-inscription or redefinition of site boundaries.

1130. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** emphasized that if the State Party had heeded the recommendations of the Committee, particularly with regard to inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the state of conservation of the property would have been improved and the present difficult situation would not have arisen. It shared the opinions of the Delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom,

1131. The Delegation of **Lebanon** shared the opinion of the Delegations of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, but remarked that the redefinition of the boundaries of a property must follow a specific procedure. The boundaries of the site must be redefined and a new request for inscription must be submitted, once the Advisory Bodies' report was sent to the Committee.

1132. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the need for the Committee to be well informed by the 29th session in 2005 with regard to the definition of the boundaries of the property and the remaining World Heritage value of the property, so that it could consider whether or not to remove the property from the World Heritage List.

1133. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had received the Emergency Assistance request from the State Party on 27 June 2004 and the request had not yet been processed.

1134. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** described how the recent rapid urbanization of the Kathmandu Valley had had such an adverse effect on the conservation of the inscribed property, and that it would justify the name change for the property. He did not consider that removing the property from the World Heritage List would be the most appropriate action for the Committee to take at that time - there should rather be a redefinition of the boundaries of the property and the buffer zones. He assured the Committee that a full report would be

available to it in time for consideration at its 29th session in 2005.

1135. **ICOMOS** observed that additional reactive monitoring missions would not bring an answer to the conservation problems in the Kathmandu Valley. It urged the elaboration of a comprehensive master plan that would provide specific and binding guidelines for the safeguarding of the heritage values of the property.

1136. The Delegation of **Japan** agreed with the position taken by the Delegation of the Netherlands, namely, that there was no need to take a hasty decision to remove the property from the World Heritage List.

1137. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that as no mission had taken place it was not appropriate for the Committee to take a decision as to whether to remove the property from the World Heritage List. It requested information about the justification for which the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List and whether the value was still retained.

1138. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that a report would be available in time for consideration by the Committee at its 29th session in 2005.

1139. The **Rapporteur** inquired if the Delegation of the United Kingdom had a proposal for a new draft decision.

1140. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that the Committee should consider the possible removal of the property from the World Heritage List at its 29th session in 2005.

1141. The **Chairperson** then declared decision **28 COM 15A.25** adopted as amended.

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

1142. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the condition of both the Fort and the Garden had been improving satisfactorily. However, the outstanding issue threatening the long-term conservation of the property was that jurisdiction for the site's management had recently been transferred from the federal authority to provincial administration, in apparent contradiction with national legislation concerning the management of properties in Pakistan inscribed on the World Heritage List.

1143. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested the State Party to study the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, because an important problem had arisen which did not however fall exclusively within the province of the Pakistani authorities. The Advisory Bodies must be involved and a timetable must be established to set the limits of the State Party commitment.

1144. The Delegation of **Benin** congratulated the Norwegian Government for its contribution, amounting to US\$ 900, 000.

1145. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked if the implication of paragraph 3 of the Draft Declaration was that the boundaries of the property would be reduced.

1146. The **Secretariat** pointed out that "support zone" in the Draft Decision should be read as "core zone".

1147. The Observer Delegation of **Belgium** noted that paragraphs 3 and 5 of the decision were identical to those of the previous year, that is items 3 and 7 of decision **27 COM 7A.24**, which, in its opinion, deserved clarification.

1148. The Delegation of **Norway** asked the State Party to provide information on the issue of jurisdiction and management authority with regard to the property.

1149. The Observer Delegation of **Pakistan** assured the Committee of the commitment of the Pakistan Government to safeguarding the heritage values and ensuring the conservation of the inscribed property. It further informed the Committee that the issue of restoring jurisdiction and responsibility for the conservation and management of the property to the federal authorities (that was, to the Department of Archaeology and Museums) was under consideration at the national level.

1150. The **Chairperson** declared the decision **28 COM 15A.26** adopted as amended.

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

1151. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1152. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commended the State Party, Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat on the work undertaken to reverse the deteriorating state of conservation of the property, but reminded all concerned of the need to remain

vigilant to ensure that improvements continued and were sustained.

1153. The Delegation of **Portugal** also commended the progress made in improving the conservation of the property, and singled out the active involvement of local communities as a very positive development.

1154. The Delegations of **Nigeria** and **Benin** congratulated the State Party for the efforts it had undertaken.

1155. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.27** adopted.

1156. On behalf of its Government, the Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its appreciation to the Committee, Advisory Bodies and Secretariat for their assistance in ensuring the conservation of the property.

Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)

1157. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission had taken place from 26 to 31 October 2003.

1158. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that there was an adequate management plan already, and that therefore paragraph 5 should be amended, replacing “to prepare” with “finalize”.

1159. The **Secretariat** explained that the management plan had not been officially adopted. It further highlighted the need to coordinate the management plan with another Global Environment Facility project for the Ramsar site.

1160. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.28** adopted as amended.

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

1161. The **Secretariat** said that it had been developing an action plan in consultation with the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage as requested by the Committee at its 27th session. The authorities of Azerbaijan planned to host a Round Table in October 2004, financed by the German World Heritage Foundation, to discuss ways to implement the action plan. It also referred to the ICCROM training course for heritage experts in Azerbaijan in June 2004 and confirmed that the State Party had submitted a state of conservation report on 2 June 2004.

1162. The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that obtaining appropriate political support was crucial for the successful conservation of the property and invited the State Party to show increased political will in that respect.

1163. **ICCROM** drew the attention of the Committee to the two-week ICCROM training course for experts from Azerbaijan in June 2004 that had addressed technical aspects of conservation as well as the role of political decision-makers in heritage management. It suggested an amendment to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, replacing “Master Plan” with “Management Plan” in line with the outcome of the training course.

1164. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** endorsed the suggested amendment by ICCROM. It proposed a further amendment, the insertion of “urges that this Decree is fully enforced” at the end of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

1165. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.29** adopted.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)

1166. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1167. The Delegation of **India** asked the State Party to describe progress made in the preparation of the management plan.

1168. The Observer Delegation of **Peru** said that its Government appreciated the assistance rendered by UNESCO in combating the problem caused by the rising water level. The national authorities had submitted an International Assistance request in order to identify appropriate measures to combat the water-related problem, and intended organizing an international seminar to discuss technical solutions to the issue. What was known as the draft Chan Chan law (Draft Law number 3807) was being prepared for submission to the Parliament.

1169. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its concern over illegal construction activities at the site and asked whether that issue was addressed in the above-mentioned draft law, which had been pending in the Congress over the past years.

1170. The Delegation of **Benin** thanked the State Party for the information provided, but requested clarification from the Secretariat regarding the expression “once again” used in paragraph 3 of the decision.

1171. The **Secretariat** explained that it referred to the decision taken by the Committee at its 27th session by which it had already invited the State Party to consider requesting International Assistance for that same purpose.

1172. The Delegation of **Chile** asked about the submission of a International Assistance request by the State Party.

1173. The **Secretariat** said that it had not received an International Assistance request concerning the property.

1174. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15A.30** adopted.

ITEM 17 B.II PROTECTION OF PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Documents

WHC-04/28COM/17B.II

Revised Draft Decision 28 COM 17B.II

1175. The **Representative of the Director-General** drew the attention of the Committee to a number of issues regarding decisions adopted at the 26th session of the Committee, held in Budapest, Hungary in 2002, and at its 27th session at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris in 2003. He explained that the item concerned 3 issues. On the first, the establishment of an inventory of the Palestinian cultural and natural heritage, an inventory of Palestinian cultural and natural sites of potential outstanding universal value had been prepared. It contained 20 properties (16 cultural, three natural and one mixed), and had been the result of a wide consultation process involving dozens of Palestinian specialists and various concerned institutions. The inventory would be published and made available to the Committee.

1176. The second issue related to the evaluation of the state of conservation of the heritage and measures for its safeguarding. Four technical assessment missions had recently been sent to Jericho, Hebron, Nablus and Tell Rumeida. The reports were in preparation.

1177. On the third issue, concerning capacity-building for the future implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, activities carried out to date included: a training workshop on the *Convention* held in September 2003 with ICCROM, in which 16 Palestinian specialists had been trained; the organization of a number of awareness-raising seminars; and the establishment of a Palestinian World Heritage working Unit. Other training

workshops were foreseen, including one in July 2004 in Bethlehem.

1178. In terms of the US\$100,000 agreed under decisions **26 COM 6.1** and **26 COM 6.2**, a work-plan had been agreed with the Palestinian authorities, including: the strengthening of a Palestinian World Heritage Unit; training on site management, and a special project on cultural landscape conservation. Funding had been decentralized for 2004 and activities would be implemented before the end of 2005.

1179. During a recent mission of the Deputy Director-General to Israel and to the Palestinian territories, the question of the impact of the construction of a wall on archaeological remains had been raised. The issue of the protection of the physical and living heritage of Palestine, on the other hand, would be addressed during a meeting between UNESCO and representatives of the Palestinian authorities, which would take place on 15 and 16 July 2004.

1180. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the African saying: "When eyes meet they may speak louder than voices", and explained that a series of informal consultations had taken place with the aim of achieving consensus on the issue under discussion. Expressing his personal gratitude to all who had participated, he informed the Committee that the revised Draft Decision that had been circulated in the room reflected that consensus, and proposed that it be adopted unanimously and without discussion.

1181. The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 17B.II** by acclamation.

1182. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the **Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO** and the **Observer Delegation of Israel** each made a statement, which are included as **Annex VII** to the present Summary Record.

1183. The **Chairperson** declared item 17B.II closed.

Sunday, 4 July 2004 (evening session)

ITEM 15B PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE

Document

WHC-04/28.COM/15B

1184. The **Secretariat** introduced the working documents. As decided by the Committee at its 27th session, the State of conservation reports listed under Part I in the document were for discussion by the Committee, whereas those in Part II would only be opened for discussion if a specific request was made to the Chairperson by a Committee member.

W National Park (Niger) (N 749)

1185. The **Secretariat** said that the planned meeting organized by the World Heritage Centre and Ramsar had taken place in W Park from 18-22 May 2004, UNESCO being represented by a consultant. The consultant had received confirmation from the Deputy Director of the Ministry of Wildlife and Fisheries that the two projects (construction of the Dodyonga Dam and phosphate mining in the Park) had been definitively abandoned, as previously stated by the State Party's Minister for Water, Environment and Desertification Control in response to concerns about W raised by the Committee.

1186. **IUCN** said that it too had been informed by the authorities in Niger that the planned dam construction had been abandoned. It had also been made aware that the phosphate mining at the site would not take place.

1187. The Delegation of **Benin**, in congratulating the Niger authorities, referred to the transboundary character of the Park, situated between Niger, Benin and Burkina Faso. It indicated that its country had taken part in the decision to abandon the dam project, which bore witness to the commitment of the countries concerned to the conservation of World Heritage.

1188. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that it was encouraging news and proposed adoption of the Draft Decision.

1189. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.1**

1190. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

1191. Decision **28 COM 15B.2**.

Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)

1192. Decision **28 COM 15B.3**.

Mount Kenya National Park / Natural Forest (Kenya) (N 800)

1193. Decision **28 COM 15B.4**.

Greater Saint Lucia Wetland Park (South Africa) (N 914)

1194. Decision **28 COM 15B.5** as amended.

Ngorongoro Conservation Zone (Tanzania) (N 39)

1195. After the Secretariat presented the report, the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania**, speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, provided additional information on the property. It expressed regret at its Government's delay in the submission of the report of the Ngorongoro study on ungulates and said that was in agreement with the Draft Decision under consideration. It reassured the Committee that it would ensure that the report would be submitted by 1 February 2005.

1196. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.6**.

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

1197. The **Secretariat** noted that a consultant mission was taking place at the time of the Committee session and new information would only be available upon submission of the consultant's report.

1198. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.7** without discussion.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)

1199. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.8** without discussion.

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083)

1200. The **Secretariat** said that a letter dated 24 May 2004 had been received from the Secretary-General of the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, forwarding a letter from the Director of the World Heritage Management Committee of Yunnan Province, dated 21 April 2004, regarding the project to construct dams on the Nujiang River. The letter indicated that a national research project had produced a Report on the Planning of Hydropower Development on Nujiang (Salween River) Middle/Lower Reaches, and that environmental impact studies were still in progress.

The current report showed that none of the proposed dams fell within the boundaries of the World Heritage property. It noted that the State Party would make further assessments and reviews regarding the environmental and technical feasibility of the proposed hydropower construction project. The Yunnan World Heritage Management Committee was alert to any new issues related to conservation and development in the Nujiang River watershed, and would keep the Committee informed, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. The Secretariat had also received a petition from 43 Chinese people, including representatives of NGOs, community members and scientists, expressing concern about the dam. The letter had been transmitted to IUCN.

1201. IUCN said that the impact of dams on World Heritage properties could be direct, via flooding, and indirect, due to the associated construction of infrastructure such as roads, and to the forced migration of displaced people. Dams could also have downstream and transboundary consequences. It noted concerns about the potential impact of the project and said that it was important to clarify the exact nature and status of the proposal before providing a detailed response. It supported the Draft Decision.

1202. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.9** without further discussion.

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

1203. The **Secretariat** noted the cooperation between the State Party and the Wet Tropics of Queensland property in Australia, and referred to a mission of representatives of the Australian property to Lorentz National Park in June 2004.

1204. IUCN said that the cooperation between Lorentz National Park and the Wet Tropics of Queensland site was a good example of a positive partnership between two States Parties. It noted progress on the strategic management plan for Lorentz National Park, along with the appointment of executive staff in the western part of the Park.

1205. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.10**

Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284)

1206. The **Secretariat** said that it had no new information to present.

1207. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.11**.

East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)

1208. The **Secretariat** said that on 24 June, it had received a mission report from the National Commissioner for Culture, Solomon Islands National Commission for UNESCO. The Commissioner had said that the mission report had been delayed due to unavoidable circumstances. The report noted that the site was well protected and that there was no sign of logging or significant agricultural activity. Some socio-economic problems had arisen due to the suspension of project funding by New Zealand. The chiefs and communities had expressed their willingness to assist and support a UNESCO/IUCN joint mission to the site later that year and recommended that the joint mission should visit the four villages in order to assess different environments around the lake. The report also included a recommendation that the New Zealand Government should reconsider reactivating and providing the funds for the projects that had already been approved during the first phase of the World Heritage project.

1209. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.12**.

Ha-Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N672 bis)

1210. The **Secretariat** reported that UNESCO had engaged in consultations with the private sector and had agreed on a waste management project in cooperation with the Six Senses Resort Group of South-East Asia.

1211. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.13**

1212. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

1213. Decision **28 COM 15B.14** .

Greater Blue Mountains Area (Australia) (N 917)

1214. Decision **28 COM 15B.15**.

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

1215. Decision **28 COM 15B.16**.

Te Wahipounamu – Southwest zone of New Zealand (New Zealand) (N 551)

1216. Decision **28 COM 15B.17**.

Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)

1217. The **Secretariat** said that on 15 June it had received a comprehensive State of Conservation report from the State Party. The report: "Impacts of illegal fishing on the Conservation of the Tubbataha Reef National Park", prepared by the Tubbataha Protected Area Management Board contained a great deal of information and had been transmitted to IUCN for consideration.

1218. **IUCN** applauded the comprehensive report from the State Party. It underlined important issues such as the impact of illegal fishing on marine biodiversity and provided a number of strategies to counter the threat. The revised Draft Decision took into consideration the new information provided by the report.

1219. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification regarding the revised Draft Decision.

1220. The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** asked to take the floor.

1221. The Delegation of **Benin** remarked that as an observer, the Delegation of the Philippines might only take the floor if a Committee member requested it to provide information.

1222. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the regulation did not apply to discussions on State of Conservation reports. However, Observer Delegations were not permitted to propose amendments to draft decisions.

1223. The Delegation of **Benin** noted that in paragraph three the request for the organization of a sub-regional forum on the subject of illegal fishing was not mentioned in the new text, and asked that it be incorporated in the event that the forum had not yet been held.

1224. The **Secretariat** confirmed that the subregional forum had not yet taken place and that a reference to it could be included in the revised Draft Decision.

1225. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.18**, as amended.

1226. The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the re-insertion of the regional forum in the decision and said that it could not over-emphasize the importance of such a forum, as the illegal fishing issue involved foreign fishing vessels.

It would seek International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to help organize the forum.

Phong Nha Ke Bang (Viet Nam) (N 951 rev)

1227. The **Secretariat** said that it had no new information to present.

1228. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.19**.

Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) (N 33-627)

1229. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the mission referred to in the working document had looked at all the issues raised over a number of years and had produced a comprehensive report, including the issue of the border fence (now the European Union border), upon which the Draft Decision was based.

1230. The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.20**.

1231. In accordance with the Committee's decision, the Observer Delegation of **Poland** indicated that it welcomed the results of the UNESCO/IUCN mission. However, referring to the first recommendation of the report concerning cooperation between the two managements of the property, it observed that Poland and Belarus had recently signed an agreement for the creation of a management council of the transboundary site. A representative of Poland shall participate at the meeting in Belarus to work on a specific draft agreement. The Delegation underscored its agreement regarding the second recommendation for the extension of the site, and recalled that this proposal now appeared to have IUCN support, which was not the case seven years ago, when the project for extension had initially been proposed. The Delegation furthermore noted with regard to the question of the fence separating the boundaries of Poland and Belarus located within the property, that responsibility for this fence belonged to Belarus. It also underlined that the presence of this fence prevented the free movement of the animals and requested the Belarus authorities to take care that this type of structure had the approval of Poland and the European Union. It indicated that cooperation with Belarus was a priority in the management and protection of the property.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

1232. The **Secretariat** said that it had received a letter from Bulgaria on 2 June 2004 stating that the

Pirin National Park Management Plan had been considered and approved at a meeting of the High Ecological Expert Council of the Ministry of Environment and Water. The Ministry intended to submit the document in July 2004 for final approval to the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, the last step in the procedure for the adoption of management plans as defined by the Bulgarian legislation (Protected Areas Act and management plan regulation). Concerning the question of the boundaries, the letter stated that it should be the task of the experts in the context of preparatory assistance for the possible extension of the property.

1233. The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.21**.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

1234. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a high-level meeting had taken place and, although late, a comprehensive report had been received from the State Party. Recent information indicated that a new routing proposal for a pipeline was under consideration. It needed further clarification from the State Party, but had not received any new information.

1235. **IUCN** stated that the issue of the previous routing of the pipeline had been discussed at several Committee sessions and that further international cooperation and funding was needed to safeguard the site.

1236. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested two clarifications on the report. The first concerned the meaning of “not substantially changed”, as stated in paragraph (d) of the report, the second concerned the oil pipeline and whether it was actually proposed, and if so, how the threats could be mitigated.

1237. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the outstanding universal value of the property was threatened.

1238. The Delegation of **Norway** asked the State Party to clarify the issue of the proposed oil pipeline.

1239. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** had no information on the subject.

1240. Replying to the Delegation of Saint Lucia, the **Secretariat** said that the water body of Lake Baikal is the cleanest on earth, and that the issue of Danger Listing at the previous session had mainly concerned the proposed construction of the oil pipeline and environmental pollution. The result of the earlier Environmental Impact Assessment for the pipeline

had been negative, which had delayed the project, but since then NGOs had reported on a new project for a pipeline, for which no confirmation had been received from the State Party.

1241. **IUCN** explained that the high-level mission had addressed Danger Listing, but that there was no need for it at this stage, although significant threats existed in addition to the oil pipeline, notably in relation to the effluent of the pulp and paper mill.

1242. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that he had been asked by the Director-General to participate in the high-level mission to Moscow. He reported on the long discussions with the Minister of Environment looking at all issues including the pulp and paper mill. He had been informed by the State Party, information confirmed by the World Bank, that measures to limit pollution from the mill were underway. However, concern had been raised over the pipeline, for which there was no clear plan at the time, and the Government informed that a decision would be taken by February-March 2004, but the Centre had not received a formal report.

1243. He further explained that NGO's had reported of two pipeline projects under development, one to the north of the Lake, and one to the south. These plans are within a framework of a large industrial cooperation scheme, one with Japan and the other with China. The Director concluded by saying this was difficult for the Committee and the Centre, as there was no way of responding to this threat because of absence of information.

1244. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stated it was in confusion as regards the status for in Danger Listing and requested an answer to the question raised by the Delegation of Saint Lucia. It further proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to be passed on to the Secretariat.

1245. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed frustration and asked clarification on the situation and how to get information from the State Party. This, it stated, should be reflected in the Draft Decision.

1246. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to amend paragraph 6 in “to provide in cooperation with IUCN an updated report”.

1247. The **Chairperson** remarked on the uncertainty with regard to feasibility.

1248. **IUCN** stated it was happy to cooperate, but it would need advice and information of the State Party in order for the Advisory Body to make an assessment concerning the in Danger Listing.

1249. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** responded it had no information on the proposed pipeline.

1250. The **Chairperson** concluded there was consensus to ask the State Party for information on the issue and declared **Decision 28 COM 15B.22** adopted as amended.

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria) (N 219)

1251. Decision **28 COM 15B.23**.

Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)

1252. The **Secretariat** informed that it had nothing to add to the Draft Decision as proposed in Document *28 COM 15B Add*.

1253. The Observer of the **United States of America** remarked that for the sake of consistency it would like to see reflected in the Draft Decision the State Party's efforts in addressing the conservation issues and it further requested to remove "snow-mobile phase-out and other", as this would be inconsistent with a recent court ruling in the US, allowing the Draft Decision to be in line with this recent ruling.

1254. The Delegation of **Benin** was concerned that the correct procedure was not being followed. It thought that it was not possible for an observer to make an amendment to a Committee's draft decision. It indicated that this amendment must be presented by a Committee member.

1255. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked upon section (f) of the report, paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision and stated that the State Party no doubt did their best, but that the legal system in the United States was very difficult.

1256. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.122 Add** adopted.

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)

1257. The **Secretariat** stated that the mission was completed and a detailed report provided, after which **Decision 28 COM 15B.27 Add**.

1258. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Nahanni National Park (Canada) (N 24)

1259. Decision **28 COM 15B.24**.

Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada)(N 256)

1260. Decision **28 COM 15B.25**.

Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

1261. Decision **28 COM 15B.26**.

Skocjan Caves (Slovenia) (N 390)

1262. Decision **28 COM 15B.28**.

Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685)

1263. Decision **28 COM 15B.29**.

Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)

1264. Decision **28 COM 15B.30**.

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)

1265. The **Secretariat** reported that in the past months challenges had arisen to the Special Law for Galapagos, as the Government had negotiated with fishermen outside the framework established for this law. As a result of the crisis, a new Minister had taken office and finally the Government was maintaining the framework of the law, while strong pressure of the fishing sector remained, which has to be monitored closely.

1266. **IUCN** reported that it had received a report on 24 June 2004 updating the situation in Galapagos, which noted that the Environmental Ministry had appealed against a Galapagos Island court ruling delivered last week that struck down the limits for the lucrative sea-cucumber catch activity. Nine conservation groups were backing the appeal, made to Ecuador's top constitutional court. The Advisory Body concluded that the implementation of the Special Law would remain a challenge and it supported Draft Decision 28 COM 15B.31, in particular paragraph 3.

1267. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported IUCN's statement and explained that this property was considered of great importance to the region, where three countries were cooperating in conservation and the fishing industry was putting strong pressure on governments. It stated that the whole of the marine corridor needed to be addressed and that IUCN had to stay involved in maintaining fishing quota.

1268. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** seconded the statement of Colombia.

1269. The Chairperson declared Decision **28COM 15B.31** adopted.

1270. The Committee adopted the following decision without discussion:

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

1271. Decision **28 COM 15B.32**.

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 202-552)

1272. The **Secretariat** reported that since the production of the document, there had been a new government, which decided not to proceed with the road through the Volcan Baru National Park. It stated that this was reflected in the revised Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.33** that was adopted.

1273. The Committee adopted the following decision without discussion:

Sian Ka'an (Mexico) (N 410)

1274. Decision **28 COM 15B.34**.

Kakadu National Park (Australia) (N 147 bis)

1275. The **Secretariat** reported that, following an agreement between the mining company (ERA) and the Mirrar Aboriginal Traditional Owners, the mine at Jabiluka would not be further developed and the mine shaft had been backfilled. It stated that the decision for the mine not to be developed, except with the approval of the Mirrar, must now be approved by the Indigenous Affairs Minister before it comes into force, and that no information had been received from the State Party, upon which Decision **28 COM 15B.35**.

1276. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Pyrénées - Mont Perdu (France /Spain) (N 773 bis)

1277. Decision **28 COM 15B.36**.

Mount Athos (Greece) (N 454)

1278. Decision **28 COM 15B.37**.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (N 274)

1279. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report and explained that four issues were of importance: 1) the conservation of the archaeological site; 2) the development of tourism; 3) the control of the slopes to prevent landslides; and 4) the uncontrolled development of the town of Aguas Calientes. He recalled that the Committee had already expressed its concerns several times before and that this time a lengthy report was received at the Secretariat, but that after study it appeared that many issues had remained unsolved, most importantly with regard to item four. He continued by saying that the landslide last April killed several people, all of them in the town of Aguas Calientes, and left several hundreds of tourists stranded. He further elaborated on the Vilcanota Valley Project of the World Bank, aiming at capacity-building, solid waste management and tourism development, in which the World Heritage Centre was cooperating, and that the Government of Peru recently had established a special Commission for the protection of the property.

1280. The Delegation of **Chile** stated that Machu Picchu was of significance, not only to the State Party of Peru, but also to the other Andean countries, and indeed the whole world. As such, it continued, the Andean countries felt close to it, also when disaster strikes and it remembered the loss of life in the recent landslide of April. The Delegation stated that the issues surrounding the conservation of the site could no longer be ignored, which was apparent also in the fact that a large delegation from Cuzco was present at this Committee session. It asked if the State Party could explain what measures have been undertaken for protection of the site.

1281. The Delegation of **Argentina** seconded Chile and stated that Machu Picchu was the representation of the Inca culture, which had covered a large part of Latin America, and it recalled the important project to nominate the Camino Inca. It further requested the State Party to clarify issues.

1282. The Delegation of **Benin** thanked the Director for the quality of his report, essential for a better understanding of the state of conservation of the property. It wished to know whether the Peruvian Commission created to ensure the protection of Peruvian heritage, had in fact been established and requested the State Party to inform the Committee of the progress made in the work of this Commission so that the Committee could rest assured regarding the state of conservation of the property and any threats that might arise.

1283. The Delegation of **Colombia** stressed the importance of supporting the State Party in its conservation efforts.

1284. The Observer Delegation of **Peru** expressed its gratitude on behalf of the Government of Peru for the opportunity to explain that Machu Picchu was a symbol for country and continent, and that both Delegation and Government fully agreed with the assessments made in the report. It explained that with regard to the actions and solutions for implementation previously proposed by the State Party, it had been too enthusiastic, and that the additional documents handed to the Secretariat proposed updated measures. It elaborated on a resolution that was passed on 24 June 2004 for new regulations and establishment of a multi-sectorial commission, which will start its work immediately after this Committee session to preserve the property's integrity through planning and conservation activities in core and buffer zones.

1285. The Observer Delegation of Peru further stated that the current scepticism towards Peru's intentions was justified, but that now for the first time all relevant players were brought together, which would make effective management possible. It continued that transport studies were not yet available, while a detailed examination of numbers of tourists in relation to the carrying capacity of the property would be arranged through the World Bank Vilcanota Valley project, as well as solid waste management and awareness raising campaigns. He explained that the disaster at Aguas Calientes, which is 2 kilometers away, pointed to the neglected development of the town, that the Government of Peru was fully aware of the issues and that the special commission would assess them, including the removal of citizens, and redefinition of the urban area. The documents that were handed to the Secretariat provided information on all the actions taken after the disaster.

1286. It continued by explaining that a Canadian mission had visited the site last May and done geological surveys of the roads, the data of which will be processed and archived in Ottawa. Furthermore, it requested UNESCO's assistance in conducting a feasibility study for setting up a team of international experts for the safeguarding of Machu Picchu. It concluded by saying that previously there had been no significant progress, but that a change had taken place in the last few months, a sort of awakening in light of the disaster. A detailed progress report on the management plan would be provided in December 2004; UNESCO's support was important.

1287. **ICOMOS** stated that there was no imminent danger to the World Heritage property.

1288. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.38** adopted.

1289. Then the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Greenpeace concerning the State of conservation of Lake Baikal.

1290. The Representative of **Greenpeace** provided additional information on the plan to proceed to build the pipeline at Lake Baikal in the Russian Federation that, according to him had been approved by the Government in March 2004. He further stated that the World Heritage Committee should send a stronger message to the State Party concerning the potential dangers facing the property if the construction plan went ahead as planned and in doing so referred to Article 8 of the *Convention*.

Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

1291. The **Secretariat** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property as included in the working document.

1292. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.39** without discussion.

Robben Island (South Africa (C 916)

1293. The **Secretariat** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property as included in the working document.

1294. The Delegation of **South Africa** welcomed the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session to send a reactive monitoring mission to Robben Island. It stressed the open and constructive spirit of cooperation and communication with the members of the mission. It informed the Committee that certain recommendations had already been implemented and that the others would be addressed soonest. A progress report would be submitted to the Committee at its 29th session.

1295. The Delegation of **Benin** recalled the symbol of resistance to Apartheid that Robben Island represented for the international community in general, and for Africa in particular. It congratulated South Africa for its commitment in protecting the values of this property, beginning with the application of the recommendations of the ICOMOS-ICCROM-IUCN mission.

1296. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.40** adopted.

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

1297. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working

document and pointed out that some of the figures on International Assistance were too low. The mission to the site had been requested by the State Party in view of its possible inscription in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1298. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Norway**, was of the opinion that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, concerning a revision of the inscription criteria, was unrealistic and that it was not a priority at a time when conservation should be the priority.

1299. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that there was ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that it should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger to save the site for humanity.

1300. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the Draft Decision relating to inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, presented by the Secretariat. It considered, like the Delegation of the United Kingdom, that the State Party should be provided with a list of recommendations to enable the site to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also proposed that the World Heritage Centre assist the State Party to formulate the strategy to be established to this end. Following observations by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Norway, it proposed the omission of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

1301. The Delegation of **Portugal** also agreed with the comments on paragraph 4 and said that its country would be willing to provide support to the property, which was also of importance for the history of Portugal.

1302. The Delegation of **South Africa** appealed for the challenge of the conservation of heritage in the developing world to be addressed, in order to avoid sites deteriorating. Capacity-building should be provided to assist the State Party in developing comprehensive conservation and management plans.

1303. The **Chairperson** concluded that there was consensus on inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the deletion of paragraph 4 from the Draft Decision.

1304. He declared Decision **28 COM 15B.41** adopted, as amended.

1305. The Delegation of **Portugal** requested assurance that the State Party agreed with the inscription.

1306. The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its appreciation to

ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for the mission to the site and confirmed the State Party's agreement with the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It thanked the Governments of Japan and France for the support provided thus far and the Government of Portugal for its offer of assistance. It outlined several measures taken by the State Party and said that a standing committee had been created for the supervision and monitoring of the site. As to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, the State Party would look into the implications at a later stage. Having informed the Committee that a management plan was under preparation with the support of the World Heritage Fund, it appealed to States Parties, UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and the international community to support the safeguarding of the site.

Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

1307. The **Secretariat** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular in reference to the copy of the memorial project constructed on the island.

1308. The **Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO** informed the Committee that during a mission he undertook in June 2004 to Senegal, accompanied by the President of the General Conference of UNESCO and the Permanent Delegate of Benin to UNESCO, he had had the opportunity to visit the two World Heritage sites, Island of Gorée and Island of Saint-Louis. He had discussed the specific case of the Island of Gorée with the Senegalese authorities, in particular the Minister of Culture of Senegal and the Mayor of Gorée. With regard to the replica, they were fully aware of the negative impact of the monument, the destruction of which would necessitate the expenditure of several million dollars. They therefore hoped to obtain technical and financial support of the international community in seeking a definitive solution to the problem.

1309. The Delegation of **Benin**, associated with this mission in his capacity as Permanent Delegate to UNESCO, thanked the Representative of the Director-General for the additional information provided, useful for a better understanding of the state of conservation of the property.

1310. The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that the site had been inscribed some considerable time before and that one could expect the responsible agency to be aware of the rules governing the *Convention*. It was surprised that nobody had noted the matter before, and wondered how that was possible.

1311. The Delegation of **Nigeria** pointed out that there was a contradiction. The original project had

been approved by UNESCO in 1991 and now the World Heritage Centre said that the memorial should be demolished.

1312. The **Representative of the Director General of UNESCO** pointed out that the Executive Board, following an international competition, had approved the memorial to be placed on the mainland at a cost US\$100 million and that the Government of Senegal had asked UNESCO to assist in generating the necessary funds. A replica of over ten metres high had been constructed on the island. The replica was not in harmony with the visual integrity of the site, both in materials and in scale.

1313. The Delegation of **Nigeria** agreed that a mistake had been made but a balance should be found with political concerns. It proposed that the Committee should express its concerns in the Draft Decision and that the State Party should provide, at the 29th session, a technical report on the strategies it envisaged to limit the effects of the replica on the property. No "danger listing" should be considered, however.

1314. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.42** adopted, with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Nigeria.

Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

1315. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979. It highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the construction of a commercial complex within the buffer zone of the property. New information had been received from the UNESCO Teheran Office on 26 June 2004, informing the Committee that the National Technical Committee had studied the issue of the commercial complex and had proposed two possible alternatives: one reducing the height of the new building to 32.64 metres; the second reducing its height to 24.48 metres. The Secretariat observed, however, that both alternatives would still have an adverse impact on the property.

1316. **ICOMOS** added that the difficulty was that the new commercial complex was under construction in a high location overlooking the Meidan, so that its construction impacted visually on the inscribed property in a very intrusive and negative way.

1317. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the State Party to inform the Committee of its view of the situation and possible mitigating measures that had been envisaged.

1318. The Observer Delegation of **Iran** informed the Committee that the National Technical Committee had recommended to the Iranian Government that the construction should be limited to 24.48 metres.

1319. The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.63** adopted.

1320. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** commended the State Party and the National Technical Committee for its technical analysis.

Monday, 5 July 2004 (morning)

**ITEM 15B PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON
THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE
(CONTINUED FROM SUNDAY 4 JULY 04
AFTERNOON)**

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/15B

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)

1321. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report and indicated that new information had been received regarding the intention of the Government of Algeria to work with the Centre on the preparation of the requested conservation plan, but that there was no reason to revise the Draft Decision.

1322. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM15B.43** adopted.

M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)

1323. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

1324. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had no problem with the Draft Decision but suggested the inclusion of a deadline for the completion of the actions.

1325. The **Secretariat** proposed that the deadline should be that for the 30th session of the Committee, that was, 1 February 2006.

1326. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM.15B.44** adopted, as amended.

**Medina of Essaouira (Ancient Mogador)
(Morocco) (C 753 rev)**

1327. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

1328. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM15B.45** adopted.

Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)

1329. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

1330. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that urgent threats were outlined in the report and asked how they were to be addressed. Danger listing might be considered the following year, but it wanted to know what would be done in the meantime.

1331. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether danger listing would be necessary, considering the assistance being provided by Italy.

1332. The Delegation of **Oman** pointed out that the fact that the Government of Morocco had undertaken to develop the appropriate legal framework was not reflected in the Draft Decision. As to possible Danger listing, it would have liked to know the opinion of the State Party thereon.

1333. The **Secretariat** said that in one year good progress could be made in the preparation of a master plan. The reference to eventual danger listing had been included in the document because the Committee had referred to it at its previous session. It suggested revising paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision to integrate the observations made by the Delegation of Oman.

1334. The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed, but repeated its question as to whether Danger listing should be considered.

1335. The **Secretariat** reiterated that threats did exist but that there was a new attitude to the management of the site.

1336. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** observed that there were many positive developments but that there was still little impact on the site. It agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

1337. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.46** adopted, as amended.

Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

1338. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

1339. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.47** adopted.

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

1340. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report included in the working document.

1341. The Delegation of **Lebanon** clarified paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.48**. Concerning paragraph 2, it informed the Committee that the building referred to was not located in the site, but rather on the boundaries, and consequently suggested the revision of this paragraph. Concerning paragraph 3, it assured the Committee that the creation of the Archaeological Marine Reserve was well underway, as was the finalization of the archaeological map which was in fact part of a World Bank project. Concerning paragraph 4, it suggested that the Committee add that it supported the proposal for the transformation of the commercial and tourist port. It also suggested replacing « Sidon Port » by « present port » in paragraph 4.

1342. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Delegation of Lebanon for its information. It asked for clarification as to what was meant when the documents referred to UNESCO (World Heritage Centre, Advisory Body, other divisions of UNESCO). As to the building, it said that the Committee was unable to stop it but asked whether an impact study had been undertaken.

1343. In response to the observation of the Delegation of Lebanon as to the location of the building, the **Secretariat** clarified that there were two archaeological zones, the strictly protected and fenced area, and the zone indicated in the master plan as having potential archaeological significance. On the reference to UNESCO, it informed the Committee that an International Scientific Committee had been set up by the Executive Board in the context of the International Campaign to Safeguard the Site of Tyre and its Surroundings. At the same time, the Centre carried out some activities and had developed cooperation with the World Bank in the framework of an overall World Bank project for Lebanon.

1344. The Delegation of **Benin** wished to know, on the one hand, whether the State Party accepted the proposal for the protection of the underwater heritage around Tyre and, on the other, if the Lebanese authorities had undertaken measures regarding illegal construction referred to and which might affect the integrity of the archaeological area of the site.

1345. In response to the question of the Delegation of Benin, the Delegation of **Lebanon** informed the Committee that the latest decisions had not yet been taken. With regard to the illegal construction, it drew the Committee's attention to a building prohibition,

included in the master plan, that had always existed in this area.

1346. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the construction had been the subject of an impact assessment, and how all the different initiatives in Tyre were coordinated.

1347. The **Secretariat** responded that due to unrest in the country for some time, developments could take place that were not under the control of the Government. That had led in the preceding years to numerous new constructions having a negative impact on the environmental value of the property. The new building under discussion was only the last in a series of new structures, and in that sense it had not dramatically changed the overall state of conservation of the property. A reference to the need to integrate Environmental Impact Assessment procedures into the planning system could be incorporated in paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision. Frequent coordination was undertaken between the International Campaign and the World Heritage Centre and with the World Bank project.

1348. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.48** adopted, as amended to reflect observations expressed during the discussion, in particular regarding the impact study.

Archaeological site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

1349. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report as included in the working document.

1350. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that many of the problems identified in the report could be found in many other sites and that in view of the lack of conservation and the presence of many foreign archaeological missions, there was a strong need for a management plan and strategic direction for the site.

1351. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the United Kingdom. It suggested that in paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision a date be included and in paragraph 4, the word 'reduce' deleted.

1352. The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested that archaeological excavations should be temporarily halted but that restoration work should be reduced.

1353. **ICOMOS** referred to the ICOMOS and UNESCO charters on archaeological sites, which stated that not everything should be excavated, and added that non-destructive research methods did exist.

1354. The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that most archaeological missions were foreign and that once they were stopped at a certain site it would be difficult to get them back. For that reason, it found the recommendation to halt the excavations too strong.

1355. The **Secretariat** emphasized that conservation was required but that restoration should not be a priority.

1356. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that a sentence be inserted in paragraph 2 regarding the need to coordinate archaeological interventions on the site.

1357. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.49** adopted, as amended.

1358. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dashur (Egypt) (C 86)

1359. Decision **28 COM 15B.50**.

Saint Catherine Area (Egypt) (C 954)

1360. Decision **28 COM 15B.51**.

Medina of Fez (Morocco) (C 170)

1361. The **Secretariat** pointed out that there had been a mistake in the translation from French into English in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, where ‘surroundings’ should replace ‘boundaries’.

1362. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15 B.52** adopted, as amended.

Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)

1363. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property.

1364. It said that of the two International Assistance requests submitted by the State Party, the request for Training Assistance could not be accommodated due to lack of resources in the World Heritage Fund, while the second request, for Technical Cooperation, would be reviewed under Agenda Item 10A.

1365. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.53**.

Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (China) (C 439 bis)

1366. The **Secretariat** drew the Committee’s attention to the outstanding issue of the lack of an adequately defined buffer zone, which had been addressed by Decision **27 COM 14B.30** and at the present session when examining the extension of the property to include the Imperial Palace of the Qing Dynasty in Shenyang.

1367. It had received from the State Party on 16 January 2004 a progress report on work to define and establish the property’s buffer zone. A partnership project had been initiated between UNESCO and Tsinghua University of China to implement a new urban renewal project in the Xicheng District of Beijing. Meanwhile, UNESCO had been also invited to act as technical adviser for the European Union's project in Beijing within the framework of the *Asia-Urbs* Programme (twinning Beijing with Rome and Paris). A conference on the preservation of historic cities in China would be organized jointly by the World Bank, the World Heritage Centre and the Government of China and held in early 2005.

1368. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested incorporating the substance of the Committee's Decision **28 COM 14B.30** regarding the extension of the property and the particular paragraph requesting definition of its buffer zone into the Draft Decision on the state of conservation of the property.

1369. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15B.54** adopted as amended.

Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)

1370. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994, extended in 2000 and 2001. It informed the Committee that new information had been received from the State Party on 27 June 2004, but that neither it nor ICOMOS had yet had time to study the report.

1371. The Delegation of **Lebanon** observed that Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.55** appeared to be a repeat of a similar decision adopted by the Committee at its 27th session, and wondered whether it was necessary to repeat the Decision. It asked whether the updating of the conservation management plan for the property had or had not been completed, and if not, why not.

1372. The **Secretariat** explained that a reiteration of the Committee’s previous recommendations would

reinforce the importance and the urgency of the work recommended.

1373. The Delegation of **Benin** noted that the Draft Decision did acknowledge receipt of a report. It asked the State Party whether non-skilled workers were being employed to undertake conservation work on the property.

1374. The Delegation of **China** described the Chinese system of local administration and management of heritage sites. All conservation work on the property had been undertaken within a framework of “minimum intervention”. Skilled traditional artisans had been employed, working under the supervision of experts. All conservation work on the property had been planned and monitored by experts from the State Administration of Culture Heritage, assisted by experts from Tsinghua University. Progress reports on the work had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 12 January 2004 and 27 June 2004, specifying that the Chinese Government had announced the scope of the protection and buffer zone at the Potala Palace, Jokhang Monastery and Norbulingka. Further regulations and technical requirements had been identified to ensure protection of the buffer zone.

1375. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that ICOMOS had reviewed the report of 12 January 2004.

1376. **ICOMOS** noted that restoration of vernacular (“humble”) buildings had proven problematic in the historic core of Lhasa and that it would be necessary to find a balance between replacement and retention of authentic historic fabric.

1377. The Delegation of **Lebanon** observed that neither the Secretariat nor the Advisory Body (ICOMOS) seemed to be up-to-date with the current state of conservation of the property, and suggested that a short mission should be undertaken to the site in the immediate future.

1378. The Delegation of **Portugal** asked for paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision to be reworded to specify the information provided by the State Party.

1379. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the words “World Heritage conservation guidelines” in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision should be replaced by the term “international standards” or a similar phrase.

1380. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that, for the sake of completeness and clarity, paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision should be amended to include

and reiterate all of the recommendations contained in Decision **27 COM 7B.45**.

1381. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 15B.55** adopted, as amended.

Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)

1382. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report for the property, Classical Gardens of Suzhou, China (C 813 bis), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1997 and extended in 2000. He highlighted for the Committee’s attention the issue of the proposed construction of a new museum within the buffer zone, near the Garden of the Humble Administrator.

1383. He said that ICOMOS had conducted a desk review of the architectural plans and that UNESCO and ICOMOS had undertaken monitoring missions to the site, the conclusion of which had been that the proposed museum, designed by Chinese-American architect IM Pei, would not adversely affect the property. Indeed, the UNESCO-ICOMOS evaluation had found that the proposed construction would be an improvement to the current condition of that lot in the buffer zone, which was occupied by a derelict high-rise hospital building of relatively recent construction.

1384. He also underscored for the Committee’s attention the need to ensure the protection of the historic urban fabric of Suzhou, which was under threat from redevelopment pressures, and suggested that the State Party might eventually wish to consider nominating an extension to the property to include the historic core of Suzhou and the related canal towns situated within the same geo-cultural area.

1385. The Delegation of **Norway** asked about the intended fate of the protected historic structures (those marked in red on the conservation master plan) that fell within the footprint of the proposed museum building.

1386. **ICOMOS** said that the structures in question would be moved elsewhere.

1387. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision to be redrafted, noting that it was not the State Party, but the Committee that was empowered to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List.

1388. The **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.56** adopted, as amended.

Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056 rev)

1389. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2002. It informed the Committee that it had received new information on the site management plan on 18 May 2004 and that it had been evaluated by ICOMOS and ICCROM. It highlighted the issue of the property's management plan, a revision of which had been submitted to the Secretariat and to the Advisory Bodies.

1390. **ICCROM** reported that ICCROM and ICOMOS had jointly reviewed the revised management plan submitted by the State Party, and observed that, in fact, the "management plan" submitted was not so much a plan guiding site management, as a set of intentions as to how the site should ideally be managed. ICCROM commended the State Party for its accurate identification of the major conservation issues at the property and for having initiated studies that addressed them directly.

1391. It also drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, although the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, it had not been included in the Indian Government's official list of nationally protected sites. That anomaly had made it difficult for the Archaeological Survey of India to extend its technical assistance to the site.

1392. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the recommendations contained in the Draft Decision and informed the Committee that national listing of the property as a protected site was under review by the Indian Government. It also informed the Committee that the Government was considering nominating an extension of the site, at an appropriate future date, to include the Bodhgaya cultural landscape.

1393. The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.57** adopted.

Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252)

1394. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the proposed "Taj Corridor Project" and informed the Committee that the project had reportedly been discontinued by the Government of India. It suggested to the Committee an amendment to the Draft Decision requesting the State Party to provide to the Secretariat a report on the status of the "Taj Corridor Project" and progress made on other issues and recommendations contained in the Draft

Decision for consideration by the Committee at its 29th Session in 2005.

1395. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that the recommendations in the Draft Decision were an ambitious list of actions, and that the Government of the United Kingdom was ready to provide technical assistance to the Government of India in their implementation, if so requested.

1396. The Delegation of **Lebanon** welcomed the news that the Taj Corridor Project had been abandoned. It noted that paragraph 4(a) of the Draft Decision had not been properly drafted - it was not for the Committee to instruct a State Party as to which ministry or department should be designated to head the recommended steering committee. It therefore requested the Secretariat to re-draft the paragraph.

1397. The **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.58** adopted as amended.

Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)

1398. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the still problematic issue of the commercialization of the entry area to the property in Zone 2 and, in particular, plans to build a shopping complex (sometimes referred to in documents as "Jagad Jawa") within Zone 3 of the property, in spite of the Committee's strong recommendation to the contrary.

1399. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.59** adopted.

Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev)

1400. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property and highlighted for the Committee's attention the issue of the projects financed by the Asian Development Bank to rip-rap the river bank and widen roads within the core protected zone of the property, with negative impact on the property's heritage values. The problem had been brought under control through the establishment of a project review committee on which representatives of the Luang Prabang Heritage House and UNESCO sat. The committee monitored all development projects with a potential impact on the inscribed property and its buffer zone.

1401. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.60** adopted.

Complex of Hué Monuments (Viet Nam) (C 678)

1402. The **Secretariat** introduced the state of conservation report for the property, Complex of Hue Monuments (C 678), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1993. It highlighted the issue of the ongoing and proposed projects to construct and/or widen roads within the Citadel and through the buffer zones of various monument zones. Those road construction projects had posed particularly difficult conservation issues for the State Party to manage, considering its intention to envisage nomination of an extension to the inscribed property linking the now individually-isolated monument zones into one contiguous cultural landscape along the Perfume River.

1403. The Delegation of **Colombia** asked about the status of the road projects affecting the property.

1404. **ICOMOS** said that it did not have current information on the subject.

1405. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the issue of roads would be on the agenda of the next meeting of the Viet Nam-UNESCO Hue Working Group, scheduled for October 2004.

1406. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 15B.61** adopted.

1407. The Delegation of **Japan** requested that the following State of Conservation reports from Part II be moved to Part I for discussion by the Committee: Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) and Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal).

Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

1408. The **Secretariat** introduced the State of Conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1998, and informed the Committee that paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision had been revised at the suggestion of the State Party.

1409. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the revised Draft Decision.

1410. The **Chairperson** declared revised Decision **28 COM 15B.64** adopted.

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)

1411. The **Secretariat** introduced the State of Conservation report for the property, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1997. It highlighted the issue of the newly-constructed Maha Devi Temple

which had negatively impacted on the conservation and the understanding of the site. A joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission had taken place on 8 May 2004 and had found that the new building was totally inappropriate, negatively affecting the conservation of the excavated archaeological remains, and obscuring the World Heritage value of the Lumbini sacred grove. Limited interpretation and presentation was available at the site. A site management plan was required, focusing on the identification and priorities of future cultural resources of the property. The Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the mission findings and recommendations for examination.

1412. The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** explained that the structure was the result of an attempt to please everyone, and that the design of the structure had been approved by UNESCO. It informed the Committee that it was prepared to make changes to modify or replace the structure and asked UNESCO and the Committee to supervise that work.

1413. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, noting that the state of conservation of the property had already been examined in Budapest, asked the Secretariat and ICOMOS if the plan for the new temple had in fact been submitted prior to construction. It observed that the "reconstruction" of the temple consisted in the creation of an envelope surrounding the site, in the form of a building, totally kitch in design, of no architectural quality, that prevented all visibility of the protected property. Faced with this irremediable act, that should have called for earlier reaction, there was no other solution than to entirely destroy the structure and recommence. The Delegation asked ICOMOS whether this act had directly affected the universal value of the property, compromising its retention on the List.

1414. The **Secretariat** said that the plan for the newly-constructed Maha Devi Temple had not been submitted to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and had therefore not been forwarded to the Committee.

1415. **ICOMOS** said that it very much regretted the construction of the new Maha Devi Temple structure.

1416. The Delegation of **South Africa** observed that there was an obvious and regrettable disconnect between the World Heritage values of the property and the management of the property which did not safeguard those values. It was, however, of the opinion that it was not too late to take corrective action. It suggested that strong action should be recommended by the Committee and paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision redrafted accordingly.

1417. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed the opinion that the “outstanding universal value” of the property was still intact, in spite of the inappropriate construction of the new temple building. It stressed the need for the authorities to develop a new management plan for the property which would include conservation protocols for the safeguarding of its heritage value, authenticity and integrity.

1418. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the design for the new temple had been submitted to UNESCO or not.

1419. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed the opinion that the property still retained its “outstanding universal value” and said that the case suggested the need for new criteria to deal with places of spiritual significance.

1420. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thought that the decision to be taken must clearly reflect both the concern and the disappointment of the Committee in the case of the degradation of the site and the non-respect by the State Party of the provisions of the Convention concerning the need to submit the plans of all construction projects within the property. Recalling that the site in question was inscribed under criteria (iii) and (vi), both as unique witness and site associated with events and beliefs, it considered that it no longer met the conditions required in the first case, because there were no buildings only ruins, but proposed, taking into account the undeniable spiritual values, and in view of the outstanding situation, to maintain criterion (vi), even if this should not apply on its own to a property.

1421. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** responded to the proposal by Lebanon, saying that there was no urgency in deciding about the deletion of criterion (iii) and that the Committee might wish to consider the question at its next regular session. It seconded the request by Saint Lucia for UNESCO to review the process by which such a structure could be built without the Committee’s approval, and to ascertain whether any UNESCO unit had, in fact, reviewed and approved the structure’s design.

1422. The Delegation of **New Zealand** spoke in favour of retaining criterion (iii) in respect of the property, pointing out that even seemingly insignificant archaeological remains retained symbolic significance.

1423. The Delegations of **Saint Lucia, Norway, Nigeria** and **China** agreed that the property had retained its “outstanding universal value” under criterion (vi) and seconded the proposal that the

Committee should wait until its next session to review the question of removing criterion (iii).

1424. The **Chairperson** repeated the request for clarification from UNESCO as to whether the Secretariat had received the design plans for the new Maha Devi Temple before it had been built.

1425. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** inquired whether the design for the new temple had been submitted to UNESCO and asked the Secretariat to report back to the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee.

1426. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the failings in the case might point to the need to revise the *Operational Guidelines* with regard to the respective roles of the different units within the UNESCO Secretariat.

1427. The Delegation of **Norway** expressed the opinion that the definition of the respective roles of UNESCO operational units was the internal concern of UNESCO and not a matter for the Committee to dictate.

1428. The Committee decided to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 29th session in 2005 and the **Chairperson** declared revised decision **28 COM 15B.66** adopted, as amended.

1429. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705)

1430. Decision **28 COM 15B.62.**

Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People’s Democratic Republic) (C 481)

1431. Decision **28 COM 15B.65.**

State Historical and Cultural Park “Ancient Merv” (Turkmenistan) (C 886)

1432. Decision **28 COM 15B.67.**

Historic Centre of Shakhrisayabz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)

1433. Decision **28 COM 15B.68.**

1434. The **Chairperson** asked whether any Delegations wished to open discussion on cultural World Heritage properties in Europe and North

America listed under Part II of the working document.

1435. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that the following properties be discussed: Salzburg (Austria), Bagrati (Georgia), Vicence (Italy) and Avila (Spain).

City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

1436. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1437. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.69**.

Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev)

1438. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that ICOMOS strongly recommended against a high-rise construction project and recalled that the State Party had not followed the recommendation made by ICOMOS at the time of the inscription to define a buffer zone.

1439. **ICOMOS** said that the Cathedral could be seen from a far distance and that the visual integrity of the property was important. Recalling its recommendation to the State Party at the time of inscription regarding the definition of a buffer zone, it pointed out that a cluster of skyscrapers was located on the opposite side of the River Rhine and that one of the buildings nearest to the Cathedral had already been constructed. ICOMOS deeply regretted the situation but also pointed out that not all the planned skyscrapers would necessarily be completed.

1440. The **Director of the Centre** informed the Committee of the consultations the Centre had carried out with the State Party in order to discuss the responsibility of States Parties under the *World Heritage Convention*. Furthermore, representatives of the Centre had attended the expert conference on the high-rise building project in Cologne in November 2003.

1441. The Delegation of **Lebanon** judged this to be an important and decisive case. The Cathedral was the principal monument of the site ; it had a special connection with the site and it was this specifically that gave it its universal value. The building was constructed directly within the World Heritage property, affecting its Outstanding Universal Value. The Committee must be coherent and firm. It must make an example of this case, especially as it

concerned Germany, a rich country and with long experience. Confronted with such a dramatic and exceptional situation, invoking paragraph 80 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Delegation recommended the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1442. The Delegation of **Norway** supported the proposition made by the Delegation of Lebanon and strongly regretted the fact that a buffer zone had not been established since the inscription of the site. Any new development projects should respect the visual integrity of the property.

1443. The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the proposals made by the Delegation of Lebanon and remarked that the Committee needed to show to the wider public its commitment to safeguarding the World Heritage property.

1444. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the proposition made by the Delegations of Lebanon and Norway. It also referred to the economic interest that the State Party had in the town. It considered that if no development took place on the opposite side of the River Rhine, the property could be retained on the World Heritage List. If that was not possible, the Committee should consider the possibility of removing it from the List, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4 of the *Convention*.

1445. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the suggestions made by the Delegations of Lebanon and Norway, and added that the Committee might even have to consider delisting.

1446. The Delegations of **Chile** and **Colombia** endorsed the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

1447. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the State Party to explain its views on the high-rise project.

1448. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** stated that the planned high-rise construction would have no material impact on the Cathedral of Cologne and that the Municipality of Cologne was in the process of establishing a buffer zone which did not include the location of the construction project. It stressed that the project had been extensively discussed in public and among the relevant national authorities over the previous year. It called upon the Committee to develop guidelines concerning the visual impact that urban development could have on monuments.

1449. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that the Draft Decision should specify what the State

Party would need to do in order to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1450. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recalled the decision taken by the Committee at its 27th session to organize a conference on high-rise building and visual integrity, and requested more information from the Secretariat thereon.

1451. The Delegation of **Lebanon** concurred with the statement of the United Kingdom, notably with regard to the organization of a meeting. Responding to the Delegation of the Netherlands, it indicated that it was important that the Advisory Bodies carry out a visual impact study and a detailed study of the state of conservation of the site that would enable the Committee to take a decision on that question during the next session. The Delegation remarked that the State Party had not informed the Centre or the Advisory Bodies of the plans already approved for construction during discussions held in the framework of the site evaluation. It suggested that the Committee modify paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision to reflect its regret of this omission.

1452. The **Director of the Centre** explained that the Vienna Conference “World Heritage and contemporary architecture – Managing the historic urban landscape” would take place from 16 to 17 May 2005 in Vienna, Austria, to discuss the contemporary interventions on World Heritage sites.

1453. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Secretariat for that information and undertook to do its utmost to assist in the preparation of the Conference, particularly in providing a range of appropriate experts as the problem of high-rise construction was pertinent to the United Kingdom.

1454. The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to follow up on the offer made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

1455. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, while acknowledging the importance of the Vienna Conference, underlined the urgency of the situation and supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

1456. The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.70**, as amended.

Acropolis, Athens (Greece) (C 404)

1457. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the letter from the State Party dated 22 June 2004 confirmed that the construction of the building would be one floor lower, following the

instructions from the Greek Central Archaeological Council. Furthermore, the letter stated that the Ministry of Culture had commissioned the required visual impact study and upon completion it would be submitted to the Council to evaluate whether the construction of the building with the reduced height would have any visual impact on the property.

1458. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that it was important to wait for the results of the visual impact study and recommended that the State Party take no decision that might prove irremediable to the integrity of the site.

1459. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** confirmed that no construction would take place in the vicinity of the property without the approval of the Greek Central Archaeological Council.

1460. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.71**.

Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne (Ireland) (C 659)

1461. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the site in February 2004 had concluded that the municipal waste incinerator would not have any major impact on it. As a result of the mission, communication between the Centre and the State Party had greatly improved. It had received submissions by the State Party on 18 June 2004 concerning the Slane Bypass and South North Pipeline as a follow-up to the recommendations of the mission.

1462. Referring to a number of subsidiary issues that the mission had considered, as mentioned in the working document, **ICOMOS** suggested that the State Party should undertake a review of development impact on the property

1463. The Observer Delegation of **Ireland** thanked the Chinese authorities for hosting the Committee. It noted the conclusions of the mission with satisfaction and promised to be vigilant over the conservation of the property.

1464. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the subsidiary issues that the mission considered should have been included in the working document.

1465. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.72**.

Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)

1466. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1467. The Delegation of **Lebanon** raised two problems: the construction of a road having an impact on the site and the existence of a high power line on the same site. Since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1979, the State Party had not established the boundaries of the property, nor had it implemented a management plan, and had provided no information about its state of conservation. Noting a contradiction between the request for inscription of new sites and the negligence of those already inscribed, the Delegation recommended that in the Draft Decision, the State Party be requested to define the boundaries of the site and to establish a management plan without delay.

1468. The Delegation of **Benin**, concurred with the comments made by the Delegation of Lebanon, recalling the need to consult ICOMOS on the state of conservation of the site. It requested that the State Party respond to the questions asked, in particular with regard to the management plan and boundaries of the site.

1469. The Delegation of **Argentina** regretted the fact that the site did not have defined boundaries or a management plan.

1470. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** warmly welcomed a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the property in order to evaluate the state of conservation of the property. It confirmed that the relevant national authorities were in the process of establishing the boundaries of the property within the framework of the forthcoming Periodic Reporting exercise. It also remarked that a management plan was being prepared and would be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2005, while an adequate management system was in force with some specific laws and structures dedicated to the conservation of cultural heritage. Furthermore, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage had evaluated the power-line project and had changed the route to be further away from the World Heritage property. Construction of the road which had been originally planned near the property had been halted.

1471. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that the *Operational Guidelines* in paragraph 24, required, adequate management mechanisms and that the State Party must provide proof of the existence of these mechanisms.

1472. The Committee adopted the decision **28 COM 15B.73**, as amended.

Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)

1473. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no new information since the finalization of the working document.

1474. The Delegation of **Norway** referred to the rapid economic growth in Riga and proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to ensure that any new building would fully respect the visual integrity of the property and that the historical watercourses would be preserved as an open public space without any new buildings.

1475. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the proposal by Norway and considered that the Draft Decision should express the Committee's regrets. It wished to know the opinion of ICOMOS on this question.

1476. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the comment by the Delegation of Lebanon and regretted that the State Party had not taken into account the decision of the Committee at its 27th session. Paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision should specify the time frame for finalizing and implementing the preservation and development plan for the property. Furthermore, the Delegation of Colombia questioned whether the law of June 2003 had any specific reference to the height restriction for construction of buildings within the property.

1477. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the opinions of Lebanon and Norway and asked to see the photograph of the construction project under consideration.

1478. The Observer Delegation of **Latvia** stated that it had taken a number of conservation measures such as the preparation of a management plan, the establishment of the Council and the finalization of the conservation and development plan. It thanked Norway for proposing the amendment and supported the organization of the Vienna Conference on World Heritage and contemporary architecture in May 2005.

1479. The Committee adopted decision **28 COM 15B.74**, as amended.

Curonian Spit (Lithuania and Russian Federation) (C 994)

1480. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that according to the report from Lithuania dated 1 July 2004 and the letter of 29 June 2004 from the authorities of the Russian Federation, the intergovernmental meeting on 16 April 2004 in Vilnius had not reached any bilateral agreement as

regarded the coordination of a joint Environmental Impact Assessment. The World Heritage Centre had also received information during the session from the Lithuanian authorities that D-6 oil exploitation had commenced while the Russian Federation had provided no information. The Ministry of Natural Resources was undergoing a structural change, which might be one of the factors hindering bilateral cooperation. Following the request from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania by letter of 22 July 2004 to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Centre had held extensive consultations with the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and members of the mission, which had led to the preparation of the revised Draft Decision.

1481. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that the Draft Decision foresaw inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2005 if no new information was received from the State Party concerned. It suggested that the Delegation provide new information.

1482. The Delegation of **Benin** remarked that with regard to this site, ICOMOS recommended that the cultural values should be better taken into account and the attention of the States Parties should be drawn to this matter.

1483. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** considered that it was important to receive the assurance from the States Parties that they both supported the Draft Decision, as it was an unusual procedure which rendered possible the automatic inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger after 1 February 2005. The joint work plan for monitoring, prevention/mitigation measures mentioned in paragraph 6 should also include compensation measures, and the details of the work plan should be repeated in paragraph 7.

1484. The Delegation of **Japan** supported the revised Draft Decision and remarked that bilateral cooperation was a guiding principal for the conservation of transboundary properties.

1485. The Delegation of **China** expressed its support for the revised Draft Decision, provided that it had been prepared in consultation with both States Parties.

1486. The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the revised Draft Decision had indeed been prepared in full consultation with both States Parties.

1487. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Benin and suggested that the States Parties should acknowledge the cultural attributes more clearly in their

management process and consider the threat of oil spills to relevant cultural aspects of the property.

1488. The Delegation of **Chile** requested both the States Parties to assure the Committee that they both agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

1489. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** appreciated the interest shown by the Committee members in the issue and said that it agreed with the revised Draft Decision.

1490. The Delegation of **Lithuania** also agreed with the revised Draft Decision as a compromise reached after a series of consultations.

1491. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.75**, as amended.

1492. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether it could read out a statement.

1493. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Lithuania to submit the statement to the Secretariat.

1494. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, in a written statement, thanked the Committee for adopting the revised Draft Decision and raised the alarm over the D-6 oil exploitation, which had already commenced. It informed the Committee that the decision taken at its 27th session had not been implemented and that bilateral cooperation with the Russian Federation had been unsatisfactory. Recalling Article 6.3 of the *World Heritage Convention*, the Lithuanian authorities hoped that the situation would improve so that it would not be necessary to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Concerning the revised Draft Decision, the Lithuanian authorities stressed that written agreement by the States Parties to carry out a joint Environmental Impact Assessment should be implemented within a reasonable time frame, as should the preparation of a joint work plan.

Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain) (C 347)

1495. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that, according to the detailed presentation given to the World Heritage Centre on 21 June 2004, the part of the route to be flooded by the enlargement of the barrage of Yesa would be reduced, and that that information had been confirmed by the Ministry for the Environment to the Ministry of Culture of Spain in a letter dated 25 June 2004. The Draft Decision had been revised to take into account the reduction, although the flood would still affect minor parts of the route.

1496. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that the situation was less serious than previously thought, according to the Advisory Bodies, the flooded parts of the route would not affect the universal value of the property.

1497. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** was concerned that the flood would still affect minor parts of the route. It nonetheless supported the revised Draft Decision.

1498. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.79**.

Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 rev)

1499. The **Secretariat** said that the World Heritage Centre had received the final report from ICOMOS Spain on the construction projects of Plaza de Santa Teresa in Avila.

1500. The **Director of the Centre** explained that the planned construction had reduced its volume but its architectural style still posed a problem of impact on the World Heritage property.

1501. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.97**.

The Megalithic Temple of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis)

1502. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that the Ambassador of Malta had informed the World Heritage Centre on 10 June 2004 that the Government of Malta had decided not to construct a landfill for domestic refuse near the property but had located an alternative site. According to the authorities of Malta, progress had also been made on the development of a conservation and preservation plan. The Draft Decision had been revised to take into account the changed situation, although there still remained a number of conservation issues.

1503. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its concern over the archaeological project and suggested that the Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out before the construction.

1504. **ICOMOS** gave the details of the archaeological park project which included the construction of shelters over two of the temples. It raised questions as to whether the project was in line with the conservation needs of the property, and if the construction of the shelters would have significant visual impact on the World Heritage

property. ICOMOS suggested revising the Draft Decision to request the State Party to provide the details of the project by the end of September 2004.

1505. The Delegation of **Lebanon** approved the change ICOMOS proposed to make to the Draft Decision and suggested adding that the State Party should not in any event commence work before having obtained the agreement of the Committee for this project.

1506. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** contested the date proposed by ICOMOS concerning the submission of the detailed archaeological part project and suggested an alternative wording namely "in due course"

1507. The **Chairperson** said that "in due course" was too vague.

1508. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** suggested "as soon as possible".

1509. The Delegation of **Lebanon** insisted that the envisaged work should not be commenced without prior Committee consultation.

1510. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** emphasized that its Government was fully committed to protecting the World Heritage site and underlined the need of the authorities to work according to their domestic calendar. It could not cede sovereignty over such an issue.

1511. The **Chairperson** said that it was important to specify a date.

1512. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** suggested 1 February 2005.

1513. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined the Delegation of Lebanon in urging the State Party not to commence any construction before consideration by the Committee.

1514. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed surprise that the Observer Delegation of Malta could evoke the notion of the abandon of sovereignty by States Parties. It wished to recall that Malta had signed the *Convention* whereby it is requested that all projects concerning a World Heritage property and its surroundings be submitted to the Committee for prior approval. Failing this, the State Party may see its site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, or withdrawn from the List. The Committee itself was sovereign in requests it made to States Parties to conform to the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*. It was impossible to find solutions once the work had commenced.

1515. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** disagreed with the Delegation of Lebanon on its interpretation of the *Convention* and stated that neither the Committee nor the Advisory Bodies had the right of veto for construction projects. It wondered whether the misunderstanding might have arisen from the different language versions of certain phrases in paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

1516. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that sovereignty of States Parties is not questioned. States Parties are free to implement or not the decisions of the Committee but then the Committee is also free to take the necessary actions including removing sites from the World Heritage List.

1517. The Observer Delegation of **Malta** thanked the Committee for its good will in assisting the State Party but once again expressed its dissatisfaction concerning the submission date of the details of the project.

1518. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.76**, as amended.

Monday, 5 July 2004 (afternoon)

ITEM 15B PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE (CONTINUED FROM MONDAY 5 JULY 04 MORNING)

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/15B

Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

1519. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that it had received an update report on Actions in Progress prepared by the local authorities of Sintra on 24 June 2004. While the report reflected some positive efforts made by the authorities of Portugal, the critical issue remained the lack of an overall management plan.

1520. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that there existed a management structure in place although there was no formal management plan. It informed the Committee that the budget available for the management of the property was around 23 million euro. ICOMOS had commented in the state of conservation reports that the conservation challenges facing the site were considerable and

would require large amounts of resources. In that regard, it suggested deleting paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision concerning a possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of the Netherlands expressed its intention to submit alternative wording in writing.

1521. The Delegation of **Argentina** endorsed the proposals made by the Netherlands.

1522. The Delegation of **Oman** suggested amending paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision as the State Party had submitted phase 1 of the management plan.

1523. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the cultural landscape of Sintra was in an advanced state of degradation, that the State Party had not taken any decisions for many years, and that the site should have been placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger a long time ago. However, an evolution had taken place and a new dynamism was evident in the framework of conservation efforts for the site, so it would not be necessary to inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. There was therefore no need to modify the Draft Decision.

1524. The Delegation of **Portugal** mentioned that phase 1 of the management plan included revised legislation on the buffer zone as well as the study on the past conservation effort, while many of the recommendations of the mission in 2000 had been followed. The budget for managing the property was 10 million euro for 2004 and an increase of up to 23 million euro was expected for 2005. Concerning the Draft Decision, the authorities would respect the decision if the Committee wished to retain paragraph 6, although the meaning of “financial, administrative and technical measures” was unclear. It would welcome a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission in 2005 or 2006 in order to evaluate the state of conservation and the progress made in safeguarding the property.

1525. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.77**, as amended.

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Serbia and Montenegro) (C 125)

1526. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a round table was being held in November 2004 in order to involve all stakeholders in the preparation of a management plan for the property.

1527. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.78**.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

1528. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that a number of missions had been undertaken by the UNESCO Division of Cultural Heritage and that a conference would be organized in September 2004 to discuss urban conservation and development issues, including transportation.

1529. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.80**.

Historic Centre of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)

1530. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

1531. Concerning the City of Graz, the Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that the Centre was informed of the construction of a building and the demolition of another in the Historic Centre of the City. It noted that there was no response from the State Party and remarked that the Committee found itself once again faced with the same problem as for the property of Vienna. The Delegation of Lebanon wished to have information from ICOMOS and the Secretariat regarding this matter.

1532. **ICOMOS** said that certain high-rise construction projects had been revised in Graz, while the festival hall had partly been damaged in the Historic Centre of Salzburg. It suggested that the Committee should examine the state of conservation of the City of Graz at its 29th session.

1533. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the State Party to express its position.

1534. The Observer Delegation of **Austria** explained that the delay in preparing a state of conservation report had been due to a complex administrative system within the country. It nonetheless renewed its commitment to safeguarding the property.

1535. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underscored that the Draft Decision should request the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat to prepare a report on the state of conservation of the City for the next Committee session.

1536. The **Director of the Centre** said that the mission to Graz was necessary to assess the impact of the construction project of the Thalia Centre as

well as the demolition of the “Kommod-Haus” building within the property.

1537. The Committee adopted both Decisions **28 COM 15B.81** and **28 COM 15B.82**

1538. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

1539. Decision **28 COM 15B.83**.

Fertő/Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev)

1540. Decision **28 COM 15B.84**.

Historic District of Quebec (C 300)

1541. Decision **28 COM 15B.85**.

Paphos (Cyprus) (C 79)

1542. Decision **28 COM 15B.86**.

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

1543. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

1544. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that, according to the report on the state of conservation, the Georgian authorities had the intention of reconstructing a part of the work, either with artificial stones to recreate the original shape of the building, or by using glazed steel to obtain a transparent cupola that could be illuminated. If this information was confirmed, the Committee should urgently seriously examine the state of conservation of this property, that was at risk of being greatly damaged. The Delegation requested the Committee not to be satisfied with simply taking note of this matter.

1545. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the reconstruction project was being proposed and supported by the Orthodox Church, which owned ecclesiastic buildings in Georgia, while the national authorities took a cautious approach to the reconstruction project. The Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports in Georgia had recently created a special section responsible for World Heritage issues, after which communication with the Centre had improved greatly.

1546. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Lebanon and asked why a property with issues as serious as that had been placed in Part II, which is the "For noting" part.

1547. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed amending the Draft Decision to request the State Party not to start the reconstruction project without consideration by the Committee.

1548. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.87**, as amended.

1549. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany) (C272 rev)

1550. Decision **28 COM 15B.88**.

Parks and Palaces of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany) (C 532 ter)

1551. Decision **28 COM 15B.89**.

Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz (Germany) (C534 rev)

1552. Decision **28 COM 15B.90**.

City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)

1553. The **Secretariat** said that it had received no information since the finalization of the working document.

1554. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that in this case the problem mainly concerned a project for the construction of a motorway adjacent to the site, that was not mentioned in the nomination dossier as a factor having possible negative effects. This project was approved in 2002 and should be completed by end 2004. The State Party had given no explanation regarding this decision, all the more incomprehensible given the magnificence of the property.

1555. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Lebanon in accordance with paragraph 22 of the *Operational Guidelines*. It proposed dispatching a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to evaluate the impact of the highway construction on the property.

1556. **ICOMOS** regretted the seriousness of the situation and agreed to the need for such a mission.

1557. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether paragraph 22 of the *Operational Guidelines* had been in force at the time of the inscription of the property.

1558. The **Secretariat** said that paragraph 22 had most likely been in operation as the site had been inscribed in 1996, but it would prefer to refer to the record.

1559. The Observer Delegation of **Italy**, whilst sharing the concerns of the Committee concerning this project, indicated that the work timetable had been completely modified: the work foreseen at the beginning of 2002 had not yet begun; prior studies had not yet been undertaken due to the intervention of the Centre and of citizens' associations opposed to the project. The Ministry of Culture had been informed. Furthermore, on 1 June 2004, the Ministry of Transport was informed that authorization to build would be accompanied by important conditions, notably obligations regarding particular attention to the site and the buffer zone. These measures would allow the studies to go forward and the State Party would transmit them to the Advisory Bodies as well as the Centre, to verify whether the conditions had been respected. The Delegation considered therefore that the situation was not as serious as outlined, although vigilance remained necessary.

1560. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Delegation of Italy for providing this reassuring information concerning this project and requested that the Draft Decision reflect this information and indicate that the State Party is requested to provide all the information before the work begins. The Draft Decision should also mention that a mission was recommended.

1561. The Delegation of **Norway** supported sending a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the site.

1562. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B 91**, as amended.

Rock Drawing of Alta (Norway) (C 352)

1563. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked why the Draft Decision had been revised.

1564. The **Secretariat** explained that it had been revised to take into account the measures that the State Party had taken to protect the site from further damage and to enhance legal protection of the property, as indicated in the state of conservation report of 10 June 2004.

1565. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.92**, as amended.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)

1566. The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that an expert meeting had been held from 13 to 15 May 2004 in order to prepare a management plan and to clarify the boundaries of the property.

1567. Speaking on the state of conservation of Auschwitz, the Observer Delegation of **Poland** declared that the State Party treated the decisions of the Committee very seriously. It regretted that the conclusions of the meeting of international experts held recently in Cracow were not integrated into the state of conservation report of the property. However, it did not think it was possible to provide before February 2005, as requested in the Draft Decision, a full management plan of the site and requested that the Committee accept a progress report concerning this document at the beginning of February.

1568. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.93**, as amended.

1569. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)

1570. Decision **28 COM 15B.94**.

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

1571. Decision **28 COM 15B.95**.

Spissky Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia) (C 620 rev)

1572. Decision **28 COM 15B.96**.

Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

1573. Decision **28 COM 15B.98**.

Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastery Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527)

1574. Decision **28 COM 15B.99**.

L'viv – the ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C865)

1575. Decision **28 COM 15B.100**.

Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728)

1576. Decision **28 COM 15B.101**.

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)

1577. Decision **28 COM 15B.102**.

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

1578. Decision **28 COM 15B.103**.

Archaeological Site of Chavin (Peru) (C 366)

1579. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed concern as to the kind of damage to the site caused by road construction and requested information from the Secretariat on the irreparable nature of the damage.

1580. The **Secretariat** explained that the site covered a very extensive archeological area and road construction had affected the archeological remains. It did not have sufficient information as to whether the damage affected the core zone or the buffer zone of the area inscribed on the List. All the archeological remains found were being documented.

1581. **ICOMOS** regretted the fact that, due to the lack of a survey, emergency measures would have to be taken.

1582. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, with reference to the ICOMOS statement, recommended sending a mission to the site.

1583. **ICOMOS** considered that it would more pertinent to wait until the plans and studies had been completed.

1584. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested amending the Draft Decision to include a reference to paragraph 56 of the *Operation Guidelines*.

1585. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the Secretariat should request the State Party to provide information on the state of progress and results of ongoing studies, and on measures taken to avoid similar damage in the future.

1586. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.104**

Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)

1587. **ICOMOS** introduced additional information on its latest mission. It was satisfied to see that the recommendations and priority actions were being respected, and that there was collaboration between the municipality and the national authorities. The management plan and the impact assessment were being developed. Archeological research was required before any intervention and construction.

1588. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM15B.105**.

Coro and its Port (Venezuela) (C 658)

1589. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its concern at the special treatment requested for the site due to political problems, as the Committee had requested urgent measures or urgent actions from countries in equally difficult political situations. The priority for the Committee was the conservation of the site.

1590. The **Secretariat** displayed a picture of La Vela, and stressed the lack of authenticity and fragility of the site, affected by serious degradation. In spite of the lack of relations between the Mayors of La Vela and Coro, some studies had been undertaken, and the UNESCO Office in Montevideo was willing to set up a group of experts and elaborate a plan for immediate action.

1591. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, supported by the Delegation of **Chile**, suggested sending a mission to verify whether the site met the criteria for inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger.

1592. The **Chairperson** concluded that the Committee wished to send a mission to verify the state of progress in formulating the management plan, and whether the site met the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger.

1593. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 15B.106**.

1594. The Committee adopted the following decisions without discussion:

Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis: San Ignacio Mini, Santa Ana, Nuestra Senora de Loreto and Santa Maria la Mayor (Argentina), Ruins of Sao Miguel das Missões (Brazil) (C 275-291)

1595. Decision **28 COM 15B.107**.

Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

1596. Decision **28 COM 15B.108**.

Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás (Brazil) (C 993)

1597. Decision **28 COM 15B.109**.

Historic Town of Ouro Preto (Brazil) (C 124)

1598. Decision **28 COM 15B.110**.

Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971)

1599. Decision **28 COM 15B.111**.

Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)

1600. Decision **28 COM 15B.112**.

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

1601. Decision **28 COM 15B.113**.

Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala) (C 65)

1602. Decision **28 COM 15B.114**.

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

1603. Decision **28 COM 15B.115**.

Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico) (C 416)

1604. Decision **28 COM 15B.116**.

Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

1605. Decision **28 COM 15B.117**.

Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

1606. Decision **28 COM 15B.118**.

City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)

1607. Decision **28 COM 15B.119**.

Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)

1608. Decision **28 COM 15B.120**.

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

1609. Decision 28 COM 15B.121.

1610. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** made a general remark concerning the organization of the next session of the Committee. It might be worth first discussing the state of conservation of sites and then proceeding with the inscriptions, so as to refresh the memory of the members of the Committee, to include conditions rather than recommendations to the States Parties, and to avoid including new inscriptions without management plans.

1611. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Saint Lucia for its statement, which would be most useful for the future work of the Committee. He closed item 15 of the agenda.

Coffee break (a.m.) - 5 July 2004

ITEM 9 REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents

WHC-04/28COM/9Rev

WHC-04/28COM/11

WHC-04/28 COM/12

1612. The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre recalled that the Committee had agreed to establish an informal consultative group to look at agenda items 9, 11 and 12 and to report back to the full Committee. The three Draft Decisions circulated in the room reflected the group's deliberations.

1613. Referring to the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (page 2 of the working document for item 9), he said that the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies had completed the work remitted to them by Decisions **6 EXT COM 5.1** and **27 COM 10** but that in so doing, substantive changes in terms of language had been introduced which had led the Chairperson of the 27th Session of the Committee to consider that more time than originally envisaged was necessary to properly consider them with the Secretariat and Advisory

Bodies prior to approval. That work would take place over the coming weeks with the firm target of having the revised *Operational Guidelines* ready by the end of October 2004.

1614. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** highlighted the need to remove the square brackets around the date in paragraph 8 of the relevant Draft Decision. In relation to paragraph 6 on staffing, it considered that one of the key posts for the World Heritage Centre, after that of the Director, was that of Deputy Director. The post should in future be firmly based in Paris and devoted to the management of the Centre, thus freeing the Director to fulfill the important diplomatic and site inspection roles required of him or her.

1615. The Delegation of **New Zealand** hoped that the *Operational Guidelines* would be ready in print form before 17 October, so that the meeting to launch the Pacific 2009 programme could work with them.

1616. The Delegation of **China** supported the views of the Netherlands and expressed its appreciation for the work of the Centre. It supported the Draft Decision, noting that, in the context of the Executive Board, China had expressed the vital importance of the Centre as one of the three pillars of the *World Heritage Convention*, together with the Committee and the States Parties, and the consequent need to strengthen its human and financial resources in order to reinforce implementation of the *Convention*.

1617. Referring to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** looked forward to the finalization of the *Operational Guidelines* but considered that transitional arrangements would be necessary with clear indications to all parties as to the dates by which particular paragraphs came into force. That would be particularly important in relation to nominations to be presented in the cycle beginning on 1 February 2005, which would need to be considered under the existing arrangements.

1618. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the statements of the Delegations of China and the Netherlands. Speaking in her capacity as Chairperson of the 27th session, Ms Vera Lacoeyllhe said that she wished to fulfill the mandate entrusted to her by the Committee at that session and explained the complexity of the task and the reasons for which it had not been possible to approve the *Operational Guidelines* in advance of the present session. In that context, it would be helpful to know whether the relevant decisions of the 28th session could be taken into account in reviewing the text with the Centre and Advisory Bodies over the coming weeks.

1619. Turning to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, there appeared to be a number of interesting initiatives or programmes being developed by the Centre but she flagged her concern that such initiatives should be presented to the Committee before being fully elaborated. It was important that full attention be paid to the Committee's previous decisions on thematic and regional programmes.

1620. Referring to paragraph 5, the Delegation of **Benin** noted that if the new *Operational Guidelines* were made available to the States Parties by 15 October 2004, it was unreasonable to expect their entering into force two weeks later. It felt that a transitory period was necessary so as not to penalise the States; it requested the Centre's opinion on this matter.

1621. The Delegation of **Japan** looked forward to the approval and entering into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines*. While it did not object to the proposal in paragraph 6 to strengthen the human resources of the Centre, it stressed the need to take full account of UNESCO's other activities and programmes. It also wished to express its concern about the severe delays in the distribution of documents for the present session. A more timely distribution of the working documents could have contributed to a more effective meeting, in that delegations would have had sufficient time to consider the documents with their expert advisers.

1622. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the remarks made by China and considered that there was a clear need for more permanent staff dedicated to the core tasks of the Committee's work. It agreed with the concerns of Saint Lucia about new initiatives and also supported strengthening collaboration with other UNESCO sectors.

1623. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the remarks of the United Kingdom in relation to the need for transitional arrangements covering the coming into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines*. It welcomed the proposals for strengthening human resources, particularly in the Latin America and Caribbean Unit, and also asked for greater emphasis to be placed on staffing to deal with environmental themes and natural heritage in particular in the Latin America and Caribbean Unit.

1624. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed support for the transitional arrangements proposed by the United Kingdom in terms of the *Operational Guidelines*, the comments made by Japan in relation to the timely distribution of documents, and those of Portugal on the need to enhance inter-sectoral collaboration within UNESCO. It also sought the Committee's views on whether the Chairperson of the 27th session would be mandated to give

consideration to decisions adopted at the 28th session in finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*.

1625. **IUCN**, speaking on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, noted the considerable amount of intellectual energy that had been invested in the review of the *Operational Guidelines* and hoped that they could soon be approved and put into force. Referring to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision, it noted that the resource constraints applied also to the Advisory Bodies and hoped that the Committee was taking that into consideration.

1626. Responding to issues raised in the discussion, the **Director** of the World Heritage Centre explained that the particularly critical situation faced by the Centre at present, whereby four senior posts were simultaneously vacant, was a result of natural turnover for professional and personal reasons. The post of Deputy Director was currently under recruitment and the process for filling the vacancies in the Latin America and Caribbean, Asia, and Policy and Statutory Implementation Units was in hand, as were plans to equip each regional desk to deal with both natural and cultural heritage. He agreed on the need to put in place transitional arrangements to cover the coming into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines* and was confident that the work would be finished within the revised deadlines.

1627. Turning to the issue of the various initiatives under development, he explained that the term "initiatives" had been quite deliberately chosen to distinguish them from the thematic and regional programmes approved by the Committee, which were central to the work of the World Heritage Centre. The initiatives were experiments arising from opportunities and ideas. Not all of them would develop into programmes approved by the Committee but would be helpful to retain some flexibility to try out new ideas.

1628. Document preparation and distribution was a problem and the Centre would try harder to respect the prescribed six-week deadline. However, for some issues the Centre was merely the last in a chain of players. For example, the production of the State of Conservation (SOC) documents was based on information provided by States Parties, which in many cases was not provided by the 1 February deadline. If the documents were prepared too far in advance, much would be missing.

1629. World Heritage was perhaps the quintessential inter-sectoral programme. Since arriving at the World Heritage Centre, he had actively promoted cooperation with other sectors, as witnessed by the initiatives underway with the Division of Ecological Science in the Democratic Republic of Congo, with

the Sector for Social and Human Sciences on the Vienna conference, and with the Education Sector for the World Heritage in Young Hands Programme. He would be making proposals to increase that further in the preparations for the forthcoming document 33 C/5.

1630. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** informed the Committee that Greece had previously made a no-strings-attached voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Centre and was currently seconding an expert there. It commended that approach to other States Parties.

1631. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Director for his detailed explanation and reiterated its question about taking into account the decisions of the 28th session of the Committee in the process of finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*. On the question of document production, it suggested preparing the SOC document in two phases, so that information received on time could be sent out in a first document with that received later incorporated into a second edition.

1632. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** considered that to be a practical proposal.

1633. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that there were two deadlines on 1 February – for nominations and for SOC. With the former, it was vital that the documents were available as early as possible and within the prescribed guidelines.

1634. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that 1 February was both the deadline for receipt of nominations for inscription and for SOC reports from States Parties. It was an unfortunate result of the change in the nominations cycle.

1635. The Delegation of **Norway**, supported by the Delegation of **New Zealand**, noted that States Parties tended to adhere to the 1 February deadline for receipt of nominations but not for SOC. It suggested that if reports were not received on time, they should not be discussed.

1636. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, considered that it would be counter-productive not to consider late reports on SOC, suggesting that a different date should be set instead.

1637. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed, adding that a different mechanism for SOC could be envisaged.

1638. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thought that 1 February should be maintained as the deadline for the reception of state of conservation reports.

However, as the safeguarding of properties was the Committee's first concern, it was appropriate, as the Director of the Centre suggested, to adopt a more flexible approach. In particular, the sending of the state of conservation reports of the properties to Committee members could be effected in several dispatches.

1639. The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed, emphasizing that having a single deadline for both nominations and SOC was actually helpful to States Parties in terms of coordinating activities.

1640. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the Committee should consider moving the deadline for nominations back to 1 December.

1641. The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed that acceptance of nominations should be conditional on States Parties demonstrating proper care for properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, including through the timely submission of SOC reports.

1642. Responding to those points, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it would be difficult to amend deadlines at that point, given the introduction the previous year of the 30 September deadline for submitting draft nominations for review, which had proved to be a beneficial measure in preparing nominations.

1643. He emphasized that conservation was at the core of the work of the World Heritage Centre, perhaps its single most important activity. The SOC documents presented at the present session included 157 reports, representing a considerable amount of discussion, review and missions.

1644. The **Committee** adopted Decision **28 COM 9**, subject to the following amendments:

1645. The deadline of 15 October should be removed from paragraph 5, but that of 1 November retained. The suggested text of the United Kingdom covering the need for transitional arrangements should be added and the paragraph should also include approval for the Chairperson of the 27th session of the Committee to take into consideration the relevant decisions of its 28th session in finalizing the *Operational Guidelines*.

1646. The square brackets around the deadline in paragraph 8 should be removed.

1647. The **Chairperson** closed item 9 of the agenda.

**ITEM 11 PRESENTATION OF
ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
FUND IN 2002-2003 AND SITUATION OF THE
BUDGET 2004-2005**

Documents
WHC-04/28.COM/11

1648. The revised Draft Decision, which had been distributed in the room to the members of the Committee, included all the new recommendations made by the working group that had been meeting in previous days to discuss the matter.

1649. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the item and said that the accounts of the World Heritage Fund, like all other accounts within the framework of UNESCO, had to be established by the Comptroller of the Organization. They referred to specific information on the arrears of each State Party, the rate of execution of the Programme and Budget, as well as all the extrabudgetary activities pertaining to World Heritage. That information, which had been already provided in the past, although in a combined form, would in the future be more detailed. Concerning the list of all the activities related to World Heritage, whose inclusion the working group had requested in future presentations of the budget, he drew the attention of the Committee to the possible difficulty in collecting information from other Sectors of UNESCO on every activity affecting a World Heritage property, and, especially in determining their relevance to the scope of the *World Heritage Convention*. Efforts would be made, at any rate, to improve the clarity of the presentation concerning those items, so as to enable the Committee to evaluate progress made with respect to the recommendations made by the External Auditor following the external audit of 1997, the report of which had been distributed in the room.

1650. The Delegation of **Benin** requested clarification on items (a) and (b) of paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision **28 COM 11**. Noting that the 1998 audit report (*WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.5*) concerned not only financial activities but also the administrative activities of the Centre, it proposed adding to item (b) "relating to the administrative and financial management". Furthermore, it wished that the World Heritage Centre present two distinct reports, one on the audit and the other on the Centre's total budget. Finally, it requested that the expression "all other recommendations where the explanation is incomplete" referred to in item (b), be clarified in order to facilitate comprehension.

1651. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the suggestion made by the previous speaker that two distinct reports should be prepared, rather than

one, and that the words "concerning financial and administrative issues" should be added to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision. In response to the request for clarification by the Delegation of Benin, it noted that since the entire system of UNESCO was subject to periodical auditing, it was appropriate to take into account other recommendations made at the general UNESCO level when they had a bearing on World Heritage issues.

1652. The Delegation of **Japan**, agreeing that the capacity of the World Heritage Centre needed to be strengthened, suggested, however, that that should go hand-in-hand with the enhancement of budget transparency, pursuit of cost-efficiency and improvement of overall management, in line with the efforts currently undertaken within UNESCO. It stressed the need for an improved presentation of the budget so as to make it more understandable for States Parties with reference, for example, to the impact of extrabudgetary resources on statutory tasks and other activities. An order of priority should be given to individual programmes, with clear goals set. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision, particularly on the need for a list of all projects financed through sources other than the World Heritage Fund, and asked the Secretariat to integrate in its future budget presentations the income received in accounts certified by the Comptroller. It further supported the request made in the Draft Decision for a report on the entire budget as well as on the following-up of the recommendations made by the External Auditor. The Centre should identify the elements of the Programme and Budget yet to be implemented, and the Committee's decisions on the strengthening of the Centre's capacity should be based on careful analysis of that data.

1653. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the members of the Committee for their support regarding the reinforcement of the staff and budget of the Centre. With respect to the points raised by the Delegations of the Netherlands, Benin and Japan, there were two main issues to be addressed: accountability and effectiveness. Concerning accountability, the Centre had completely revised the presentation of the budget in past years. An improved presentation would be prepared for the next year, including the list of all projects funded through resources other than the World Heritage Fund. That would also be beneficial to the image of the *Convention* as it would demonstrate its capacity to attract funding and promote its ideals.

1654. On the subject of effectiveness, he assured the Committee of his personal commitment to identifying additional human and financial resources, as was also shown by the increase in the staff in the preceding years. He also informed the

Committee that, thanks to an agreement reached between the Centre and the United Nations Foundation, the staff of the Centre would undergo a capacity-building programme based on the results-based management approach. It would imply more work at the initial stage, but it was hoped that in the future it might improve the performance of the Secretariat in better serving the Committee, taking into account, however, the fact that the Centre, as part of UNESCO, would nevertheless be subject to overall administrative constraints.

1655. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, recalling that the introduction of the results-based management approach had been already agreed by the Executive Board of UNESCO, acknowledged that the Centre had made great progress in the presentation of the budget, and looked forward to examining a new and further improved budget the following year (2005) at the 29th session of the Committee in South Africa.

1656. The Chairperson declared Decision **28 COM 11** adopted with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Benin. He closed item 11 of the agenda.

ITEM 12 PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET 2006-2007 (DRAFT 33C/5)

Document
WHC-24/28.COM/12

1657. The revised Draft Decision, which had been distributed in the room to the members of the Committee, included all the new recommendations made by the working group that had been meeting in previous days to discuss the matter.

1658. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that document *WHC-04.28 COM/12: Proposals concerning the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget 2006-2007 (Draft 33C/5)* and Draft Decision **28 COM 12** had been drafted in response to previous requests by the Committee to be involved in the preparation of the World Heritage content of future Programme and Budget (C/5) and Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) documents. It presented the existing situation in terms of programme priorities and finance and staffing, including the dual role of the World Heritage Centre as both Secretariat to the Committee and part of UNESCO, in order that the Committee might develop proposals on the future orientation of the work.

1659. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed an amendment to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

1660. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision was not truly "representative" of the opinions of the working group.

1661. The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed with the structure of the Draft Decision, and supported the comments of Lebanon and Saint Lucia. Paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision highlighted a pressing problem on which the Committee must intervene: that of co-ordination between the *World Heritage Convention* and other UNESCO Conventions and Recommendations, in particular the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. It needed to be discussed in detail and could be an item for the extraordinary session of the Committee proposed for later in 2004 or for its 29th session in South Africa in 2005. Paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision also required urgent consideration in relation to the objectives for the Centre and should also be discussed either at an extraordinary session of the Committee or at its 29th session.

1662. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the previous speakers. The working document was very helpful, in particular the emphasis in paragraph 12 on the functions of the World Heritage Centre in relation to Article 14 of the *Convention*. It was important that more resources from the regular budget be allocated to those functions, so that in future there could be a clearly-defined group of people working exclusively on them and funded through the regular programme. Referring to paragraph 16 of the document, there was a compelling need to take a long-term view of the issues to be addressed. Paragraph 22 included the following important statement on which the Committee might wish to reflect: "Members of the Committee may wish to note that in addition to the human resources allocated to the World Heritage Centre by the Director-General, other parts of UNESCO, including the Division of Cultural Heritage, Science and Education Sectors and the UNESCO Field Offices carry out activities in relation to World Heritage properties."

1663. Paragraph 23 referred to decision **27 COM 11.3** which called, *inter alia*, for the "reinforcement of the staff of the World Heritage Centre". That much was clear, but the time had come to be more specific in terms of what it meant in terms of numbers. On the basis of informal talks with some staff from the Centre, it seemed that one member of staff could reasonably be expected to cope with 40 sites. Given the fact that approximately that number of sites were added to the List each year, it suggested the need for one additional member of staff funded on the regular budget each year in order to avoid any negative impact on the *Convention*.

That was an important message to convey to the Director-General. Continuing with the theme of staffing, it considered that there was a need for a clearly defined organizational structure, which might require some re-shuffling of the existing arrangements.

1664. Referring to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, it commented that Committee members should be aware that the current financial situation had in part arisen because the reserves of the Fund had been depleted. There would be no reserve after the present biennium.

1665. It wished to see an explicit reference in paragraph 8(a) of the Draft Decision to the need to strengthen the human resources allocated to the Centre, while paragraph 9 should emphasize the need for collaboration as well as cooperation.

1666. The Delegation of **Japan** recalled that World Heritage had to be considered in the context of UNESCO as a whole and that the special situations that had arisen around the world since the present Medium-Term Strategy had been set in train must be borne in mind, together with their impact on the Programme as a whole. It would be important to consider how the Committee's strategy could be implemented through the forthcoming Medium-Term Strategy.

1667. Referring to paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision, it agreed, supported by the Delegations of the **United Kingdom** and **Oman**, that there was a need for close coordination between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, but reminded the Committee that the two instruments were based on different notions.

1668. The Delegation of **Benin** concurred with the observations of the Delegations of the Netherlands, Japan and the United Kingdom. It proposed that paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision **28 COM 12**, in its view too general and perhaps insufficient, include a recommendation referring in particular to the Committee. Recalling that the 1972 *Convention* was much older than that of 2003, it thought that the specific recommendation would avoid possible conflict between the two conventions.

1669. The Observer Delegation of **Belgium** was concerned by the questions relating to the staff of the Centre. It proposed amendments to paragraph 5, concerning the level of staffing, and in paragraph 8 (b), concerning the World Heritage Centre. It proposed, moreover, to delete items (iii) and (v) of paragraph 8(c), and to replace them by proposals submitted by the working group on the Cairns Decision, to avoid conflict between the priority domains.

1670. Responding, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for clarification in the form of a written amendment. He noted that, with the exception of the proposal for a risk preparedness strategy, the priorities set out in the Draft Decision were long-standing priorities of the Committee. The recruitment exercise currently underway for the post of Deputy Director included a requirement that applicants should be natural heritage experts. He asked the Committee to permit some management flexibility in terms of the background of staff.

1671. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the proposal by the Observer Delegation of Belgium on paragraph 8(c). The requirement for an expert in natural heritage was relevant, particularly in light of the earlier discussion about the need for the new Deputy Director to have an essentially managerial function. It therefore supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 5.

1672. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 12** as amended after consultation.

1673. The **Chairperson** closed item 12 of the agenda.

ITEM 13 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM TUESDAY 29 JUNE 04 MORNING)

Report of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision

Document Draft Decision 28 COM 13.1

1674. The **Chairperson** invited Mr Jade Tabet (Lebanon), in his capacity as Chairperson of the Cairns Decision working group, to report on the group's results and conclusion.

1675. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** on the Cairns Decision, reminded the Committee of the mandate that it had entrusted to the group. He informed that the group was composed of the Delegations of Lebanon and Egypt for the Arab group, of Saint Lucia and Argentina for the Latin American and Caribbean group, Benin and South Africa for the African group, the Netherlands and Norway for the European group, India and New Zealand for the Asia and Pacific group and by Lithuania and the Russian Federation for the Eastern European group, the Advisory Bodies and numerous observers.

1676. He presented the results of the working group, as well as the Draft Decision reflecting them, to the Committee.

1677. He furthermore recalled that this draft was the result of agreement between all the members of the working group.

1678. The **Chairperson** thanked the Cairns Decision working group for their hard work.

1679. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the working group. It proposed the following amendments to the Draft Decision: to insert “primarily” in the second line of paragraph 5; to include a reference to the State Party in paragraph 12; paragraph 13, item (ii) was rather prescriptive in assigning work for the Committee which was really the concern of the State Party and should be amended accordingly, and to include the words “order of priorities” in paragraph 16, subparagraph (c).

1680. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its gratitude to the working group and said, with reference to paragraph 13, that its Government would like to contribute by hosting the expert meeting, the dates of which were to be considered in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, and covering all costs for around 30 international experts.

1681. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the working group and welcomed the Draft Decision. It requested clarification as to the significance of “natural property” in paragraph 16 (a).

1682. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** indicated that the group had considered as a priority the reduction of the imbalance between the different categories of properties inscribed on the List and, to this end, had decided to establish a limit to the nomination of cultural heritage.

1683. The Delegation of **Oman** thanked the Chairperson of the working group and asked whether the 30% mentioned in paragraph 13 (ii) was a goal, or just a figure for encouragement, an incentive, and whether the assessment of the mechanism in 2007, referred to in paragraph 17, was correct.

1684. The Delegation of **Colombia** extended its congratulations to the working group. With reference to paragraph 13 (ii), it asked about the criterion for determining what constituted under-represented regions and, with regard to paragraph 16 (a), whether it also concerned mixed properties.

1685. The Delegation of **China** thanked the Chairperson of the working group and its members, in particular Argentina, which had helped build the consensus after many consultations, both during meetings and outside them.

1686. The Delegation of **Benin** recalled its participation in the working group and, whilst expressing its satisfaction for the compromise, underlined the importance of training personnel who could work on the identification of properties of potential universal value. To this end, it suggested adding the word « more » in front of the words « in conformity with Article 11 of the *Convention* » in the penultimate line of paragraph i of Article 13 of the Draft Decision.

1687. It furthermore recalled that the homogenization activity of the tentative lists was an ongoing process and that some States Parties needed to accomplish this task of improving their lists in a gradual manner.

1688. The Delegation of **Portugal** said that its country had lost the European soccer championship, but that the Draft Decision before the Committee saved the day. It was delighted to note that all the issues put forward in the statement made by Portugal before the working group started work had been addressed. It requested clarification as to the issue of identification raised by Benin, and asked whether Colombia’s question as to what constituted an under-represented country would be addressed at the special meeting in Russia.

1689. Furthermore, it proposed adding a subparagraph (c) to paragraph 16, and said that paragraph 12 should include “States Parties”. Clear goals had to be achieved in 2007, but perhaps insertion of “at least” before 30% was needed. It was a huge goal and great ambition, which warranted support, but something less categorical might be better.

1690. The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the suggestion made by Portugal and proposed inserting “strategic” before “comprehensive” in paragraph 10 related to capacity-building, and inserting “further decides to examine the mechanism” in paragraph 16.

1691. The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the working group on a job well done and seconded Benin, while for paragraph 16 (a) it proposed changing “concerns” into “includes”.

1692. The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the group for its excellent and comprehensive work, and remarked that, with regard to the imbalance between Nature and Culture, nature would always be under-

represented as there were many countries with no or few natural properties, for which extra assistance should be considered.

1693. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the timetable in paragraph 17 was unrealistic, as nominations for that year were already, or at least should already be, in preparation, which would be unfair to the countries concerned. On the issue of the Nature-Culture imbalance, it concerned workload as well, in particular for ICOMOS. There had been some discussion about the need for an expert group on the issue of Outstanding Universal Value in plenary, an expert group on the Cairns Decision, but no decision had been taken on an extraordinary Committee session in Paris.

1694. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said he could not propose such a session, but that if the Committee decided to convene one, he could find a date for it.

1695. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed convening an extraordinary session.

1696. The Delegation of **Norway** said that there was a consensus on the idea contained in the Draft Decision and that there was a need to distinguish between editorial and substantive proposals.

1697. The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Delegation of Russia for the generous offer to host the expert meeting. As to paragraph 13 of the draft decision point (i), it proposed that the last sentence should read: "... substantially consistent with Article 11 of the *Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*". It proposed changing the word "could" to "should" in paragraph 13 (ii). For paragraph 16, it emphasized that it clearly stated that the proposal was on a transitory basis. Furthermore, it proposed maintaining subparagraph (a) as drafted by consensus and splitting subparagraph (b) in two after "... emergency basis".

1698. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson of the working group for its constructive proposals. It had had two concerns. First, sufficient assistance had to be provided to States Parties for the preparation of nominations, and second, the Cairns Decision was too rigid. Those concerns were almost entirely met by the Draft Decision. However, reference should be made in paragraph 16 (a) to mixed properties instead of to natural properties alone, as for a number of States Parties the interaction between cultural and natural values was extremely important.

1699. In thanking the participants of the working group and its Chairperson for having given it the floor during the session of the working group, it

expressed its perplexity with regard to the formulation of Article 16 of the Draft Decision.

1700. It suggested adding the words "or mixed" after the words "a nature site" in paragraph a) and, in recalling in this respect that many States Parties possessed more cultural sites than natural ones, indicated that this formulation did not constitute an obstacle to the increase of natural sites.

1701. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** clarified that the formulation proposed to the Committee in the Draft Decision was debated at length and that, due to the great imbalance between natural and cultural sites in favour of the latter, it was decided to establish a limit to the nomination of cultural sites.

1702. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that there were 23 mixed (cultural-natural) properties.

1703. The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked Argentina for its involvement and asked for clarification of the meaning of 'less represented' in paragraph 16 concerning the prioritization of nominations to be examined. In its opinion, it was a subjective notion.

1704. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that "less represented" was a relative expression and that it provided some flexibility that should be examined at the expert meeting in Russia.

1705. The Delegation of **Chile** disagreed with the proposal of the Observer Delegation of Italy, as it called into question the validity of the Cairns Decision. It would prefer to maintain the text as proposed.

1706. The Delegation of **Benin** expressed doubts about the definition of « less represented » States Parties.

1707. The Delegation of **Oman** said that the definition of "less represented" was clear.

1708. The Observer Delegation of **France** recalled the concerns that it had expressed several days earlier during the debate on the Cairns Decision, when it had maintained that its revision was premature. However, it considered that the compromise reached by the working group was satisfactory and should not be questioned.

1709. It decided therefore to support the transitory solution proposed in the Draft Decision.

1710. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** congratulated the working group and agreed that

there was consensus on the definition of "less represented". It was of the opinion that paragraph 16 (a) could be more open to States Parties which wished to nominate mixed properties. It also stated that an international funding campaign for World Heritage was needed.

1711. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed concern about the discussion that was taking place. It agreed that in principle all States Parties should be represented on the List but that the List should be representative and credible. It also expressed concern about the eventual additional workload for the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

1712. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, commenting on paragraph 13, said that the 30% in item (ii) seemed to be a very high target. As to item (iii) of the same paragraph, he recommended that the reference to 20% should be rephrased, as the World Heritage Committee both inscribed and deleted properties from the List of World of Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, on paragraph 16 (b), he asked who would set the priorities.

1713. The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that the 30% in paragraph 13 (ii) was set deliberately high and that the thinking of paragraph 13 (iii) was to remove 20% of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger. As to the priorities, it referred to the Cairns Decision, which clearly defined how that should be dealt with.

1714. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** again asked who would assess the priorities.

1715. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the Committee could be informed at its 29th session of the number of nominations received and the primary assessment by the Centre.

1716. The Delegation of **Oman** recommended that existing procedures should be maintained for a certain period of time.

1717. The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that the criteria to establish such priorities were clearly defined in the Cairns Decision that entrusted the Centre with the mandate to use « the date of receipt of fully completed nominations » as a prioritizing means.

1718. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested that a practical solution would be to ask the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to submit the assessment of the nominations received to the following Committee session.

1719. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 13.1** adopted as amended. He closed item 13 of the agenda.

Tuesday, 6 July 2004 (morning)

ITEM 16 PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND FOLLOW-UP REGIONAL PROGRAMME

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/16

1720. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to introduce the results of the fourth periodical reporting exercise for examination and decision by the Committee. The report had already been presented in detail a few days previously to facilitate the discussion and decision-taking process. He also introduced Mr Elias Mujica and Ms Alissandra Cummins, well-known experts in the region.

1721. The **Secretariat** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for allocating sufficient time for the presentation of the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Report, in a shorter version. The presentation would focus on the main characteristics of the preparation of the report, on key results of the analysis of the periodic reports and, finally, on the proposed action plan for the region. The periodic reporting process had been organized according to three subregions: South America, Central America and Mexico, and the Caribbean. States Parties and the Advisory Bodies had participated through specifically designated focal points for periodic reporting (one for the natural and one for the cultural heritage). Reports were due on the overall application of the *World Heritage Convention* from 31 States Parties as were reports on the state of conservation of 62 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

1722. As at July 2003, there were 107 properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (out of the 754 worldwide) from Latin American and Caribbean States Parties. The region continued to preserve a high level of biological and cultural diversity. As a general framework, the World Heritage sites showed a very high proportion of archaeological sites and colonial historic towns/urban ensembles. The results also illustrated the near absence of heritage from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well as cultural landscapes.

1723. **Mr Mujica** (Regional cultural expert for the Latin America and the Caribbean) was given the floor and said that he would concentrate on selected key issues based upon a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the Periodic Reports submitted by the

States Parties, and on a critical analysis of the reports by the Regional Group of Experts.

1724. He stressed the evidence of lack of institutional memory and lack of adequate World Heritage documentation within national institutions. A lack of integration among different institutional levels, as well as between thematic and chronological inventories was also noted.

1725. He said that around 70% of the States Parties reported that they had valid Tentative Lists. In general, Tentative Lists were mostly cumulative and not the outcome of in-depth and systematic reflection on the diversity of the heritage, and the way the State Party could contribute to the representativity of the World Heritage List. Furthermore, there was a lack of coordination and harmonization of Tentative Lists on the subregional level.

1726. The set of questions related to the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage, and the integration of heritage issues into broader planning and development schemes appeared very limited. In general, there was very limited coordination and integration of natural and cultural heritage preservation.

1727. Concerning identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation, nearly three-quarters of the reports suggested a need for the reform of policy and/or legal frameworks, which might suggest that legislation did not correspond to present-day concepts and requirements and/or that national policies for the heritage needed to be reviewed. In relation to training, the great majority of respondents identified training needs and opportunities, although only 29.8% of the States Parties had developed their own training modules or programmes for World Heritage.

1728. The challenge was to strengthen training facilities and ensure that the technical and managerial capacities of the human resources of the institutions responsible for the cultural and natural heritage, particularly in the management of heritage and cultural projects, were linked with job opportunities.

1729. The potential for international cooperation and fund-raising was not fully utilized in the region - the fact that there were only very few twinned World Heritage Sites suggested missed opportunities to share experiences and lessons learned.

1730. As for education, information and awareness-raising, particular attention should be called to the 57% participation in the *World Heritage in Young Hands* project.

1731. Concerning the statement of authenticity/integrity, the reports demonstrated a limited understanding of those concepts and a remarkable lack of knowledge of the evaluation reports of the Advisory Bodies, and, more specifically, of their assessment of authenticity and integrity at the time of the inscription of the property.

1732. In relation to the management of World Heritage properties, only 52.6% of the sites had a "public use" plan, indicating that the notion of a management plan was at times confused and, in most cases, did not involve an integrated approach to management. Only 41% of the properties had formal monitoring systems in place and there was also clearly a very limited understanding of the importance and relevance of monitoring the state of conservation and the effectiveness of management. Such issues should receive the highest attention of the Committee.

1733. In short, the main gaps were to be found: between the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies on the one hand, and those responsible for the management of cultural and natural heritage properties on the other; within the States Parties, between the national institutions in charge of heritage and managers of World Heritage sites, and, finally, between culture and nature. The linking of nature and culture needed to be fully developed, as did the reevaluation of concepts such as universal value vis-à-vis regional value, authenticity and integrity.

1734. It was equally necessary to strengthen the harmonization of legal instruments of different sectors and to establish a framework for the full participation of and cooperation among national governments, decision-makers, site managers, experts, interest groups and the public at large. The establishment of National World Heritage Committees might be an appropriate response at the national level, whereas at the level of the properties, the establishment of site commissions should be promoted. Participatory processes in the preparation and implementation of management plans would have to ensure broad support and participation.

1735. **Ms Cummins** (Regional expert) then took the floor and introduced the action plan for the Caribbean. The Caribbean was defined as the Insular Caribbean and Belize, Guyana and Suriname: 14 of the 31 States Parties of the region were located in the Caribbean. Between them, the Caribbean States Parties had 14 World Heritage sites. Previous meetings had been important in generating critical technical, institutional and political support for World Heritage. One of the most critical issues to emerge from those fora had been on the issue of

identity and the definition of authenticity within the Caribbean context.

1736. Activities designed to promote the development of effective capacity-building within the Caribbean complemented the actions proposed for the conservation of heritage sites. It must be stressed that while training was an important component of the programme which had been elaborated, effective capacity-building must take cognizance of the needs and aspirations of all sectors, including communities and civil society as a whole and technicians. At the same time, an efficient coordinating mechanism was critical to achieving success. Priority would be given particularly to ensuring continual communication amongst all stakeholders, and the adaptation and dissemination of the *World Heritage in Young Hands* kit and associated resources.

1737. The **Chairperson** thanked the presenters and opened the floor for discussion by the Committee.

1738. The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Secretariat and the experts for the preparation of the excellent report for Latin America and the Caribbean. It was clear, complete and well-structured. The action plan was a useful initiative, taking into account the four objectives of the Global Strategy: credibility, conservation, capacity-building and communication.

1739. It further thanked the UNESCO staff, Mr Mujica and Ms Cummins for the side event and informal discussion held on previous days. Obviously it would be crucial to distribute the report in a friendly version, both in English and in Spanish, throughout the region. Further actions, namely a subregional meeting, should be organized in order to address an action plan as was indicated for the Caribbean region.

1740. The Delegation of Argentina further considered it pertinent to remind the meeting of some other regional and subregional meetings - besides the specific meetings mentioned in the introduction - closely related to issues that could be considered for the action plan: first of all, the meeting of Querétaro, on the representativity of the World Heritage List in America, held in Mexico in December 2003. The Observer Delegation of Mexico had kindly distributed the conclusions and papers compiled in an excellent publication. Additional subregional meetings included Estancias Jesuíticas (Córdoba, 2002), and the workshop organized by UNESCO/IUCN in Iguazú (September 2002), on capacity-building for World Heritage. The site managers' regional seminar on remote sensing applied to the conservation of national and cultural heritage held in Córdoba had been a result of the

partnership between the Argentinian Space Agency, UNESCO and the European Space Agency.

1741. Considering further developments for the region, the Qhapaq Ñan (Main Andean Road) project should be considered as a flagship project for the subregion due to its close relation with the Global Strategy exercise.

1742. The Delegation of Argentina had seen at first-hand that there was some difficulty in understanding certain questions, since Argentina had participated in the first part of the elaboration of the report with different sectors in its country. Nevertheless, the level of participation had been most satisfactory for the whole region. Argentina had held a national seminar devoted to its eight sites and the results reflected the difficulties and trends in the region: lack of consistency of concepts of the *Convention* - for instance, outstanding universal value; lack of human and financial resources; different jurisdictions acting in a conflicting manner on the same site; lack of institutional memory; lack of continuity, clear imbalance in matters of management areas and risk preparedness for natural sites; insufficient participation of local communities in the overall process of nominations, and disproportionate expectations derived from inscription in the World Heritage List. Not enough serious consideration had been devoted politically to the way in which heritage conservation could contribute to the quality of life of people. There was much to be done in the field of awareness and of communications not only amongst young people, but also in the media.

1743. Concerning Chapter 5 of the Report, and after more than 30 years of World Heritage in Latin America, some points should be stressed:

1744. - for the credibility of the List, an in-depth analysis of under-represented categories was needed in order to identify World Heritage Sites by potential categories such as cultural landscapes, industrial heritage and modern urban heritage of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries;

1745. - better understanding of the *Convention* and the obligations deriving from its ratification was needed. That would be in order not to wait for UNESCO actions and initiatives that should be undertaken by the State Party itself;

1746. - UNESCO should improve coordination between its different sectors and field offices to avoid overlapping and, of course, increase human and financial resources, taking into account the real needs of the region. It should organize the translation into Spanish of the Report;

1747. - as experts had pointed out in the Report, further resources should be allocated to UNESCO National Commissions. There was also a need, however, to strengthen the international approach in order to deal in a specific way with World Heritage issues even if that would not be an easy task: more participation meant more transparency from the point of view of the Advisory Bodies; in-depth analysis in a regional perspective of under-represented categories, but also a self-assessment of what had been done or not done in the previous 30 years in the region.

1748. For the future, the Delegation of **Argentina** felt that further efforts were required to overcome the fragmentary vision of natural and cultural that reflected a similar attitude from public bodies.

1749. With reference to ICCROM, its presence in the region was not as strong as it could be. It would like to encourage reflection on how that situation could be changed considering the urgent needs. In that connection, the Delegation considered it pertinent to refer to concerns expressed by ICOMOS on the need to establish a "Lista del Patrimonio de las Américas", to be managed by ICOMOS, in connection with Tentative Lists and the representativity of the Americas, as reflected in the conclusions of the Querétaro meeting. Those concerns should be shared with the Committee because they were closely related to the Global Strategy.

1750. It stressed the importance of working on the concept of "interpretation", which had a crucial role in education and the conservation of natural and cultural resources and was not sufficiently developed in Latin America.

1751. It was necessary to work in qualitative programmes because the underlying values of exceptional natural and cultural resources went beyond aesthetics and could not be properly understood without adequate information.

1752. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on Draft Decision **28 COM 16**.

1753. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended those responsible for the Periodic Report on the high quality of the result, it being the first time that the "four-C" scenario had been achieved. In that regard, immediate concrete action should be taken. The Delegation shared all the concerns raised by the Report, and took particular notice of its findings since it had territories in the Caribbean.

1754. The Delegation of **Colombia** fully agreed with the Delegation of Argentina and underlined

some key needs: the translation of the periodic report into the Spanish language, an action plan for Latin America, not only for the Caribbean, and a meeting to define guidelines for it. It stressed its support for the Main Andean Road Project, a very important technical and financial initiative involving six of the region's countries in the nomination process.

1755. The Delegation of **Portugal** confirmed the importance of the periodic reporting exercise as a crucial instrument for guiding the establishment of priorities. The Report under discussion should provide inspiration for the elaboration of the corresponding Europe and North America Periodic Report, and, in that respect, the Delegation recalled the interesting conclusions of the Spain and Portugal meeting held in Lisbon two months previously as part of the periodic reporting exercise. It would be useful to translate the Report into the Portuguese language, as it could be of interest not only to Brazilian professionals but also to a wider forum. It expressed interest in the idea of the List of World Heritage in the Americas and asked for more information about the role of universities in the elaboration of the Periodic Report.

1756. The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated the Latin America and the Caribbean team on its effort and underscored the importance of the exercise for the Europe periodic report. It expressed concern as to the difficulty of selecting priorities based on the findings of the periodic reports.

1757. The Delegation of **Oman** congratulated the Secretariat team on the work done, which showed that a more comprehensive exercise had taken place than for previous reports. It asked for clarification concerning paragraphs 3 and 11 of the Draft Decision concerning the actions plans, notably the number of those planned.

1758. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that any initiative to develop an action plan for Latin America would have to be provided for in the next budget, and said that paragraph 11 of the Draft Decision should be amended.

1759. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** complimented colleagues on a very lucid and concise exercise. It stressed the lack of awareness of the *Convention* at regional and national levels in the Caribbean and stated that the periodic reporting exercise had great potential to enable the sharing of experiences between Latin America and the Caribbean. It drew the attention of the Secretariat to the implementation of the action plan and suggested that support from UNESCO field offices should be envisaged, as should support for building up a solid partnership

mechanism in the Caribbean, and developing one in other geographical regions (Belize, Mexico).

1760. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the States Parties and, concerning paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision on the decentralization of funds, requested clarification on the proper measures to be taken to ensure coordination with the Secretariat.

1761. The Delegation of **China** commended the States Parties on producing the report in cooperation with experts and the Advisory Bodies, and agreed with the Delegation of Portugal as to the interest of the exercise for comparative analysis and exchanges of best practice, which should be encouraged.

1762. The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the States Parties and the Secretariat on its effort and reminded the Committee of similarities with the conclusions of previous periodic reports. It would be interesting to summarize the results of the present exercise and previous exercises and for those results to be published as a global view which would enhance cooperation.

1763. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the States Parties and the Secretariat on its effort and underlined the importance of the exercise for the Europe and North America Periodic Report. The Delegation considered it important that that point should be taken into consideration at the next extraordinary session of the Committee, which would have to approve the follow-up to the conclusions of the Report. It suggested publishing a synthesis of the six periodic reports when the cycle was completed, as a very valuable initiative that was also in line with the Global Strategy policy.

1764. The Delegation of **Chile** commended those who had participated in the exercise and emphasized that the region should be concerned as to the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. It thanked the Netherlands, Spain and Japan for extrabudgetary funds for the region and agreed with Lithuania regarding the interest of selecting actions for the future as well as of improving relations with the Advisory Bodies.

1765. **ICCROM** joined the congratulations voiced by the State Parties and underlined three points concerning the report: the role of the Advisory Bodies as a very positive element to take into account in the future; the action plan, developed in parallel to the elaboration of the report, and the usefulness of compiling a synthesis of all the periodical reports finalized during the first cycle.

1766. The **Secretariat** thanked the Committee for the positive feedback. The ambitious action plan responded to the Committee's ambition. It agreed

that there was a need to establish clear priorities for future work. Concerning the question posed by Portugal on the role of universities, it said that those very promising partners had yet to be fully involved. In conclusion, States Parties must bear in mind that the future depended on the interest and spirit of cooperation they themselves could provide.

1767. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that after intense negotiation amongst the States Parties of the region, they were ready to approve Draft Decision **28 COM 16**.

1768. The **Chairperson** declared Draft Decision **28 COM 16** adopted. He closed item 16 of the agenda.

Break for partnerships day presentations

Tuesday, 6 July 2004 (evening session)

1769. The Delegation of **Argentina** reminded the Committee about the remaining issue concerning Draft Decision **28 COM 13.2** on the Main Andean Road project. It thanked the Government of Peru for its interest in the initiative, and proposed minor changes, in writing, to paragraph 6, agreed on following discussion among the Committee Members. The paragraph should be divided into two different paragraphs. It should include after *nomination* "taking into account the Regional Action Plan which is being prepared by the six State Parties with the financial support of the Inter-American Development Bank" and paragraph 7 should begin "Congratulates the World Heritage Centre..." The Delegation of Argentina proposed including *to develop* instead of *to elaborate*.

1770. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, while recognizing the interest of the promising initiative, remarked that the project received support from extrabudgetary funds. It proposed deleting paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision.

1771. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the project was a flagship project for the Secretariat. Should it receive unexpected extrabudgetary funds in the following year, the Centre would not mobilize financial resources for it.

1772. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated concern about approving a budgetary item in a draft decision.

1773. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the written proposal and hoped that paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision would be maintained. It expressed its

gratitude for the indispensable help and support received by the World Heritage Centre.

1774. The Delegation of **Norway** agreed with the concern expressed by the Delegation of the Netherlands and requested clarification as to the singularity of the project.

1775. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the project had been discussed during the 27th session of the Committee and that it was indeed a flagship project for all units at the Centre.

1776. The Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Delegation of Colombia for its statement and agreed on the need to provide a seed budget to increase international cooperation. It drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision concerning the need to keep the Committee informed of progress made at its 29th session in 2005.

1777. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 13.2** adopted, as amended.

1778. The Observer Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for its interest and help in the implementation of the project.

ITEM 19B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/INF.19B

1779. The **Chairperson** explained that the item had been reduced in its scope due to time constraints. The only subject discussed would be the proposal to establish a World Heritage Training and Research Institute in China, presented by the Chinese authorities and included in document *WHC-04/28.COM/INF.19B*.

1780. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the proposal had been the subject of some consultation among the Chinese authorities, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies during an informal meeting prior to the Committee's session. The aim of the proposal was to seize the momentum created by the organization of the World Heritage Committee session to launch an initiative that might support the development of capacity in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* at national and possibly regional level. It was also in line with one of the Strategic Objectives set by the Committee, namely, capacity-building.

1781. The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the Chinese authorities on their decision to establish a

World Heritage training institute, thus setting an excellent example for other regions. It asked where the institute would be located.

1782. The Delegation of **China** said that it would be established in Suzhou and that the Director-General of UNESCO had already inaugurated its premises.

1783. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated China on its initiative, which was most welcome, and said that it looked forward to seeing it further developed.

1784. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the initiative and congratulated China. It said that a certain number of similar institutions existed in Africa, such as the School of African Heritage (EPA) in Benin, and the Programme for Museum Development in Africa (PMDA) in Kenya, that could benefit from international assistance to rebalance the List.

1785. The Delegations of **Colombia, Nigeria, Oman, the Netherlands and Norway** expressed their strong support for the proposal and commended the Chinese authorities on its initiative.

1786. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, together with the Delegations of **Portugal** and the **United Kingdom**, associated itself with the previous speakers in supporting the proposal, and suggested that the Committee might invite the Chinese authorities to provide a report on the development of the initiative at the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee in December 2004, rather than at its 29th ordinary session in June/July 2005, as initially proposed in the Draft Decision. It would have been useful to have more details on the implications of the proposal, including with respect to the budget of the World Heritage Fund. It should be possible to gather such information by December.

1787. **ICCROM**, in associating itself with previous speakers, noted that the establishment of regional training centres, such as that proposed by China, responds to Article 5, paragraph (e) of the *Convention* that invites States Parties to "foster the establishment of national/regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage".

1788. The Committee adopted the decision **28 COM 19.2** by acclamation.

1789. The **Chairperson** closed item 19 of the agenda.

ITEM 10A EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Documents
WHC-04/28.COM/10A..Rev2
WHC-04/28.COM/10B

1790. The **Chairperson** noted that all the recommendations of the Bureau had been reflected in the revised Draft Decision presented to the Committee.

1791. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the Bureau had met four times to examine the requests and suggested that, if there were no objections, the Committee adopt the Draft Decision.

1792. Decision **28.COM/10A.Rev2** was adopted.

1793. The **Chairperson** closed item 10 of the agenda.

ITEM 23 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR

Documents
WHC-04/28.COM/23

1794. The **Chairperson** recalled that Rule 13.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* stipulated that the Committee, at the end of each ordinary session, should elect its Bureau.

1795. The Delegation of **Benin** proposed Mr Themba Wakashe (South Africa) as Chairperson of the 29th session.

1796. The **Committee** expressed its unanimous support by acclamation.

1797. The **Chairperson** declared Mr Themba Wakashe (South Africa) elected as Chairperson of the 29th session of the Committee. He expressed his wholehearted congratulations on behalf of the Committee.

1798. He asked for nominations for the post of Rapporteur.

1799. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** nominated Mr Ariel Gonzalez (Argentina) as Rapporteur.

1800. The **Committee** expressed its unanimous support by acclamation.

1801. The **Chairperson** announced the election of Mr Ariel Gonzalez (Argentina) as Rapporteur.

1802. The Delegation of **Benin**, on behalf of the African group, proposed that Nigeria continue to ensure the role of Vice-Chairperson, recalling that

this group traditionally elected its representative for a period of two years.

1803. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed Portugal as Vice-Chairperson.

1804. The Delegation of **Chile** proposed Colombia as Vice-Chairperson.

1805. The Delegation of **Oman** proposed Lebanon as Vice-Chairperson.

1806. The Delegation of **Japan** proposed New Zealand as Vice-Chairperson.

1807. The **Chairperson** declared Colombia, Lebanon, New Zealand, Nigeria, and Portugal elected as Vice-Chairpersons.

1808. The newly-elected **Chairperson** of the 29th session thanked the People's Republic of China for hosting such a successful and hospitable session. The earlier presence of the Director-General had indicated the importance of the forum in international efforts to preserve the World Heritage. The work of the Centre seemed at times undervalued, yet brought the nations of the world together to preserve and ensure a future legacy for humanity. He thanked the Committee and the State Parties for adhering to the values of protecting human history and biological diversity for future generations. He paid tribute to the world's decision to hold for the first time a World Heritage Committee session in sub-saharan Africa in July 2005. He highlighted the spiritual, social and material dimensions of heritage contributing to the wellbeing of people and the alleviation of poverty.

1809. He hoped that the Committee would address some important issues in July, including the implementation of the Global Strategy and its impact on developing countries; the restoration, protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage in post-conflict situations; peace and security as they impacted on heritage; the value of heritage in complementing regional integration through transboundary protection and joint presentations of nomination files; and, heritage education in promoting national identities, peace and prosperity. He thanked the Committee for its confidence and the Chinese hosts for their hospitality.

1810. The **Chairperson** thanked the incoming Chairperson for his kind words and agreed to the proposal to show an introductory film about South Africa.

1811. The Committee adopted Decision **28 COM 23**.

1812. The **Chairperson** closed item 23 of the agenda.

ITEM 14B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED FROM SUN 4 JULY 04 MORNING)

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Rev.

WHC-04/28.COM/14B Add.

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14B Corr.

1813. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to discuss Draft Decision **28COM.14B.57** submitted by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and revised by the drafting group established by the Committee concerning the methods of work of the States Parties, Centre and Advisory Bodies in the process of the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List.

1814. The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Argentina** recommended postponing discussion of the Draft Decision until the following day in view of the lack of time.

1815. The Delegation of **Japan**, supported by the Delegation of **Oman**, said that even the following day would not provide enough time to discuss all the issues involved, and suggested postponing the discussion until the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee.

1816. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, supported by the Delegation of **Colombia**, said that the subject was too important to postpone to a future date and should be discussed at the present session, on the following day.

1817. The **Rapporteur** said that if the item was to be discussed in the morning, certain time constraints must be borne in mind. A lengthy debate might mean that the record of the Decisions of the Committee, in the process of finalization, would not be available for the Committee's approval in the afternoon.

1818. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded the Committee that a Draft Decision was already before the Committee. A drafting group had worked hard on it, and at least part of it should be discussed at the current session. Elements on which there was disagreement could be postponed until a future session. If there were technical reasons preventing the discussion from taking place in the morning, it should take place immediately.

1819. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it had no problem with the text as it stood. If there were disagreements about certain points, their consideration could be postponed.

1820. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined the importance of this point in that it was linked to the discussion of the Working Group on the Cairns Decision.

1821. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon, and proposed replacing the existing bracketed paragraph 1 with a new paragraph that would remind Committee members that State Parties and Advisory Bodies must do their work with the utmost diligence. The replacement paragraph would read as follows: "*Considering that the quality of the Decisions of the Committee depends upon the quality, completeness and timeliness of the documentation and information provided by the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies*".

1822. The Delegation of **Japan** said that it was very much opposed to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision. It had no intention of refraining from proposing nominations during its term on the Committee, and asked for the Legal Adviser's opinion on the legality of such a decision.

1823. The **Legal Adviser** said that the text of paragraph 7(ii) as it stood carried no legal implications, as it only proposed that the Committee should consider at its next session whether to adopt such a rule. If the Delegation of Japan so wished, the Legal Adviser would be happy to undertake an in-depth study of the legal implications of the proposal itself.

1824. The Delegation of **Japan** said that it was not satisfied with the answer given by the Legal Adviser. The submission of nominations was a right under the *World Heritage Convention*, and to be required to refrain from submitting nominations was a violation of that right. It asked the Legal Adviser to study the question.

1825. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the point made in paragraph 3 was raised in paragraph 9 and that the former could therefore be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4 (iii), the text in brackets should be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4 (vi), the date of 31 March was too tight for many less developed countries and should be extended to 30 April. Concerning paragraph 6(i), it agreed with Lebanon: it was a repetition of a decision already included elsewhere. Concerning paragraph 6(iii), the Delegation asked what "technically complete" meant. Concerning paragraph 6(vi), it noted that it was up to Committee members to ensure that their

questions were answered; the statement was not necessary in the decision. Concerning paragraph 7(ii), the Delegation commended the Legal Adviser on a clear response to the questions raised.

1826. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the Draft Decision under discussion was the outcome of a collective process involving other Committee members, States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. It agreed that the draft text proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands should replace existing paragraph 1. Paragraph 4(iv) and other sub-paragraphs should be redrafted to include references to the relevant paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines*. The issues raised in paragraph 5 should be re-examined at the Committee's 7th Extraordinary Session. In paragraph 6(ii), "14 days" should be in square brackets. The reference should match the schedule given in the *Operational Guidelines*. It added that, pursuant to the Committee's decision **26 COM 14** adopted at its 26th session (2002), the Secretariat should provide to the Committee at each ordinary session a list of nominations received by the deadline of 1 February with an indication of their status as "complete" or "incomplete".

1827. The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with Japan regarding the opinion of the Legal Adviser. The Delegation did not accept that Committee members could be prevented from submitting nominations during their mandates.

1828. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Lebanon concerning paragraph 6(i). Concerning paragraph 6(ii), it believed that 14 days was not enough time for the World Heritage Centre to analyze nominations and report back to the State Party. Paragraph 7(ii) was very restrictive. Colombia had relatively few sites on the World Heritage List and the rule would not be acceptable to it.

1829. Concerning paragraph 7(ii), the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that it only referred to the need for a discussion of the issue. It agreed, however, that it could be removed from the Draft Decision.

1830. The Delegation of **Chile** said that it agreed with the entire Draft Decision, but also supported the points made by Argentina. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), if the Committee wished to retain the spirit of the proposal, the text could read "nominations not in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* should not be on the agenda of the Committee." Concerning the request to put the question to the Legal Adviser, that question was whether the Committee could modify the *Convention*. Could the Committee restrict the right of members to nominate properties to the List?

1831. Responding to the Delegation of Chile as to whether the Committee could amend the *Convention*, the **Legal Adviser** said that its Article 37 stipulated that it could be revised by the General Conference of UNESCO. The Committee itself was not so empowered. Furthermore, nothing in the *Convention* prevented Committee members from presenting nominations.

1832. The Delegation of **Benin** invited the Committee to reflect carefully upon the question of "lobbying" that a member of the Committee could or could not exercise in the framework of his/her mandate. Concerning the Draft Decision, the Delegation found no justification in paragraph 1 to state that the Committee had encountered difficulties during the present session as difficulties had existed for many years. It shared the view of other speakers who wished to delete paragraph 3. With regard to paragraph 6(ii), it considered that due to the lack of staff at the Centre, the 14-day delay was not sufficient. It furthermore questioned if it was for the Centre to review again the nominations. Paragraph 6(vi), found insulting to the Committee, should, in its opinion, be deleted. In respect to paragraph 7, the Committee must "decide" and not "propose" the creation of a mechanism, which however was yet to be defined. It noted finally that the majority of speakers were in favour of the deletion of paragraph 7(ii), considering it contrary to the fundamental rights of the States Parties.

1833. The **Secretariat** explained that the reference to "14 days" in paragraph 6(ii) was not realistic. Between 50 and 60 nominations were received by 1 February, and reviewing them took at least one month. Furthermore, the timetable for the processing of nominations included in the *Operational Guidelines* provided that the Centre would transmit complete nominations to the Advisory Bodies in March, following their receipt by 1 February.

1834. The Delegation of **Oman** agreed with previous speakers that paragraph 3 could be deleted as it covered the same issues as paragraph 9. Concerning paragraph 4(iv), it agreed that the *Operational Guidelines* reference should be included. The definition of "technically complete" in paragraph 6(iii) should be provided. Concerning 7(ii), the Delegation agreed with the Delegations of Japan and Egypt and recommended adding the phrase "subject to the opinion of the Legal Adviser." Concerning paragraph 8, it thought that any reference to the credibility of the List would reflect badly on the credibility of the Committee and that, consequently, the paragraph should be deleted.

1835. The **Secretariat** explained that "technically complete" meant "complete according to the *Operational Guidelines*."

1836. The Delegation of **Norway** was of the opinion that the Draft Decision was a very good document and agreed with its direction. He thanked the drafting group and the United Kingdom for their work in its preparation. Many of the points raised would be relevant in the revised *Operational Guidelines*, and it suggested that they should be considered when the new *Guidelines* were approved. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), it agreed that a date was necessary. The Secretariat should consult ICOMOS and IUCN in order to arrive at the latest date possible so that documents could be sent out in time. It agreed that paragraph 6(vi) should be deleted and on the need for 7(ii), although its consideration should be pushed back to the next ordinary session of the Committee so that sufficient time would be available to prepare a sound legal document. Finally, it agreed with the Netherlands that paragraphs 3 and 9 had both been covered in the budget discussions and could be deleted.

1837. The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that consensus had been reached that paragraph 1 should be replaced with the text proposed by the Netherlands. It agreed with previous speakers that the bracketed phrase in 4(iii) should be deleted. Concerning paragraph 4(vi), while it agreed in principle, the Committee should be careful not to amend the *Operational Guidelines* in its decision, and asked whether that was a new procedure. It also agreed with paragraph 6(iii). Concerning 7(ii), the Delegation suggested new wording to the effect that the Committee would examine the "principle" of Committee members voluntarily refraining from presenting nominations. If the Committee could not agree to examine the principle, then the point should be deleted.

1838. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee members to focus on the amendments.

1839. The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that it appreciated the "rigour" with which the drafting group had produced the document, but it questioned the use of the phrase "intellectual rigour" in paragraph 4(ii), as the Delegation felt that it implied suffering and stress. The word "professionalism" would be preferable. Furthermore, paragraphs 7(ii) and 8 appeared to be a self-indictment of the Committee's performance. Had the Committee really been so bad? Those two points should be scrapped.

1840. The Delegation of **Lithuania** had no difficulty with paragraph 7(ii), but thought that such a measure was only one means of dealing with conflict of interest situations. It proposed that a small working group should be established to explore other sources of conflict of interest and ethical questions in general, together with solutions that might be applied.

1841. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the point raised by paragraph 7(ii) was really so problematic, as it was similar to the measure introduced four years previously when the Committee had been asked to consider reducing its mandate voluntarily to four years. Such a measure could become a voluntary decision taken at the time of a State Party's standing for election at the General Assembly. It need not be a rule.

1842. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that as half the members of the Committee had presented nominations, it was difficult for them to take part in ongoing debates. It suggested that paragraph 7(ii) be deleted and presented at the next session of the Committee, together with the opinion of the Legal Adviser.

1843. The Delegation of **China** supported the amendment of the Netherlands to replace paragraph 1. It also asked for the phrase "official languages" to be replaced by the correct phrase, "working languages." Finally, concerning paragraph 7(ii), it supported the position of the Delegation of Portugal.

1844. **IUCN** was appreciative of the open discussion of the issues. It agreed with the deletion of the text in brackets in paragraphs 4(iii) and 6. Concerning the date of 31 March in paragraph 4(vi), a date earlier than 31 March would facilitate the IUCN evaluation process, but a date after 31 March would make it difficult for the Advisory Body to comply with the Committee's desire to receive documents six weeks in advance of the Committee session. It urged the Committee not to select a date later than that provided in the text. Concerning paragraph 9 and the provision of adequate resources for the World Heritage Centre, it should also reflect the needs of the Advisory Bodies.

1845. **ICOMOS** agreed with IUCN. Concerning paragraph 6(vi), the point had already been addressed, but it was self-evident that the Advisory Bodies were there to respond to questions from the Committee members. The paragraph was unnecessary.

1846. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** said that the Draft Decision needed further elaboration. Concerning paragraph 7(ii), there was no need to discuss the point. It had full confidence in the probity of Committee members. It was happy in the knowledge that Committee members did not exercise any influence beyond what was proper. Furthermore, under such a rule, how would transboundary nominations be handled? It agreed with the Delegation of Japan that it was an artificial limit. To prevent Committee members from presenting nominations would require a change to the Committee's Rules of Procedure. Paragraphs

4(vi) and 6(ii) were unnecessarily bureaucratic, and reminiscent of a schoolteacher's prohibitions to children. To sum up, more time for reflection was needed, and paragraph 7(ii) should be deleted altogether in the meantime.

1847. The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the implications of paragraph 7(ii) - that Committee members influenced votes on certain nominations - were unjustified. The Committee should not be guided by innuendo. The evidence of sites which had not been inscribed at the 28th session proved that the provision was unnecessary.

1848. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it felt embarrassed vis-à-vis the Observers because the debate gives the impression that the Committee members were busy inscribing their own sites and did not even want to discuss the issue of conflict of interest. It reminded them of the article in the Economist, which already gave a negative image of the Committee.

1849. The **Chairperson** declared decision **28 COM 14B.57** adopted, as amended.

ITEM 14A TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES (CONTINUED FROM TUES. 29 JUNE 04 AFTERNOON).

Documents

WHC-04/28.COM/14A

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14

WHC-04/28.COM/14A Rev

WHC-04/28.COM/INF. 14A add

1850. Returning to Item 14A, the **Chairperson** said that the Secretariat had prepared a revised paragraph 2 for Decision **28 COM 14A** concerning Tentative Lists: "*Noting also that the recently completed study of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN would contribute significantly to the discussion concerning the improved use of tentative lists as requested by the Committee in its Decision 27 COM 8A*". Seeing no objection, he declared decision **28 COM 14A** adopted as amended. He closed item 14 of the agenda.

Session suspended until Wednesday, 7 July 2004 afternoon, for the preparation of the Decisions report by the Secretariat.

Wednesday, 7 July 2004 (afternoon)

**ITEM 24 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF
THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD
HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-JULY 2005)**

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/24

1851. The **Secretariat** introduced the provisional agenda, mentioning that the available dates proposed by South Africa for the session were the first two weeks of July 2005. The agenda was structured according to tradition, with the examination of the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List coming before new nominations to it. It drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, due to an oversight, item 12 should have included a sub-item (12 C) concerning the report on progress in the implementation of activities for the protection of the Palestinian cultural and natural heritage. The Secretariat asked the Committee whether, as suggested by the Delegation of Nigeria, a specific item should be included to discuss the state of conservation of the African World Heritage.

1852. The Delegation of **South Africa** confirmed the availability of the above-mentioned dates.

1853. The Delegation of **Norway** asked the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the Committee's extraordinary session in December 2004 on alternative ways of organizing the work of the Committee and the content of its agenda.

1854. The **Secretariat** agreed to do so, and suggested that the paper might be discussed under Item 4 bis of the agenda for that session.

1855. The Delegation of **Benin** congratulated the Secretariat for its very complete presentation of the provisional agenda. It supported the proposal of the United Kingdom to defer the examination and adoption of the extraordinary session of the Committee in December 2004. Like Nigeria, it hoped that at the occasion of this first Committee session in sub-Saharan Africa, particular attention would be given to the situation of world heritage of this continent and informed the Committee that the African Group was reflecting upon an appropriate form to give to this special event. It finally proposed that for the 29th session the examination of the African Periodic Report be the subject of a special report rather than an ordinary one, and thus benefit from greater attention.

1856. The **Secretariat** proposed organizing a full-day event devoted specifically to the African World Heritage, possibly involving partners and donors. It could be a side event and it might not, therefore, be necessary to include it as a formal item in the agenda.

1857. The **Chairperson** declared the agenda for the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (June-July 2005) adopted, as amended (**28 COM 24**). He closed item 24 of the agenda.

ITEM 25 OTHER BUSINESS

1858. The **Chairperson** thanked Lebanon, Oman and the United Kingdom for their original invitations to host the next session of the World Heritage Committee. He then asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the proposed agenda for the 7th extraordinary Committee session.

1859. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the agenda proposed by the Secretariat for the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee, which was due to take place in December 2004. It included items that had not been discussed during the current session of the Committee due to lack of time, and other policy issues such as the new version of the *Operational Guidelines* and the implementation of the Strategic Objectives set by the Committee. International Assistance requests could also be examined by the Committee, so as not to delay the approval of important activities until June or July 2005. No new working documents would be produced, other than for item 12 (Publications Plans by the World Heritage Centre). He recalled that, in line with Rule 9.3 of the *Rules of Procedure*, the provisional agenda of an extraordinary session could not be changed once approved by the Committee. He also drew the attention of the Committee to the need to authorize the necessary budgetary adjustments to provide the funding required for the extraordinary session, estimated to be roughly US\$110,000.

1860. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the Director's listing of agenda items was practically complete and asked firstly whether preparation of document 34 C/4 (Medium-Term Strategy) should be included alongside document 33 C/5 among the agenda items under the heading Administrative and Financial Matters.

1861. It further asked for reference to be made in Draft Decision **28 COM 12** to intersectoral cooperation and coordination, and asked secondly whether Draft Decision **28 COM 14 (b)**, paragraph 6, referred to the 7th extraordinary session or to the special meeting in the Russian Federation.

1862. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed to the first request, and to the second, responded that it was a procedural issue that could be taken up at the next Committee session, which was to be decided by the Committee.

1863. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that a decision was needed for document 33 C/5, as if two Committee sessions were to be held, it would have to be included in the document for the Director-General because the budget for them would come from the Regular Programme budget. Until such time as a decision had been made on that point, however, the Delegation agreed to the readjustment mentioned by the Director of the Centre.

1864. The Delegation of **New Zealand** asked when the new voting mechanism for the election of Committee members would be discussed, as it had been decided in **28 COM 25.1** to defer consideration until the 7th extraordinary session.

1865. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it was proposed to make that subject into a new item 14, replacing “Other Business”.

1866. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it had understood that the Bureau had decided that the 7th extraordinary session should last five days, while in fact only three days were being proposed. With regard to provisional agenda item 4, it was too narrowly drafted, as more than a report on the *Revised Operational Guidelines* was needed, covering also other issues that would come up in the debate. With regard to the method of work of the Committee, it proposed a new, more wide-ranging item 2 to cover legal issues such as restrictions on Committee members nominating properties.

1867. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed and proposed rewording item 4 to read: “Report and discussions on the *Revised Operational Guidelines*”, and adding an agenda item 14 *bis* on “Working methods of the Committee”.

1868. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that “Working methods of the Committee” would link closely to the debate on the *Revised Operational Guidelines*, and that therefore it would be more appropriate as provisional agenda item 4 *bis*.

1869. The **Director** said, with regard to the time frame, that a room had been booked for a full week, which, in his opinion, would be needed to discuss the 18 items on the provisional agenda. He recalled that Committee sessions usually started on a Monday and continued until Saturday, when the final report was adopted, with one day without meetings (Friday) for report writing.

1870. The Delegation of **Oman** expressed its support for the United Kingdom's proposal, as well as for a five-day meeting from 6 to 11 December.

1871. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Bureau had recommended five days.

1872. The **Director** replied that a Committee meeting usually took six days: four days of work, one day for report-writing by the Secretariat, and a morning for discussion and adoption of the report.

1873. The Delegation of **Colombia** said, in relation to the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Report and the request for an Action Plan for Latin America, that a meeting was going to be held in the first week of October 2004 in Colombia, and asked whether a report or discussion on it could be included as agenda item 5(e).

1874. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the Executive Board would be in session in October, but that the proposal by the Delegation of Colombia was acceptable.

1875. The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed support for a five-day meeting as proposed by the Centre and, with regard to paragraph 5 “Progress Report on Periodic Reporting for Africa”, suggested that it should not be included in the agenda of the 7th extraordinary session, but in that of the 29th Committee session, which would take place on African soil.

1876. The **Director of the of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the item had been postponed from the 28th session and contained an update on activities carried out since 2003. The fact that it was included in the agenda of the 7th extraordinary session would not prevent a fuller discussion of the subject at the 29th session of the Committee in 2005. Indeed, it could be the subject of a special one-day side event during the Committee's session in South Africa.

1877. In answer to the Delegation of the United Kingdom, he said that the proposed dates for the 7th extraordinary session were 6 to 11 December 2004.

1878. The Delegation of **Argentina** agreed with the dates and requested confirmation on the discussion of Periodic Reporting Progress reports, which included a progress report for Latin America and the Caribbean, to ensure that it covered the Action Plan for Latin America and the Main Andean Road Project.

1879. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that an agenda item 5 (f): Main Andean Road Project could be added.

1880. The **Chairperson** declared the agenda for the 7th extraordinary session adopted, as amended. (**28 COM 25.2**) He closed item 25 of the agenda.

ITEM 26 DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (28 JUNE - 7 JULY 2004, SUZHOU, CHINA)

Document
WHC-04/28.COM/26

1881. The **Rapporteur** introduced the working document. She explained that Part I concerned decisions under agenda items 1 to 14 that had been discussed in plenary, while Part II (items 15 to 25) would be distributed shortly. Three issues had influenced preparation of this document: 1) the 56 nominations and 157 state of conservation reports, of which 35 concerned the World Heritage List in Danger, had led to over 200 decisions on these items, a total of nearly 250 decisions; 2) the agenda item on state of conservation had been discussed very late in the meeting, which had meant considerable pressure on the Secretariat due to lack of time and thus accounting for some minor differences which needed fine-tuning, and 3) the Secretariat had limited time for report preparation, as a morning and evening meeting had been added to the schedule.

1882. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding item by item.

1883. The Delegation of **Benin** sought additional information concerning procedures. Certain names of States Parties – notably Azerbaijan, Eritrea – were incorrect. The Delegation would make its written comments for the Secretariat.

1884. The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **28 COM 4**, **28 COM 5** and **28 COM 6** adopted.

1885. The Delegation of **Benin** noted a problem of formulation. It indicated that the word ‘document’ appeared whereas it should not.

1886. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 7** and **28 COM 8** adopted.

1887. With regard to Decision **28 COM 9**, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed the insertion of the words “if finalized” in paragraph 7 concerning the *Operational Guidelines*.

1888. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed to the proposal and recalled that, as previously proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands, any new decisions pertinent to the revised *Operational*

Guidelines should also be considered to fall within the mandate entrusted to the Chairperson of the 27th session by the Committee.

1889. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed and proposed inserting the words “is also authorized to include”.

1890. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **28 COM 9** adopted, as amended.

1891. The Observer Delegation of **Belgium** noted that in decision 9 mention should be made of the 27th and 28th sessions.

1892. The **Chairperson** accepted the proposal.

1893. He declared decisions 28 COM 10A.1, 28 COM 10A.2, 28 COM 10A.3, 28 COM 11 and 28 COM 12 adopted.

1894. With regard to decision **28 COM 10A.3**, the Delegation of **Benin** noted that the French version of the document contained a repetition of the words ‘et d’éducation’ and requested that the error be corrected.

1895. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the English version was clear and asked the Delegation of Benin to hand the correction for the French version in writing to the Rapporteur.

1896. With regard to decision **28 COM 13**, the Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that there was a small omission in paragraph 16b and suggested the correction in the English version.

1897. The **Director** confirmed that the omission would be corrected.

1898. The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the Rapporteur on her tremendous work, as well as that of the Secretariat, and proposed some small changes to paragraphs 2 and 9, where there was a problem of consistency.

1899. In paragraph 13 concerning the Russian Federation’s proposal to host the special meeting, it requested clarification as to how the proposal was incorporated and on the costs for participation of experts, as for Latin America some 10 to 15 experts were expected, supplemented by those from other regions. It supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 13 (i) to make it read “more consistent with Article 11 ...”.

1900. It further made a proposal for paragraph 13 (iii), suggesting to add the wording: “to remove from the World Heritage List in Danger”.

1901. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it had all been accepted and proposed adding “presently inscribed”.

1902. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that adoption of Decision **28 COM 13.1** depended on it.

1903. Concerning paragraph 13, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked how it related to the issue on Outstanding Universal Value that had been deleted, as it was slightly different.

1904. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that there was a correlation and that he saw no contradiction.

1905. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it should be deleted, as the conference had already been proposed, and suggested replacing “could” by “should”. It was not sure of the meaning of regional context.

1906. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the intervention of the Delegation of Argentina with regard to decision **28 COM 13.1**. Concerning specifically paragraph 13 and Russia’s invitation, the Delegation suggested that it would perhaps be more appropriate to include it in a new paragraph.

1907. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that no formal proposal from the Russian Federation was adopted in plenary, and that more details should be given on this generous offer.

1908. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of Lebanon declared its satisfaction with the proposed amendments.

1909. Referring to decision **28 COM 14B.14**, the Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested a correction to paragraph 2, where the first word "Recommend" should be replaced by "Request".

1910. Referring to decision **28 COM 14B.16**, the Delegation of Lebanon suggested that the first word of paragraph 3, "Encourage", be replaced by the word "Request".

1911. Referring then to decision **28 COM 14B.28**, the Delegation of Lebanon, suggested that paragraph 5 (continues in English) should be "request" and not "encourage".

1912. Referring to decision **28 COM 14B.36**, the Observer Delegation of **Andora** noted a concordance problem between the English and French versions. In paragraph 4, the English version contained the words *above measures* and requested that the equivalent be reflected in the French version.

1913. Concerning Decision **28 COM 14B.42**, following a question raised by the Delegation of Portugal, the **Secretariat** informed the Committee about the difference between nominations which are deferred and referred back. In the past, with a Bureau session, referred back nominations were reviewed by the Committee during the same year, whereas deferred nominations could go only to the Committee session the following year. In the future with the revised *Operational Guidelines*, deferred nominations would be treated like new nominations to be transmitted by the deadline of 1 February, whereas referred back dossiers could go to the Committee the following year. During the interim time between the current *Operational Guidelines* and the new ones, the practice of the Committee was to treat these dossiers the same way, examples were The landscape of the Pico Island vineyard culture (Portugal) which was referred back and Town Hall and Roland on the marketplace of Bremen (Germany) which was deferred by the same Committee. In general the difference depended on the amount of work that was needed to comply with the request by the Committee, such as a comprehensive comparative study, or the revision of the core and buffer zone of a property.

1914. Concerning Decision **28 COM 14B.57**, paragraph 8, the Delegation of **Oman** stated that the word "credibility" was maybe too strong.

1915. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of the Netherlands, proposed to maintain the above-cited word.

1916. Referring to paragraph 7 of the decision, the Delegation of **Benin** requested that the term "Office of the Legal Adviser" be replaced by the term "Legal Adviser".

1917. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed discussing only those decisions that still needed some debate and adopting the other decisions without debate.

1918. The Delegation of **Benin** commented upon the procedure for adoption and requested that once this decision was adopted, they return to the other points to be raised.

1919. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would be good procedure to approve the whole bloc of decisions and to open the floor for discussion only when delegations wished to speak on specific items.

1920. The **Chairperson** agreed to proceed in that way.

1921. Referring to Draft Decision **28 COM 15A.25**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed deleting paragraph 5 and it submitted a written text that was incorporated.

1922. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposal of the Netherlands.

1923. Referring to Draft Decision **28 COM 15A.31**, the Delegation of **Egypt** referred to the inconsistencies between the English and the French versions, particularly in paragraph 4, line 2 and paragraph 5, line 1.

1924. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the English version of the Draft Decision should be considered the original version.

1925. The Director of the World Heritage Centre said that it was so.

1926. The **Rapporteur** proposed grouping together the state of conservation reports under item 15B.

1927. Concerning Draft Decision **28 COM 15B.22**, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its concern about the wording of the Draft Decision and said that it did not reflect the Committee's position on the matter.

1928. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the United Kingdom and suggested the deletion of the words "with satisfaction". The Delegation of the United Kingdom might like to provide a draft text for an additional paragraph.

1929. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it proposed adding to the paragraph 5 the words "Deletes with satisfaction" and adding a paragraph 5bis which would read "Further notes the concerns regarding the potential impact of oil and gas pipelines on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and considers that any such proposal should undergo a comprehensive EIA to international standards". It also proposed adding to paragraph 7 after the word "route" the words "and the issues noted under paragraph 4 above".

1930. The Delegation of **Colombia**, referring to Decision **28 COM 15B.31**, noted that the Committee's recommendation was missing from the text of the Draft Decision. It therefore proposed adding to paragraph 3 the words "and to ensure that the fishing quotas established by the due processes under the Galapagos Special Law are respected".

1931. The **Chairperson** declared decisions **28 COM 15B.1 to 28 COM 15B.38** adopted, as amended.

1932. The **Rapporteur** suggested that the Committee consider Decisions **28 COM 15B.39 to 28 COM 15B.80** as a first group and Decisions **28 COM 15B.81 to 28 COM 15B.121** as a second group. Decision **28 COM 15B.122** had already been adopted.

1933. Referring to Decision **28 COM 15B.48**, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the new building referred to in the report affected the outstanding universal value of the property and why that was not reflected in the report.

1934. The **Secretariat** replied that the new construction was not big in dimension and did not affect the outstanding universal value of the property.

1935. The **Chairperson** declared adopted the group of decisions **28 COM 15B.39 to 28 COM 15B.80** and the group of decisions **28 COM 15B.81 to 28 COM 15B.121**.

1936. He then declared decision **28 COM 15C** adopted without debate.

1937. He declared decision **28 COM 16** adopted, as amended during the discussion of the item.

1938. The Delegation of **Argentina** asked for a reference to the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee to be made in the decision concerning the adoption of the provisional agenda of the 29th session of the Committee.

1939. The Delegation of **Benin** intervened on decision **28 COM 17C** (Monitoring of Periodic Reporting in Africa). It requested confirmation as to whether that discussion would be carried over to the 7th session of the Committee.

1940. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the item would be postponed for discussion to the 7th extraordinary session.

1941. The Chairperson declared decisions **28 COM 17A, 17B.I, 17B.II, 17C** and **17D** adopted.

1942. The **Rapporteur** noted that the Committee had decided to postpone discussion of items 18, 19 (except the aspect relating to the World Heritage Research and Training Institute in China), 20, 21 and 22 to the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee.

1943. Referring to item 19, **ICCROM** suggesting inserting in Decision **28 COM 19** the words "decides in view of the time constraints to defer the discussion until its 7th extraordinary session".

1944. Referring to item 20, the Delegation of **Argentina** proposed adding the words "noting with satisfaction the day on partnerships that took place on 6 July in the context of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee".

1945. The **Chairperson** declared decisions **28 COM 18, 19, 20, 21** and **22** adopted, as amended.

1946. The Delegation of **Benin** intervened on decision **28 COM 23, c)**, concerning the election of the Vice-Chairpersons and requested that the same procedure be followed as for the items a) and b) of decision 23. In other words, the beginning and the end of the mandate of each of the elected parties must be indicated.

1947. The **Chairperson** agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Benin and declared Decision **28 COM 23** adopted as amended. He closed item 26 of the agenda.

ITEM 27 CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

1948. The Rapporteur offered some observations about ways of working drawn from the past days. There had been similar observations on past occasions but as yet no solution had been found. In future, it would be essential that the Committee deal with reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties before examining nominations for inscription. This would facilitate the Committee's work and the preparation of decisions. It would also be essential to adhere ever more closely to the guidelines on terminology in relation to Decisions adopted at the 26th and 27th sessions of the Committee: indeed the preceding debate had highlighted the need for this. Work flows would also be more efficient if the Committee were to adopt decisions paragraph by paragraph so that it was clear exactly what was agreed: this was particularly important in sensitive cases. While it was sometimes necessary for the Secretariat to consult the Advisory Bodies after a Decision had been taken, this should be kept to a minimum to maintain the integrity of the Committee's decisions. The Rapporteur would, with her successor and immediate predecessors draft some proposals for consideration during the 7th Extraordinary session of the Committee in Paris in December, which would include an item of methods of working. Finally she thanked the Secretariat for its professionalism, loyalty and assistance in undertaking this challenging task.

1949. In closing the session, the **Chairperson** thanked all participants for their hard work but noted that the act of inscribing properties on the List was only the beginning of the international community's collective work to ensure sure that they retained the

outstanding universal values for which they had been inscribed. A heavy responsibility weighed on the shoulders of the Committee. One of the most fundamental tasks related to safeguarding World Heritage was that of sensitizing young people to the need to protect it.

1950. In his closing address, Mr Zhang Xincheng, referred to the adoption of decisions making it a milestone in the cause of World Heritage. Out of the 48 nominations 34 properties were inscribed, including 5 from unrepresented countries, making the List much richer and more diverse. He referred to the success stories such as the withdrawal from the in-Danger listing of Angkor (Cambodia), Bahla Fort (Oman) and Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) whose Outstanding Universal Value of is no longer threatened. Following in-depth deliberations of the Committee and the Working Group on the Cairns Decision, a consensus was reached to form a Suzhou-Cairns Decision. Calling this a significant step forward, he was convinced that the four Cs of the Global Strategy, namely, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication and Credibility, will be greatly strengthened. He informed the meeting that the Committee had decided to hold the 7th Extraordinary Session in Paris in December (2004), to examine those agenda items not covered during the current session. He thanked the Committee, the Bureau members for their hard work, for their spirit of mutual understanding and friendly consultation with commitment to safeguarding the *World Heritage Convention* and specifically Dr. Omotoso Eluyemi of Nigeria, for replacing him in accordance with the *Rules of Procedure*; representatives of the States Parties, the three Advisory Bodies, and various IGOs and NGOs, who attended as Observers. He also thanked the Director-General of UNESCO; the Assistant Director-General for Culture, and the Director of the Centre for their support; He expressed his gratitude to the Chinese people for their tremendous support and hospitality throughout the session, thanking H. E. Mr. Hu Jintao, President of the PRC, for his warm and encouraging message at the opening read by H. E. Madam Chen Zhili, State Councillor of the PRC. He invited Mr Themba Wakashe from South Africa (the next Chair) to join him on the podium, officially closing the session and wished everyone a safe journey home. (The Chairperson's complete closing speech can be found on the following web site : <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>)

1951. **Representatives of the Youth Forum** that had been taking place in parallel presented the conclusions of their work to the Committee. Their findings are annexed to this document (Annex VI).

1952. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** offered his thanks to the Chairperson, Rapporteur and Committee for their contributions to what had been a truly memorable session and in particular to all those involved in the preparation and conduct of the session – the Chinese authorities and volunteers, UNESCO staff and the interpreters.

1953. The **Vice Mayor of Suzhou**, Mr Wang Guoxing, expressed the warmest congratulations of the municipality of Suzhou, noting that the conservation of World Heritage was an important driver for peace and development, and wished everyone a nice trip. (Mr. Wang Guoxing's complete speech can be found on the following web site: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/>).

1954. The **Delegation of Portugal**, speaking on behalf of the Committee, expressed its heartfelt thanks to the Chairperson, Rapporteur, the Chinese authorities, volunteers, World Heritage Centre staff, UNESCO secretariat and interpreters for their efficient and harmonious work before and during the session. Inspired by the beauty of the World Heritage property, the Humble Administrator's Garden, it hoped that future humble administrators would follow the same path and continue to identify and protect World Heritage.

1955. The newly elected **Chairperson for the 29th session** said that he was acutely conscious of the responsibility that the post entailed. He thanked the outgoing Chairperson and the Government of China for their extraordinary efforts and looked forward to welcoming the Committee to South Africa in 2005.

1956. The Chairperson declared the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

20h40: Session concluded

