

**World Heritage  
Patrimoine mondial**

**29 COM**

Distribution limited / limitée

**WHC-05/29.COM/INF.22**

Paris, 25 April/ avril 2006

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES  
POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE  
MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Twenty ninth Session  
Vingt-neuvième session

Durban, South Africa / Durban, Afrique du Sud  
10-17 July 2005 / 10-17 juillet 2005

**Item 22 of the Provisional Agenda: Adoption of Decisions**

**Summary Record of the 29th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005)**

**Point 22 de l'ordre du jour provisoire: Adoption des décisions**

**Résumé des interventions de la 29e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Durban, 2005)**

**SUMMARY RECORD**

**RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS**





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</u></b>		<b><u>II</u></b>
<b><u>FIRST DAY .....</u></b>		<b><u>1</u></b>
<b>FIRST MEETING .....</b>		<b>1</b>
ITEM 1	OPENING OF THE SESSION	1
<b><u>SECOND DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>5</u></b>
<b>SECOND MEETING .....</b>		<b>5</b>
ITEM 2	REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS	5
ITEM 3A	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	6
ITEM 3B	PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	6
ITEM 4	REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 7TH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (UNESCO, 2004)	6
ITEM 11C	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA	8
<b><u>SECOND DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>17</u></b>
<b>THIRD MEETING.....</b>		<b>17</b>
ITEM 11C	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA (CONTINUED)	18
ITEM 5	REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	20
ITEM 9	ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005), ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1	26
<b><u>THIRD DAY .....</u></b>		<b><u>31</u></b>
<b>FOURTH MEETING.....</b>		<b>31</b>
ITEM 9:	ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005), ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1 (CONTINUED)	32
ITEM 7 A	EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER	39
<b><u>THIRD DAY .....</u></b>		<b><u>47</u></b>

<b>FIFTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>47</b>
ITEM 7A    EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES ; STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	47
<b><u>FOURTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>SIXTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>73</b>
ITEM 7A    EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	73
<b><u>FOURTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>87</b>
<b>SEVENTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>87</b>
ITEM 7A    EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES : STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	87
ITEM 7B    EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	96
<b><u>FIFTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>118</b>
<b>EIGHTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>118</b>
ITEM 14B   INFORMATION ON THE EVALUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND’S PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE, TECHNICAL COOPERATION, TRAINING, AND PROMOTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES	118
ITEM 8 A   ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER: TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED IN CONFORMITY WITH THE <i>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES</i> (2005) AND AS OF 30 MAY 2005.	119
ITEM 8 B   NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER.	120
<b><u>FIFTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>132</b>
<b>NINTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>132</b>
ITEM 8 B   NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	132
<b><u>SIXTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>158</b>
<b>TENTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>158</b>
ITEM 8 B   NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	158
ITEM 11    PERIODIC REPORTS	170
ITEM 11A   PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA	170
<b><u>SIXTH DAY</u></b> .....	<b>174</b>
<b>ELEVENTH MEETING</b> .....	<b>174</b>

ITEM 8 B	NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (CONTINUED)	174
ITEM 11D	PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE	192
ITEM 7B	EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED)	194
<b><u>SIXTH DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>201</u></b>
<b>SUBSIDIARY BODY ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ISSUES .....</b>		<b>201</b>
ITEM 10	GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY: BUDGETARY PROVISIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR CAPACITY BUILDING ON NATURAL HERITAGE	201
ITEM 12	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES	202
ITEM 13	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES PROGRESS REPORT ON WORLD HERITAGE PACT	205
<b><u>SIXTH DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>209</u></b>
<b>SUBSIDIARY BODY ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ISSUES .....</b>		<b>209</b>
ITEM 14A	EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS	209
ITEM 15	REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET 2004-2005 AND FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ISSUES OF THE AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE UNDERTAKEN IN 1997	210
ITEM 16	PRESENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET 2006-2007	213
ITEM 17	REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM	218
<b><u>SEVENTH DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>219</u></b>
<b>TWELFTH MEETING.....</b>		<b>219</b>
ITEM 7B	EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED)	219
ITEM 18	WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	240
<b><u>EIGHTH DAY.....</u></b>		<b><u>243</u></b>
<b>THIRTEENTH MEETING.....</b>		<b>243</b>
ITEM 6	REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE FOR THE 15TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (CONTINUED)	244
ITEM 9	ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005) ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1 (CONTINUED)	245
ITEM 19	ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR FOR THE 30TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE	246

ITEM 20	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 30TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE 2006	247
ITEM 22	ADOPTION OF DECISIONS	251

# FIRST DAY

## FIRST MEETING

Sunday 10 July 2005

05.15 p.m. - 06.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: The first meeting of the Committee was dedicated to the formal opening of its 29th session. The interventions of both the authorities of the Host Country and of UNESCO underscored the relevance of such session, the first in Sub-Saharan Africa, for the involvement of Africa in the implementation of the *Convention*.

Note du Rapporteur : La première réunion du Comité a été consacrée à l'ouverture officielle de sa 29e session. Dans leurs interventions, les autorités du pays hôte et de l'UNESCO ont souligné l'importance de cette session pour la première fois en Afrique sub-saharienne et pour l'engagement de l'Afrique dans la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*.

### ITEM 1      OPENING OF THE SESSION

The 29th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by Mr. Themba Wakashe, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, following the introduction by Professor I. Mosala, Director-General of the Department of Arts and Culture of the Republic of South Africa, on 10 July 2005 in Durban, Republic of South Africa. The Chairperson welcomed Mr. Z. Mkhize, Acting Premier of the Province of KwaZulu-Natal, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Michael Abiola Omolewa, President of the General Conference of UNESCO, Advocate B. Gawanas, Commissioner for Social Affairs at the African Union, Mr. Pallo Jordan, Minister of Arts and Culture of the Republic of South Africa, Committee Members, States Parties and all observers. The 21 members of the Committee - Argentina, Benin, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, India, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland - participated in the session.

The following States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* which are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan,



Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America

The Permanent Observer mission of Palestine to UNESCO also attended the session as an observer.

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 of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the session.

Statements were made by the personalities attending the opening session, a summary of which follows:

In his opening address Mr. Themba Wakashe, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Deputy Director-General of the Department of Arts and Culture of the Republic of South Africa, welcomed the honourable guests, the Director-General of UNESCO, the President of the General Conference of UNESCO, members of the World Heritage Committee and other distinguished delegates and observers. He underscored the importance of respecting cultural diversity and enhancing traditional heritage conservation measures. Referring to an African anecdote, he called for the sharing of wisdom among all, and declared the 29th Session of the World Heritage Committee open. The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII and is accessible at the following Web link:

Dr. Zimbili Mkhize, Acting Premier of the Province of KwaZulu-Natal, Republic of South Africa, extended a welcome to all the guests and, in the perspective of the situation of Africa today, underscored the importance of conservation and enhancement of the heritage as a vector of sustainable development. The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII.

In his address, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, thanked and congratulated the host country for its preparation of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee and its warm hospitality. He explained the priority given in UNESCO's activities to the African Region, and emphasized the importance of education and culture for development of human resources. He also underlined the importance of intersectoral and regional partnership for sustainable development, and drew attention to UNESCO's cooperation with the African Union and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII.

Professor Michael Abiola Omolewa, President of the General Conference of UNESCO, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to UNESCO, addressed the opening session, stressing the significance of heritage as a tool for conflict prevention. The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII.

Advocate Ms. Bience Gawanas, Commissioner for Social Affairs at the African Union, thanked the host country for its hospitality and for having associated the whole of Africa with the occasion. She also thanked the Director-General of UNESCO for having chosen the venue of Durban for the 29th session of the Committee. She placed particular emphasis on regional solidarity. The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII.

The last speaker at the opening session was Dr. Zweledinga Pallo Jordan, Honourable Minister of Arts and Culture of the Republic of South Africa, who delivered a keynote

address on behalf of the President of the Republic of South Africa, the host country. He underscored the importance of heritage as a tool for development, identity-building and peace-making. The full text of the address is reproduced in Annex VII.

The opening session was followed by a stage performance entitled “An African Cosmology”, symbolizing the six World Heritage properties of the Republic of South Africa and paying tribute to African cultural and natural diversity.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.



## SECOND DAY

### SECOND MEETING

Monday 11 July 2005

10.00 a.m.-01.10 p.m

**Chairperson: Mr Wakashe**

Note of the Rapporteur: After approving its agenda and considering other introductory matters, the Committee at its second meeting engaged into a substantive discussion of the follow-up of the periodic report for Africa. Notably, an *African Position Paper* was unanimously supported, which addresses the challenges of the implementation of the *Convention* in the African Region - including by the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund.

Note du Rapporteur : Après avoir procédé à l'approbation de son ordre du jour et à l'examen d'autres questions préalables, le Comité, lors de sa 2e réunion, a entrepris une discussion importante sur le suivi du rapport périodique pour l'Afrique. Notamment, un *Exposé de la Position de l'Afrique* qui envisage les défis de la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* dans la région Afrique – y compris la création d'un Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'Afrique – a été approuvé à l'unanimité.

## ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/2*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 2*

The **Chairperson** presented the bilingual document on observer status, consisting of a part I containing the draft Decision and a part II concerning requests for observer status and invitations to the Committee session.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted. He took it that the Committee wished to endorse part II of the document.

It was so agreed.

The **Chairperson** recalled that filming the working sessions of the Committee was not authorized.

Regarding the language in which Spanish-speaking Committee members wished their interventions to be reflected in the summary records, the Delegations of **Argentina**, **Chile** and **Colombia** requested that their interventions be summarized in English.

### **ITEM 3A PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/3A.Rev 3*

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the revised provisional agenda. He recalled that the working group for agenda item 18, on the Working Methods of the World Heritage Committee, would be chaired by Lithuania, as it had been at the Seventh Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee. The working group would continue the work begun at the Seventh Extraordinary Session.

The **Chairperson** declared the agenda adopted.

### **ITEM 3B PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/3B.Rev 2*

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau, which had met the day before and that morning to discuss both the agenda and the timetable, had suggested certain changes in the timetable.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the proposed changes concerned the order of discussion of certain items, notably to take account of the presence of key participants.

The **Chairperson** said he took it that the proposal by the Delegation of **Colombia**, supported by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, to commence the morning meetings at 9.30 a.m. instead of 10.00 a.m. was acceptable. As the latter Delegation had pointed out, that would allow for more time to discuss new nominations to the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** declared the timetable adopted as amended.

### **ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 7TH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (UNESCO, 2004)**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/4  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.04  
*Draft Decision:* 29 COM 4

The **Rapporteur** of the 7th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Ariel Gonzalez, presented his report. He said that the seventeen decisions adopted during the 7th extraordinary session used carefully drafted and balanced language, which reflected the significance of some of the important issues addressed, such as the working methods of the Committee, the entry into force of the revised *Operational Guidelines*, and the interaction between the periodic reporting exercise and the state of conservation reports. He then recalled some adjustments introduced in the preparation of the Summary Records in order to make them more user-friendly, such as the clear identification of each day of debate, and proposed some additional adjustments to be introduced in the report of the present session of the Committee, notably a thematic index and a country index at the end of the Summary Records. After recalling the excellent work of the World Heritage Centre in assisting him in his task of Rapporteur, he thanked the Delegation of Spain for financing the interpretation to Spanish at the Committee's session. He expressed his hope that Spanish would be increasingly used, along with English and French, in the activities of the Committee. For instance, he would very much like to see, as of 2006, the text of the Committee's decisions translated into Spanish.

The Delegation of **Chile** congratulated the Rapporteur on his work, which reflected the complexity of the issues discussed, and was beautifully documented in the Summary Records. The Delegation also thanked Spain for making it possible for participants to take the floor in Spanish, one of the official languages of the United Nations, during the present Committee session.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also thanked the Rapporteur for his work and for the presentation of the document, and thanked Spain for making it possible to speak Spanish. It supported the proposal made by the Rapporteur regarding the translation of the Committee's decisions into Spanish, and expressed the hope that that would broaden their impact.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie les autorités de l'Afrique du Sud pour la généreuse hospitalité et se dit honorée de pouvoir participer à cette session du Comité organisé en Afrique. Elle se unit aux félicitations au Rapporteur manifestés par les autres délégations pour l'excellent travail accompli dans la rédaction du rapport et ajoute que, grâce à son action, des grandes améliorations ont été apportés à la qualité finale et à la transparence du rapport.

The Delegation of **China** thanked South Africa for its hospitality and the first-rate preparations for the Committee's session. The Delegation thanked the Rapporteur and all those involved in the World Heritage Centre for their excellent work.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its gratitude for the excellent way the Committee session had been organized, and thanked South Africa for its hospitality and creativity. The Delegation praised the Report of the Rapporteur as being straightforward and clear.

The Delegation of **India** thanked South Africa for organizing the World Heritage Committee session, and said that it had felt as if it had come home in the city of Durban. The Delegation supported the statements by previous speakers, and applauded the Report.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked South Africa for its warm welcome hosting the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation thanked the Rapporteur for his Report and said that it had enjoyed working with him. The detailed model for decisions contained therein should be read and used in the future.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its input. He expressed his sincere thanks for the work done by the Rapporteur, and added that it had been a pleasure to work with a Rapporteur of such high quality.

## **ITEM 11C PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA**

*Documents: WHC-05/29.COM/11C.2  
WHC-05/29.COM/11C2.Rev  
WHC-05/29.COM/11C.2.Add*

### *Draft Decision 29 COM 11 C.2*

Le **Directeur du Centre** rappelle les principaux faits depuis la septième session extraordinaire du Comité, notamment la réunion d'experts qui s'est tenue en Afrique du Sud en mars 2005.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie le Comité d'avoir accepté que *l'Exposé de la position de l'Afrique* soit présenté en priorité au début de la session. En rappelant que ce document est le résultat d'un travail collectif, elle demande au Comité de bien vouloir donner la parole à deux observateurs qui vont assister la Délégation dans la présentation. Elle rappelle en outre le processus qui, depuis la 28e session du Comité à Suzhou, a abouti à la rédaction du document et à l'avant-projet de création du Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain. Elle précise que le document a été inspiré – dans l'esprit du NEPAD – par les dimensions socio-économiques du patrimoine.

Citing Shakespeare, 'To be or not to be', the Delegation voiced the general philosophy 'who are we not to be visible on the World Heritage scene?' It expressed gratitude to South Africa for organizing the meeting in March in Cape Town, and thanked the members of the Drafting Group, the Delegations of Zimbabwe (Chair of the Drafting Group), Nigeria and Benin. It recalled that, when the idea of the *Africa Position Paper* had been developed it had been stressed that the African Union should be included in that process, leading to a meeting in Addis Ababa between, amongst others, South Africa and Zimbabwe and the Commissioner of Social Affairs, the Deputy Chairperson and the Chairperson of the African Union. The *Position Paper* would be tabled in November 2005 at the African Union meeting of Ministers

of Culture and presented to the African Union Summit for its consideration in January 2006.

Within UNESCO, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and Ambassadors to UNESO had held consultations with the Director-General, the Assistant Directors-General for Culture and for Africa, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and also with World Heritage Centre staff.

At the meeting held in March in Cape Town, attended by seventy heritage experts from Africa, the draft *Position Paper* and Action Plan had been discussed and adopted. The establishment of an African World Heritage Fund had also been discussed, following which the African Development Bank had undertaken a feasibility study of the Fund.

La Délégation du Bénin précise que, après cette réunion d'experts, d'autres rencontres ont eu lieu au sein du groupe Afrique à l'UNESCO et avec des représentants de l'Union africaine. Elle souhaite en outre que *l'Exposé de la position de l'Afrique* puisse être entériné par la Réunion des ministres de la culture des pays africains et par le Sommet des chefs d'Etat des pays de l'Union africaine en janvier 2006 afin de pouvoir lancer le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain. Elle demande à M. Dawson Munjeri, président du Groupe de rédaction, d'expliquer au Comité les grandes lignes du document.

In introducing the *Africa Position Paper*, **Mr Dawson Munjeri**, from the Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe**, thanked the Committee for allowing him to present such document and expressed gratitude to the Africa Group for having given him the opportunity to be part of a historic process. He explained that there had been a paradigm shift from a local to a regional driven process for the implementation of World Heritage in Africa. The *African Position Paper* was focused on the African countries themselves, with a call for action in 21 recommendations. With the *Position Paper*, political will and commitment was sought within the African continent, as was the involvement of NEPAD.

The representative of the African Development Bank for South Africa, **Mr Mogototoane Rapulane**, explained that the Bank had been requested to propose a framework for the recommendation made by the Africa Periodic Report for the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund. Consultations had been undertaken with the World Heritage Centre and NEPAD in that process. He then presented in detail the draft proposal for the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **China** welcomed the *Africa Position Paper*, which acknowledged the challenges of the African heritage. It suggested that the Committee endorse the *Position Paper*, leading to a better implementation of the World Heritage in Africa. The Delegation informed the Committee that China had supported the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund by providing an initial contribution of US\$ 30,000 as a token of its commitment to the African World Heritage cause.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked South Africa for its hospitality and excellent organization. It underlined its strong support for a better structure, which



could assist in the inscription of African properties on the World Heritage List and also ensure better preservation and management of inscribed properties. The Delegation regretted the current imbalance in the World Heritage List, since a number of potential World Heritage properties existed in developing countries and especially in Africa. The Netherlands had readily supported the feasibility study for the African World Heritage Fund. It applauded what was a historic moment, when a good initiative had been taken with a long-term view by a number of African States Parties. It expressed concern, however, about the proposed nominations of African properties which would be discussed later during the session. The Delegation asked whether the new initiative for capacity building and training would include the involvement of the local population. It further asked whether close cooperation was foreseen with other bodies and Conventions working in similar or adjacent fields. It wished to be informed about how countries could be helped to speed up the process of having more properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the entire African continent on the *Position Paper* and expressed its support for the African heritage. It would be happy to contribute to the feasibility study for the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Norway** congratulated South Africa on its outstanding performance. It commended the substantial work that had been done, and supported both the *Position Paper* and the African World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked South Africa for hosting the Committee session and likewise for organizing the March meeting in Cape Town for the Africa Region. It stressed the need for empowerment of the African heritage, in which the World Heritage Committee could take the lead. It stressed the important role World Heritage played in the sustainable development of the continent, but acknowledged that the management of properties was problematic, and noted with satisfaction that training in management was an integral part of the *Position Paper*, expressing the hope that it would be conducive to increasing support for the shared heritage. The Delegation suggested including in paragraph 9 or 10 of draft Decision **29 COM 11C** a reference to the *Africa Position Paper*. It further considered that clear indicators and outputs should be added to the document, indicating for example that the percentage of African properties on the World Heritage List would be increased from 8% to 15% or 20% in the next 10 years. It further suggested that clearer cooperation should be advocated with the African Union, NEPAD, the *Ramsar Convention on Wetlands* as well as other Conventions. Regarding paragraphs 11 and 12 of draft Decision **29 COM 11C.2**, it was perhaps premature to provide for the African World Heritage Fund to report to the Committee. It agreed that the Committee should support the Fund.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, thanking the presenters, fully endorsed the *Africa Position Paper*. It looked forward to the implementation of its recommendations. It likewise supported the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund. It expressed concern, however, about the reporting mechanism between the African World Heritage Fund and the World Heritage Committee and, regarding paragraph 10, was in favour of retaining the draft Decision presented, as the Fund could start reporting when it was in a situation to do so. It added that it expected that other organs

endorsed by the World Heritage Committee, like the Nordic World Heritage Foundation, would similarly be invited to report.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support for the *Position Paper* and its hope that the initiative would improve the situation of the African heritage and its surroundings. The *Position Paper* represented a concrete shift from concept to practice, supported by an institutional mechanism. The Delegation agreed that the African World Heritage Fund, to which South Africa intended to contribute, should report on its action, which would complement the work of the Committee, within the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed support for both the *Africa Position Paper* and the African World Heritage Fund, which were fully in the spirit of protection, conservation and international cooperation as advocated by the *World Heritage Convention*. It would fit in with existing regional programmes for capacity building, conservation and increasing the number of proposals for inscription. There was a need to ensure a coordination mechanism between the Fund and the Committee, and to that end the Delegation submitted a proposed amendment, also on behalf of the United Kingdom, Lithuania and the Netherlands, to draft Decision 29 COM 11C.2, paragraph 5, adding the words: ‘...and discuss with the Committee its orientation and strategy.’

The Delegation of the **Japan**, thanking South Africa for hosting the Committee session, said that the meeting served as a springboard for the African heritage, which was of global importance. Japan’s increased support was twofold: through the recent G8 debt reduction and through its support to several African World Heritage properties through the Japanese funds-in-trust, for example in Benin (Royal Palaces of Abomey) and Mozambique (Fort on the Island of Mozambique). The Delegation welcomed the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund, and was impressed by African countries’ ownership of their heritage. It hoped that the feasibility study would be duly followed up.

The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the African continent on its long-term vision of heritage as part of collective life, and in the context of the African Union and NEPAD. It also welcomed the initiative as an instrument to eradicate poverty and mitigate the effects of climate change. The *Position Paper* was an excellent way of implementing the recommendations of the Africa Periodic Report. It likewise expressed its support for the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund. It endorsed the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia to paragraph 10 of the draft Decision as well as the amendment suggested by Portugal and other Committee members.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated South Africa on the organization of the 29th session of the Committee. It supported the *Africa Position Paper* and the African World Heritage Fund. It also expressed its support for the amendment proposed by Portugal. It stressed that a close link between the African World Heritage Fund and the Committee would be useful. The Delegation endorsed the proposal of Saint Lucia to invite all institutions bearing the World Heritage name to report to the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, thanking the presenter of the *African Position Paper*, said that Nigeria, having taken part in the Drafting Group for the *Position Paper*, was committed to the initiative and its principles and objectives. The *Position Paper* headed in the right direction for the development of the African heritage and its safeguarding. The Delegation thanked the African Union and its States Parties, as well as the Netherlands and China for their financial support to the feasibility study for the African World Heritage Fund, and expressed gratitude to other Committee members for their statements of support.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the presenter and the Africa Group for the excellent *Africa Position Paper*. It drew the Committee's attention to the fact that in the Latin America and the Caribbean region eight States Parties did not yet have any property inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation appreciated the presentation on the African World Heritage Fund. It supported the amendment to paragraph 5 proposed by Portugal.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the *Position Paper*, recalling that, both as an Observer and as a Committee member, it had followed the implementation of the Africa Periodic Report. It believed that the Fund would succeed in helping to respond to the challenging present situation in Africa, which was underrepresented on the World Heritage List and at the same time overrepresented on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It endorsed the statements made by Egypt, Saint Lucia and Portugal and supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its gratitude to South Africa for hosting the Committee's 29th session. It commended and endorsed the *Position Paper* and the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund. It was ready to provide support to the Fund.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle sa participation active aux travaux de rédaction de l'*Exposé de la position de l'Afrique* et exprime son soutien au projet de décision, tout en suggérant quelques modifications mineures visant, d'une part, à harmoniser les deux versions linguistiques du texte et, d'autre part, à rationaliser la formulation des paragraphes 7 et 9 de la version française du projet de décision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its share in organizing the event and thanked the South African authorities for their hospitality. It expressed its admiration and strong support for the initiative of the *Position Paper* and the African World Heritage Fund, from which it hoped that Africa would benefit. It looked forward to supporting the Fund, which would cover wider issues of development. It supported the statements made by Saint Lucia and Portugal.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) remercie et félicite les autorités sud-africaines pour l'excellente organisation du Comité et la réception donnée lors de l'ouverture de la session. Elle se réjouit en outre de la très heureuse initiative concernant le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain, non seulement parce qu'une telle initiative reflète pleinement l'esprit de la *Convention* en matière de coopération internationale mais aussi parce qu'elle est inspirée non pas par un seul pays ou une seule région géographique mais par tout un continent. Elle salue dans l'avant-projet de Fonds un

instrument de développement économique et social et déclare que l'Italie va contribuer de toutes ses forces à la réussite d'un tel instrument.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its appreciation for the organization of the meeting. It had participated actively in the meetings that had preceded the current session of the Committee and led to the drafting of the *African Position Paper*. It thanked the presenters and also the Committee for its positive reception of the *Position Paper*, which would help Africa in implementing it, thus putting the region high on the UNESCO agenda.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** thanked the presenters of the *Position Paper*, considering that the commitment to such document would be strengthened by the warm response of the Committee. The Delegation proposed to use its voluntary contribution to UNESCO for the feasibility study. It also supported the idea of twinning as a way of establishing contact among the people living in or around the heritage.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** (Observateur) remercie les autorités sud-africaines pour l'organisation de cette session du Comité et rappelle que le développement durable est nécessairement lié au patrimoine. Elle exprime sa satisfaction pour cette initiative qui concerne tout le continent africain et appuie la création du Fonds, qui sera fécond non seulement pour le patrimoine africain mais qui va certainement profiter aussi au monde entier. Elle déclare qu'aucun effort ne sera épargné de son côté pour contribuer à ce Fonds.

La Mission permanente d'observation de **Palestine** auprès de l'UNESCO (Observateur) remercie les autorités sud-africaines pour l'accueil chaleureux et l'organisation de cette session du Comité. Elle souligne l'importance d'un Fonds pour le patrimoine africain et elle appuie avec force sa création, en espérant pouvoir un jour y contribuer avec des moyens financiers.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain**, after thanking the South African organizers, expressed support for the two initiatives presented and acknowledged that corrective action was required to redress the present position of Africa on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation announced that it wished to contribute to the African World Heritage Fund once it was established or at a preliminary stage.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** (Observateur) remercie les autorités sud-africaines pour l'organisation de cette session du Comité et rappelle que le développement durable est nécessairement lié au patrimoine. Elle exprime sa satisfaction pour cette initiative qui concerne tout le continent africain et appuie la création du Fonds, qui sera fécond non seulement pour le patrimoine africain mais qui va certainement profiter aussi au monde entier. Elle déclare qu'aucun effort ne sera épargné de son côté pour contribuer à ce Fonds.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) remercie l'Afrique du Sud pour avoir invité son pays à participer activement aux réunions préparatoires de l'*Exposé de la position de l'Afrique*. Elle se dit d'accord avec les déclarations de la Tunisie en ce qui concerne les rapports étroits qui lient le patrimoine et le développement durable. En sa

qualité de porte parole du Groupe Afrique à l'UNESCO et au nom des pays africains elle remercie vivement tous les intervenants qui, lors de la présente discussion, se sont prononcés en faveur d'une telle initiative et remercie, en particulier, tous ceux qui se sont engagés à verser des contributions à ce Fonds.

The **African Union** expressed gratitude for the *Position Paper* being presented both to the World Heritage Committee and to the African Union, observing that the common heritage bound Africa together. It appreciated the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund, through which concrete measures could be undertaken. The *Position Paper* gave a vision and a mission to the Fund, which included placing the heritage in a context of social and economic development. The African Union stated its willingness to contribute to the African World Heritage Fund.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its gratitude for the gathering organized by South Africa. The *Position Paper* was a noble exercise for a noble cause. Africa had shown its commitment and had recognized the need for empowerment. The Delegation acknowledged the many programmes launched through UNESCO and ICCROM such as AFRICA 2009, Africom, Ecole du Patrimoine Africain and the Programme for Museum Development, and various heritage training programmes. The *Position Paper* advocated an approach to the African heritage that went beyond the protection of monuments. Africa could best be promoted through its heritage.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the *Position Paper* and the draft proposal for the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund would be tabled at the meeting of Ministers of Culture of the African Union, to be held in Nairobi, Kenya, on 4 and 5 November 2005. The endorsement and support of the World Heritage Committee would lend added weight to the document.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** thanked South Africa for organizing the Committee session and congratulated the Africa Group for having prepared the *Position Paper* which was a true follow-up to the Global Strategy, a coherent package. The *Position Paper* could also usefully be presented to the African Union Ministers of Environment or Parks. Once the *Position Paper* and the proposal for the establishment of the Fund was approved by the African Union Summit, in the context of poverty alleviation and sustainable development, a link or interaction might be sought with the G8 Secretariat.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** (Observateur) félicite l'Afrique du Sud pour la chaleur de son accueil et la magnifique réception lors de l'ouverture de la session. Elle soutient pleinement l'*Exposé de la position de l'Afrique* et déclare que, avec cette nouvelle approche, le continent africain aura une présence plus large sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the suggestion by the Observer Delegation of Canada to present the *Position Paper* to the next meeting of the African Union Ministers of Environment.

**ICOMOS** warmly welcomed the *Position Paper* and appreciated the pro-active approach, which might optimize the number of future nominations and inscriptions on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It recommended an active dialogue with the

Advisory Bodies. ICOMOS wished to play an active role in that dialogue. It drew attention to the thematic regional studies already undertaken, which supported the setting out of benefits.

**ICCROM** congratulated South Africa on the well-organized Committee session. Recalling its long collaboration with Africa, inter alia through the AFRICA 2009 programme, it strongly supported the initiative of the African *Position Paper* and the proposal to establish an African World Heritage Fund.

**IUCN** welcomed the Paper and its emphasis on improved heritage conservation in Africa. It noted that the majority of World Heritage properties in Africa were natural properties, unlike the situation in other regions of the world. It noted with concern the number of African properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. That underscored the need for urgent action to better protect and strengthen the African heritage properties and to build more support. Those concerns reinforced the findings of the IUCN World Parks Congress held in Durban in 2003. IUCN supported the African Heritage Programme, and emphasized the need to improve natural heritage protection within the programme. It noted the potential for linking the African Heritage Programme with a programme IUCN is developing with other partners: the African Protected Areas Initiative, which would be presented on the Partners for Africa Day, 16 July 2005.

For natural heritage sites in Africa, IUCN considered there were three pressing needs: to better link World Heritage properties with surrounding local communities and to ensure that those communities benefited from World Heritage properties; to strengthen the capacity of the Protected Areas agencies that manage those properties. A key element there was sustainable financing and IUCN welcomed the establishment of an African Fund, but felt that it needed to be linked with similar initiatives and that priority should be given to supporting sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The third need was to strengthen support at all levels, especially among politicians, without whose support it would be difficult to move forward.

IUCN had a network of offices in more than 20 African countries, with projects in a number of World Heritage properties and it accordingly looked forward to close cooperation with the African Heritage Programme. IUCN supported the statements by Canada and Egypt and urged that the key findings of the African Heritage Programme, relevant to natural heritage, be communicated to Environment Ministries in Africa as well as to the Ministries of Culture.

The **Chairperson** invited the presenters to respond to participants' comments.

**Mr Munjeri** welcomed the very positive interventions of the Committee, Observers and Advisory Bodies. The comments dovetailed with what had been envisaged in the *Position Paper*, but went even further. In the light of the debate the final Action Plan could be refined. He thanked the Chairperson for the leadership he had taken during the preparation of the *Position Paper* and of the proposal to establish the Fund.

On behalf of South Africa, the Africa Group and the Committee, the **Chairperson** thanked Mr Munjeri for the efforts he had put into his task.

The **Development Bank of South Africa** noted the words of support for the African World Heritage Fund as well as the pledges of additional support for the feasibility study for the Fund. After the finalization of the study, the Fund would be launched in February 2006.

The **Chairperson** expressed gratitude to the members of the Committee and observers for the overwhelming support for the *African Position Paper* and the African World Heritage Fund. He expressed his hope that the programmes presented would contribute to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* on the African continent, for the benefit of the people and the properties alike.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the amendments proposed to draft Decision **29 COM 11C.2**.

La Délégation du **Bénin** demande des éclaircissements sur le « plan d'action sur dix ans » cité dans le projet de décision. Sous réserve d'explications à ce sujet, elle exprime son soutien au projet de décision tel qu'amendé.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 11C.2** provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

## SECOND DAY

### THIRD MEETING

Monday 11 July 2005

02.45 p.m. -07.50 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its third meeting, the Committee finalized the examination of the items associated to the follow-up of the periodic report for Africa, concentrating in the execution of the AFRICA 2009 Programme in the context of the *African Position Paper*. It then received the oral report by the Director of the World Heritage Centre on the activities of the Centre and the status of implementation of the Decisions of the Committee. The subsequent debate was concentrated on two main issues: the nature and perspectives of the “Marine Programme”, the “World Heritage Programme for Small Island Developing States (SIDS)” and the “Thematic Initiative on Astronomy and World Heritage”; and the results of the international conference "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape" (Vienna, Austria, 12 - 14 May 2005). Finally, the Committee started the examination of the report and recommendations of the “Special Meeting of Experts of the *World Heritage Convention: the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value*” (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005).

Note du Rapporteur: A sa 3e réunion, le Comité a fini d'examiner les points de l'ordre du jour portant sur le suivi du rapport périodique pour l'Afrique, en se concentrant sur l'exécution du programme AFRICA 2009 dans le contexte de l'*Exposé de la Position de l'Afrique*. Il a ensuite reçu le rapport oral du Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial sur les activités du Centre et sur le niveau de mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité. Le débat consécutif s'est concentré sur deux sujets principaux : la nature et les perspectives du « Programme marin », le « Programme du patrimoine mondial pour les Petits Etats Insulaires en Développement » (PEID) et l'« Initiative thématique sur l'Astronomie et le patrimoine mondial » ; ainsi que les résultats de la conférence internationale « Patrimoine mondial et Architecture contemporaine – Gérer les paysages urbains historiques » (Vienne, Autriche, 12-14 mai 2005). Enfin, le Comité a commencé l'examen du rapport et les recommandations de la « Réunion spéciale d'experts de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* : le concept de valeur universelle exceptionnelle » (Kazan, Fédération de Russie, 6-9 avril 2005).



**ITEM 11C PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA (continued)**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/11C  
Draft Decision 29 COM 11C.1*

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the item, recalling the objectives of the Africa Periodic Report. Attention was drawn in particular to disaster management in the event of disasters such as tsunamis, deforestation, locust plagues, fires and damage caused by invasive species. For such activities and for further implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in Africa additional funding was needed.

**ICCROM** presented to the Committee the document and the folder on the AFRICA 2009 programme.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre on action taken in the field of both the cultural and the natural heritage. It recalled a decision taken by the Seventh Extraordinary Session on follow-up to Periodic Reporting in Africa, concerning account to be taken of linguistic diversity in the Africa Regional Programme, expressing its concern about the Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa and their links with the *World Heritage Convention*. Those countries were represented by only one property, Island of Mozambique in Mozambique. Angola and Cape Verde had ratified the Convention, Guinea-Bissau and Sao Tome and Principe had not yet done so. The Delegation suggested an amendment to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision reading: ‘taking into consideration the diversity of languages with a view to promoting a more effective implementation of the programmes’.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie le Secrétariat pour la clarté de l’exposé. Tout en soutenant le programme, elle souhaite avoir des précisions quant aux actions qu’il reste à mettre en œuvre et demande si un bilan à mi-parcours pourrait être fait. Elle souhaite souligner qu’il s’agit là de volonté politique et qu’une synergie avec les Ministres africains concernés s’avère nécessaire. La Délégation souhaite également savoir s’il existe d’autres institutions en dehors de l’Ecole du patrimoine africain et l’Ecole d’Architecture de Mombassa.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** thanked the World Heritage Centre and commended the AFRICA 2009 programme. It agreed with Portugal that linguistic diversity should be taken into account and attention given to the Portuguese-speaking States Parties. The Delegation pleaded for an annual rather than a biennial program for capacity building within the AFRICA 2009 programme. It congratulated Sierra Leone for having ratified the *Convention* and called upon the countries that had not yet done so to do likewise. It commended AFRICA 2009 as an essential institution in the development of skills and extended its thanks to those who supported that programme.

The Delegation of **Egypt** endorsed the views of South Africa, Benin and Nigeria regarding the AFRICA 2009 programme; the results of a mid-term evaluation would provide useful input for the setting of priorities for the next four years. It recommended that the programme should be linked with other organizations and initiatives.

La Délégation du **Bénin** suggère que le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial participe aux prochaines réunions des ministres de la culture des pays africains et des chefs d'Etat des pays de l'Union africaine, afin que le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain soit perçu d'une façon globale et non pas exclusivement dans sa dimension africaine.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the two reports, but wished to make a small correction to the presentation made by ICCROM. It had been mentioned that the Khami Ruins National Monument property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. That had not been the case; the site had been on the List of Endangered Sites of World Monuments Watch. At that time funds from American Express had supported the property and enabled a management plan to be established, leading to improved conservation of the property. On the initiative of the State Party, the UNESCO Youth Forum and France had also been involved in that property. Responding to the intervention of the Delegation of Benin, the Observer Delegation acknowledged the new situation, accepted and endorsed by the Committee, whereby future additional programming could be considered once the African World Heritage Fund became operational. It recommended that such programming should follow a holistic strategic approach.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** commended the work accomplished. Regarding the AFRICA 2009 programme, it recalled that Kenya had hosted three-month training courses in the framework of the programme and the results had been such that the programme would now be replicated in other regions, such as Asia and Oceania. The Africa World Heritage Fund to be established would provide an opportunity for further concrete results. The Observer Delegation thanked the supporters of the AFRICA 2009 programme, as well as African States Parties which had contributed by sending directors and other experts to the training courses.

The **World Heritage Centre** welcomed the recommendations from the Delegation of Benin and, in response to the statement by Portugal, added that very recently a training course had taken place in Maputo, Mozambique, in which two Portuguese experts had taken part. The Centre affirmed that it would continue to develop training manuals and also to support institutional development within the heritage sector. To this regards, cooperation with Brazil might also be sought.

**ICCROM** explained, on the question of the evaluation of the AFRICA 2009 programme, that various evaluations had taken place throughout its existence, and also prior to the launching of the programme. In 2001 an external evaluation had taken place, followed by an impact assessment of the programme in 2004. The results of those reviews had been communicated to all directors of institutions in Africa. In 2005 an

external evaluation would be carried out. Its results would serve as a basis for programming the final phase. ICCROM recognized that, within the new scenario opened up by the *African Position Paper*, new synergies must be found and a holistic approach adopted, to which it hoped to contribute. It acknowledged that problems had been encountered when implementing the programme, such as a lack of funding and a failure to offer trainees the right opportunities once their training was completed.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the debate. At the request of Portugal, supported formally by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** and informally by the Delegations of **Benin** and **Nigeria**, an amendment was proposed to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision, adding the words: ‘taking into consideration the diversity of languages with a view to promoting a more effective delivery of regional programmes’. The Rapporteur noted that, since paragraphs 8 and 9 had budgetary implications, they should remain pending until discussion of the budget item.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 11C.1** provisionally adopted as amended.

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

Documents: *WHC-05/29.COM/5*  
*WHC-05/29.COM/INF.5*

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present its report.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente brièvement le document de travail et ses trois annexes, en particulier les annexes 1 et 2. Il attire l’attention du Comité sur deux nouveautés : premièrement, la récente publication par le Centre des *Textes fondamentaux de la Convention du patrimoine mondial de 1972*, en remarquant que cette première édition sera certainement suivie par d’autres, les textes et les règlements étant en constante évolution. Il invite les Etats parties à soumettre leurs observations afin que les versions suivantes puissent être améliorées. Deuxièmement, la base de données de toutes les décisions du Comité est désormais disponible en ligne et sera bientôt enrichie.

He then presented the Marine Programme, almost entirely funded by extrabudgetary resources and aimed at supporting capacity building and the promotion of new nominations at a number of coastal and marine sites. He further presented the World Heritage Programme for Small Island Developing States (SIDS), which focused on promoting nominations and on capacity building in the Pacific, Caribbean and African Island States. He went on to present the Thematic Initiative on Astronomy and World Heritage created in 2003.

The World Heritage Forests meeting (Nancy, France, 9 - 11 March 2005) had brought together funding agencies, major regional training centres and protected area managers, and had highlighted the importance of supporting management rather than inscribing new properties, as that category was already well represented on the List. It had also looked at World Heritage forest protected areas in a broader context by addressing factors beyond the sites' boundaries.

He concluded by presenting the results of the international conference "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape" (Vienna, Austria, 12 - 14 May 2005), which had discussed principles and guidelines for the development and management of contemporary architecture in World Heritage cities. The conference had resulted in the *Vienna Memorandum*, which highlighted the importance of the overall urban landscape in terms of its historic significance and provided guidelines for conservation management and urban development.

The **Chairperson** invited comments from the floor and suggested that the item should be discussed point by point, beginning with draft Decision **29 COM 5**.

Ms Maria Zulema Velez Jara (Colombia) took the Chair.

Many delegations, taking the opportunity to extend warm thanks to the South African authorities for their hospitality, commended the Centre on the impressive work accomplished, including the publication of the *Basic Texts*. The Delegation of **Argentina** said that a Spanish version of the *Basic Texts* would be welcome.

There being no further comments on the first part of the item, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 5** provisionally adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider draft Decision **29 COM 5.1**.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that it supported the Marine Programme and the SIDS, but considered that the astronomy programme should be evaluated in a regional perspective.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the decision should also cover underwater non-movable cultural heritage and that paragraph 3 of the decision should be enlarged to encourage the celebration of achievements in science.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that small islands and marine programmes were already covered by the *Convention on Biological Diversity* (CBD). Referring to the proposed Initiative on Astronomy, it said that, even though Egypt was one of the countries with the most ancient astronomical sites, it recommended that the Centre should not over-extend its activities, given the limited financial resources available.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the SIDS programme, which complemented the Pacific 2009 Action Plan, since fifteen of the SIDS were in the Pacific. It noted that

the targets were to secure ratification by two more States Parties and the preparation of four more tentative lists, but the aim was to go beyond those targets.

The Delegation of **Argentina** observed, with reference to the Initiative on Astronomy, (paragraph 3) that different aspects – not just scientific - could be associated with that type of site, and that they could be better reflected in the text.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that draft Decision **29 COM 5.1** should also refer to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and concurred with the intervention of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, calling for a reference to the Year of Astronomy in 2009.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the SIDS programme, noting that it should not be a thematic but a regional programme, while questioning what could be done with funding of US\$20,000.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed support for the adoption of draft Decision 29 COM 5.1.

The Delegation of **Colombia** concurred with Saint Lucia and Argentina. It highlighted the need for coordination with CBD.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that allocation of resources under CBD was considerable as compared to the funding made available through the World Heritage Fund, and stated that coordination was necessary.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados**, referring to the SIDS, endorsed the comments made by New Zealand and St Lucia, while agreeing with Egypt. It supported the Marine Programme, but noted that it would not be applicable to the Caribbean, as the Saint Vincent and Saint Lucia meetings had illustrated that the potential sites were mostly terrestrial or cultural. SIDS and marine programmes therefore needed to be separate.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) informe le Comité et le Centre du patrimoine mondial que l'année 2009 marquera le 600e anniversaire de la première exploration du cosmos grâce à un télescope par l'astronome Galilée. L'Italie a demandé au Conseil exécutif à sa prochaine session de déclarer 2009 Année de l'astronomie. Ce serait une excellente occasion pour que le Comité se penche aussi sur ce thème et tire parti des fonds accrus qui seront peut-être votés pour le prochain exercice biennal en examinant des sites de cette catégorie.

With reference to the statement of the preceding speaker, the Delegation of **Egypt** considered unnecessary a special programme on Astronomy. It suggested thus to delete paragraph 3 of the decision, and just refer to the Year of Astronomy. The Delegation also questioned the amount of US\$20,000 for SIDS.

In his response, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that culture did not form part of the Marine Programme since that programme had a natural heritage focus, whereas the SIDS programme had a cultural component. He said that coordination with other conventions was already proceeding, as was indicated in Document *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.5*. Separating the programme by regions would not be useful, as the programme sought to address, among other things, the global aspect of Small Island States' problems. Funding came mainly from extrabudgetary resources and would merely be complemented by the small amount of US\$20,000 from the World Heritage Fund. As regards the "Astronomy and World Heritage" Initiative, he considered that the Initiative had been supported by a number of States Parties, while acknowledging that many of its aspects still needed to be explored in greater depth.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its disappointment that there was no integrated culture-nature approach in the Marine Programme. It stressed the great importance of underwater cultural heritage. Referring to the results of Periodic Reporting and the lack of an integrated approach by States Parties, it stated that the Centre should pursue that approach. In the light of the explanations given, however, it would not insist on the amendments it had intended to propose.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed that the "Astronomy and World Heritage" Initiative needed to be explored further and paragraph 3 amended accordingly.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the debates by stating that there was no change to paragraph 1; that the United Kingdom had withdrawn proposed changes to paragraph 2 and that paragraph 3 was amended, whereas paragraph 4 was suspended until discussion of the budget item.

The Delegations of **Saint Lucia, Egypt** and **Argentina** supported that understanding, the latter reiterating that expressions of intangible heritage, including forms of knowledge, were missing from paragraph 3.

On that understanding, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 5.1** provisionally adopted as amended.

He invited the Committee to consider draft Decision **29 COM 5.2**.

Following a question by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** on the need to include business plans in management planning, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that that was part of sustainable financing for protected areas and was intended to assist States Parties in addressing financial issues, in particular for forest sites.

La Délégation du **Liban** comprend l'inquiétude de la Délégation de Sainte-Lucie et remarque que si l'on commence à intégrer la nécessité de « business plans » dans les plans de gestion des biens, les biens du patrimoine mondial se transformeront très vite en Disneyland.

The Delegation of **India** proposed an amendment to item 10 of the Nancy recommendations. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that it was not for the Committee to amend those recommendations.

La Délégation du **Liban** remarque qu'en français, la décision utilise l'expression « prend note » et suggère de faire de même en anglais.

The **Chairperson** suggested replacing the word « adopts » by « takes note ».

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 5.2** provisionally adopted as amended.

He invited the Committee to consider draft Decision **29 COM 5.3**.

Au sujet du projet 5.3, la Délégation du **Liban** informe le Comité que son représentant a participé à la conférence *Patrimoine mondial et architecture contemporaine – Gestion du paysage urbain historique*, tenue à Vienne du 12 au 14 mai 2005. L'importance du *Mémorandum de Vienne* est due au fait que c'est le premier document depuis 30 ans (depuis la « Recommandation de l'UNESCO concernant la sauvegarde des ensembles historiques ou traditionnels et leur rôle dans la vie contemporaine » de 1976) qui émane d'un organe lié à l'UNESCO et qui se concentre sur les villes historiques et la vie contemporaine. Le *Mémorandum* aborde cette question au-delà de la Recommandation de 1976, car il traite de l'ensemble du paysage urbain historique, y compris des conditions écologiques, topographiques, économiques et socioculturelles. Le *Mémorandum* est un document fondamental. La Délégation propose quelques amendements au projet de décision, notamment un nouveau paragraphe (4) concernant la nécessité d'intégrer la notion des paysages urbains historiques dans les dossiers de proposition à l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Concernant le paragraphe 6, elle s'interroge sur la nécessité de présenter le *Mémorandum* à la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO, indiquant que ce serait plutôt à l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties d'adopter une Déclaration à ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Portugal** pointed out that the Vienna meeting had brought together many stakeholders. It also stressed the important concept of the urban landscape. That should be brought forward to the General Conference following the normal procedure.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested that the *Memorandum* should be transformed into a declaration for adoption by the General Assembly. The Delegation of **Norway** supported both Portugal and Saint Lucia, whereas the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Vienna meeting on the results and pointed out that Vienna Memorandum should not be retroactive. It also drew attention to the diversity in the management of the buffer zones of each town and townscape. When a site was inscribed, the conditions had to be made clear in order to avoid future problems.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** shared the view expressed by Japan about the questions raised by paragraphs 4 and 6. Clarification was needed in particular in cases where the urban landscape was not part of the original inscription and conditions. That concerned an individual monument not located in a historic landscape.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the results of the Vienna conference as a landmark in the evolution of cultural heritage in living cities. Historic urban landscapes need to be integrated into the Operational Guidelines to the *Convention* in the future.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that paragraph 4 clearly referred to new nominations, whereas paragraph 5 was about existing sites.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** insisted that paragraph 4 referred to evaluation of existing sites.

La Délégation du **Liban** se réfère à l'intervention de la Délégation de l'Allemagne (Observateur) concernant le paragraphe 4. A son avis, lorsque l'on inscrit un bien sur la Liste, on ne peut pas y faire n'importe quoi. Lors de l'inscription, on ne peut pas imaginer tout ce qui peut arriver à un bien, mais on doit veiller à préserver sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. C'est le rôle du Comité d'assurer le suivi de l'état de conservation du bien. Ce qui est demandé, c'est d'intégrer le paysage urbain historique dans l'évaluation continue des valeurs par les organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with Lebanon and noted that all States Parties had the same obligations to take care of their sites.

**ICOMOS** supported the decision and further pointed out that other tools, notably the *Washington Charter*, were available for assessing historic centre conservation policies.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que la notion de « paysage urbain » est très complète car elle intègre aussi, au-delà de la notion du « townscape », l'environnement, les plantes, les fleuves, etc. Elle est plus large que « townscape ». Toutefois, la Délégation souhaite éviter de rouvrir un débat scientifique.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** stated that it was impressed by the overwhelming support from delegates for the *Vienna Memorandum*, which would assist countries in dealing with new architecture and finding a balance between old and new and the surrounding landscape.

The **Chairperson** expressed his sincere thanks on behalf of the Committee to the City of Vienna for its hospitality during the conference.

The **Rapporteur** noted, concerning the decision, that there was no change to paragraphs 1 to 3, there was a new paragraph 4, minor changes to paragraph 5, former paragraph 4 became paragraph 6 and a new paragraph 7 referred to the General Assembly of States Parties.



The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed to those points but insisted on the original wording of the paragraph referring to the General Conference.

La Délégation du **Liban** indique qu'elle n'est pas opposée à la proposition de la Délégation du Portugal et propose d'ajouter un dernier paragraphe concernant la recommandation à la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 5.3** provisionally adopted as amended.

**ITEM 9 ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005), ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/9  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9B

*Draft Decision:* **29 COM 9**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 9 and invited Mr Christopher Young (United Kingdom) to present the conclusions and recommendations of the “Special Meeting of Experts of the *World Heritage Convention: the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value*” (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005)” in his capacity as the Rapporteur of the meeting.

Having thanked the Russian Federation, the Republic of Tatarstan and the Municipality of Kazan for hosting the Special Meeting of Experts, **Mr Christopher Young** recalled that the mandate given by previous sessions of the Committee was broad and included (1) the general concept of “outstanding universal value” under the *World Heritage Convention*, (2) the preparation of Tentative Lists, (3) improving the quality of nominations and (4) identifying directions towards the sustainable conservation of World Heritage. The experts came from 30 countries many of which were Members of the Committee. The World Heritage Centre had prepared the background paper and a set of guiding questions prior to the meeting, and the agenda of the meeting had included a keynote speech by the former Chairperson of the Committee, Ms Christine Cameron, as well as presentations by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The experts had adopted an elaborate set of recommendations on the basis of the results of the working group discussions and the plenary sessions, which had been subsequently reduced to a synoptic table indicating priorities and budgetary implications. Mr Young commented that (a) outstanding universal value was an elusive concept and could only be interpreted under a set of criteria, (b) fixed definitions of outstanding universal value

would prevent an evolution of the concept, (c) the Committee's attitude towards the concept had changed over time and that process needed to be recorded and reviewed, and (d) many of the recommendations of the Special Meeting of Experts were good practices for the implementation of the *Convention* in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Young and opened the floor for comments.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its concern that the recommendations of the meeting did not address the actual problems, for example concerning different ways in which the concept of outstanding universal value had been applied by the Advisory Bodies for cultural and natural properties, although the background paper and the keynote presentations identified some clear trends in that regard. It supported the recommendations of the experts regarding the importance of Tentative Lists for redressing the existing imbalance of the World Heritage List. The Delegation concluded by stating that the World Heritage List in its entirety should be a means to narrate stories of humankind.

The Delegation of **Norway** considered that the question of outstanding universal value should be considered together with issues of authenticity and integrity, and recalled that the Nara Document on Authenticity adopted in 1994 stated that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong. It supported the recommendations of the experts regarding the preparation of Tentative Lists and the development of a pilot project on sustainable conservation. The Delegation underlined its wish for UNESCO to make more efforts in coordinating the activities of the World Heritage Centre with those of other programmes within UNESCO.

Having recalled the heavy responsibility of the World Heritage Committee for making value judgements on the value of properties nominated by States Parties, the Delegation of **New Zealand** considered that the value of heritage was not fixed in time and could not necessarily be determined by scientific methods. It welcomed the recommendations of the Special Meeting of Experts which acknowledged that outstanding universal value was attributed by people and evolved over time. The Delegation therefore proposed to add a paragraph, comprising two subsections, to the draft Decision: (a) "with regard to the development of a corpus of past Committee decisions and discussion on outstanding universal value, the World Heritage Centre shall, within its overall study, also draw out references or obvious omissions relating to the values of indigenous peoples, as related to World Heritage," and (b) "the priority of work as identified in the Synoptic Table of Recommendations and Priorities, with regard to 'Sustainable Conservation' and the 'involvement of all stakeholders in management of World Heritage properties' in particular, shall have its priority changed from 'medium' to 'high'".

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que les questions débattues à la réunion d'experts de Kazan sont d'une importance fondamentale. Elle considère que poser la question de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle comme « le meilleur d'entre les meilleurs » ou « un exemple représentatif des meilleurs », telle que résumée par Mme Christina Cameron dans son discours introductif de la réunion de Kazan, pourrait paraître simpliste. Elle

considère en outre que cette distinction pourrait mener à une dichotomie dangereuse entre les biens du patrimoine mondial et aussi entre cultures différentes. Elle estime enfin que la présentation préparée par l'UICN à l'occasion de la réunion a été inspirée par une vision positiviste de la science désormais largement dépassée. Elle estime en outre que la réunion a certes été un point de départ intéressant mais que le moment est venu de considérer la question de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle dans une perspective plus large. Elle considère enfin qu'il faudrait envisager un « comité de sages » qui puisse élaborer des propositions sur le modèle de ce qui a été fait pour la rédaction de la déclaration de Nara sur l'authenticité.

The Delegation of **China** said that more emphasis should be placed on the application of criteria when preparing nomination dossiers in order to enhance the credibility of the World Heritage List. Furthermore, States Parties should strengthen protective measures and ensure the sustainable use of inscribed sites. States Parties must also refine and broaden their activities in the field of heritage, since a better implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* was possible only when strong support existed at national and regional levels. The Delegation further emphasized the need for elaborating Tentative Lists as well as strengthening educational and promotional activities, and also called for more support for the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Japan** referred to the diverging approaches taken by the Advisory Bodies in the application of the concept of outstanding universal value and proposed that, although the Special Meeting of Experts had achieved a broad consensus, more time would be needed to further reflect on the issues, including the definition of “underrepresented” and the numerical management of the World Heritage List. The Delegation endorsed the idea, put forward by the Delegation of Lebanon, of organizing a meeting of great thinkers from different disciplines and also hoped that the Working Group on Working Methods of the World Heritage Committee established during the Seventh Extraordinary Session would help to shed light on how the concept of outstanding universal value should be applied.

Having commended the keynote presentation given by Ms Cameron, the Delegation of **Portugal** wondered how outstanding universal value could be established, particularly given that heritage value was not considered to be intrinsic. It referred to the 2003 *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* which intentionally did not subscribe to the idea of outstanding universal value. The Delegation emphasized the need to continue reflecting on that concept.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** praised the keynote presentation by Ms Cameron and underlined the importance of taking into account non-Western ways of considering value and heritage when discussing the concept of outstanding universal value. It acknowledged that the outcome of the Special Meeting of Experts needed to be examined in greater depth.

La Délégation du **Bénin** tient tout d'abord à remercier la Fédération de Russie pour avoir organisé la réunion d'experts de Kazan. Elle rappelle que le mandat confié aux experts

par le Comité du patrimoine mondial était de réfléchir sur la notion de valeur universelle exceptionnelle et d'identifier des outils pour son application pratique et non pas d'entamer une discussion philosophique. En affirmant que la notion de valeur universelle exceptionnelle ne doit pas rester eurocentrique, elle soutient la proposition faite par la Délégation du Liban concernant le comité de sages.

The **Chairperson** indicated that more time would be needed to discuss the issues given its importance for the work of the Committee and announced the list of speakers for the following days.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.



## **THIRD DAY**

### **FOURTH MEETING**

**Tuesday 12 July 2005**

**10.00 am - 01.00 pm**

**Chairperson: Mr Wakashe**

Note of the Rapporteur: At its fourth meeting, the Committee concluded the examination of the report and recommendations of the “Special Meeting of Experts of the *World Heritage Convention: the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value*” (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005)”. After a debate in which delegations expressed different views on the nature and application of the concept of outstanding universal value, it suspended further consideration of this issue in order to allow a drafting group to reformulate the corresponding draft Decision. The Committee started then the examination of its report to the 15th session of the General Assembly of States Parties. Taking into account that the nominations to be examined later in the session would have to be reflected in the referred report, the Committee also suspended consideration of this item.

Note du Rapporteur : Lors de sa 4e réunion, le Comité a achevé l'examen du rapport et des recommandations de la « Réunion spéciale d'experts de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial : le concept de valeur universelle exceptionnelle* » (Kazan, Fédération de Russie, 6-9 avril 2005). Après un débat au cours duquel les délégations ont exprimé différents points de vue sur la nature et l'application du concept de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, le Comité a interrompu la discussion de cette question pour permettre à un groupe de travail de reformuler le projet de décision correspondant. Le Comité a ensuite entrepris d'examiner son rapport pour la 15e session de l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties. Etant donné que les propositions d'inscription devant être étudiées plus tard au cours de la session devraient figurer dans ce rapport, le Comité a également suspendu l'examen de ce point.

**ITEM 9: ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005), ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1 (continued)**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume the discussion on item 9, and gave the floor to the Rapporteur of the Special Meeting of Experts of the *World Heritage Convention*: the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value (Kazan, Russian Federation, 6-9 April 2005).

Summarizing the previous day's discussion, **Mr Young** said it had been acknowledged that the recommendations of the meeting included useful practical measures and the question was how to implement them. It had also emerged that the Members of the Committee felt that the Special Meeting of Experts had not solved all the questions concerning the nature of outstanding universal value. He reminded the Committee that it had taken several expert and intergovernmental meetings to achieve, for example, the adoption of the Nara Document on Authenticity and it was therefore important to continue to reflect on the concept of outstanding universal value. Furthermore, the concept of outstanding universal value had changed and would continue to evolve with the development of an understanding of cultural and natural heritage, and in that regard more emphasis should be placed on developing a corpus of past Committee decisions.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of New Zealand on the previous day, since that was in the spirit of the Special Meeting of Experts.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that natural heritage might be distributed unevenly and it would therefore not be possible to achieve geographical balance for such heritage. Outstanding universal value was often not evident but rather needed to be carefully demonstrated, and that sometimes posed particular challenges for States Parties in understanding that World Heritage properties should be of international value and not just of national or regional importance. World Heritage had the potential to provide best practice for demonstrating biodiversity as well as for urban regeneration and poverty alleviation, but that could not be done without understanding what outstanding universal value constituted. Taking up the point made by Mr Young, the Delegation acknowledged the need to develop a corpus of past Committee decisions regarding the concept and the application of outstanding universal value and suggested that States Parties with many properties should consider assisting those countries with less experience in preparing nomination dossiers.

The Delegation of **Egypt** recalled that more than 40 States Parties possessed no World Heritage properties and proposed that the current ways of applying the concept of outstanding universal value be continued at least until those States Parties each had a World Heritage property. It commended the observations made by Mr Young and expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of **India** said it was important for the discussion of the concept and the application of outstanding universal value to be placed in the context of the history of developing countries and the need to ensure cultural diversity, because the construction of such value was too often politically motivated. Certain categories of heritage and geographical regions were underrepresented as a result of colonialism and therefore it was acceptable that only certain types of cultural heritage were considered to be of universal value. Defining the value of a property was not a purely philosophical exercise but had also to be seen in its political perspective. This was, therefore, a political issue, that could not be addressed at the level of a meeting of experts on their individual capacities. The Delegation was further concerned that the draft Decision did not entirely reflect the recommendations of the Special Meeting of Experts, mainly the one relating to the review of the implementation of the recommendations in conjunction with the year of reflection in 2007. It therefore supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Japan to continue the discussion during the next session of the World Heritage Committee, at the intergovernmental level.

The Delegation of **South Africa** recalled the consensus during the Special Meeting of Experts not to change the criteria used to establish outstanding universal value for the time being but cautioned that the future work of the Committee should take into account the emerging interpretation of heritage for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Chile** recognized that the Special Meeting of Experts had been a major intellectual exercise and thanked the Russian Federation for having organized and hosted the meeting. It further thanked Mr Young for the excellent report of the meeting. To embark on a reinterpretation of the value of each of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List would be inappropriate, but the debate on the notion of outstanding universal value reinforced the need for a careful and rigorous evaluation of each new nomination. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** regretted that the Special Meeting of Experts had not fully addressed the concerns of the Committee regarding the nature of outstanding universal value and particularly about different ways in which the concept had been applied by IUCN and ICOMOS. It wondered whether the different approaches would ever converge, and if that were the case, whether the Committee might come to terms with reality. The Delegation further pointed out that the part of the draft Decision referring to the synoptic table of recommendations with budgetary implications could not be adopted without consideration by the Subsidiary Body on administrative and financial issues.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stressed the importance of wide participation by all stakeholders, local communities and indigenous people as one of the major outcomes of the recommendations prepared by the Special Meeting of Experts. It also expressed its agreement with the position of the Delegation of India on the need to reflect in the draft Decision the review of the implementation of the recommendations in conjunction with the year of reflection in 2007, as was recommended by the experts.



La Délégation du **Liban** estime qu'il serait très dangereux de soutenir que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle doit être définie par les gouvernements et non pas par les experts. Elle rappelle que conformément à la *Convention* les Etats membres du Comité choisissent pour les représenter des personnes qualifiées dans le domaine du patrimoine culturel ou naturel. Si d'une part il est vrai que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle a certainement une composante politique, la Délégation du Liban appelle d'autre part l'attention sur les risques d'une telle vision qui aurait pour effet de renforcer et non pas de combler les lacunes de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the statement made by the Delegation of New Zealand. The World Heritage Committee should be seen as a group of experts and both the Committee and the Advisory Bodies should resist political pressures. It further reiterated its earlier concern that the recommendations of the Special Meeting of Experts did not fully address the key issues concerning outstanding universal value such as the different approaches taken by ICOMOS and IUCN. The Delegation proposed to convene a meeting of a smaller group of experts to discuss the issues of the application of the concept.

The Delegation of **Egypt** considered that the principle of credibility related to the quality of the properties, not to the number of sites on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de la **Hongrie** (Observateur) remercie les autorités sud-africaines pour leur accueil. Tout en rappelant sa participation à la réunion spéciale d'experts, elle comprend que ceux qui s'attendaient à une définition précise de « valeur universelle exceptionnelle » puissent être déçus, mais rappelle aussi l'ampleur du mandat confié aux experts par le Comité. Elle estime par ailleurs que la définition figurant à l'article 49 des Orientations est assez souple. Elle considère enfin que le discours introductif de Mme Cameron ne porte pas exclusivement sur l'évolution de « meilleur d'entre les meilleurs » à « exemple représentatif des meilleurs », mais aussi sur la lecture de la *Convention* comme instrument de coopération internationale.

Elle remercie la Fédération de Russie pour avoir organisé une telle réunion et approuve l'idée de poursuivre la réflexion sur le sujet dans le contexte de l'année de réflexion, 2007.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** recalled that outstanding universal value was not given but officially approved by the 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee. It called for a cautious approach, suggesting a review of the ways in which the concept had been applied to all inscriptions of properties so far in the history of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** remarked that the spirit of the *Convention* was to free cultural expressions from ideologies. The discussions by experts needed to be taken up by intergovernmental committees in order to translate them into policies in the field of heritage. It proposed that the concept of outstanding universal value might be discussed by the World Heritage Committee at every session in the future.

Recalling the far-reaching discussion held during the Special Meeting of Experts, the Observer Delegation of **Barbados** remarked that the concept of outstanding universal value was continuously changing. It proposed that the Committee should review the concept and the application of outstanding universal value on a regular basis, for example every six years. The Delegation further suggested amending the draft Decision in order to assist States Parties with no or few World Heritage sites to demonstrate the existence of heritage of outstanding universal value utilizing all means available. It also underlined the importance of considering outstanding universal value within a regional context.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Members of the Committee agreed on the need to review the issue on a regular basis.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** (Observateur) considère que le résultat de la réunion est très positif et affirme que la notion de patrimoine autochtone lui paraît dangereuse parce qu'elle laisse entendre une distinction entre « patrimoine autochtone » et « patrimoine non autochtone » qui ne reflète pas l'idée même de valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled that the mandate of the Special Meeting of Experts had not been to define outstanding universal value but to assess and recommend the best ways of applying the concept when implementing the *World Heritage Convention*, with particular reference to the preparation of Tentative Lists and nomination dossiers and achieving sustainable conservation. It pointed out that, as discussed during the Special Meeting of Experts, the text of the *Convention* had deliberately left the concept of outstanding universal value flexible, but paragraph 49 of the *Operational Guidelines* gave a definition. The Delegation recalled the aim of the Committee to achieve a World Heritage List that was balanced, representative and credible. A key to credibility was outstanding universal value, a key to representativity was the use of criteria, and a key to geographical balance was the working methods of the Committee. It reminded the Committee of the provision of the *Convention* which did not require each State Party to possess a World Heritage site.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** reminded the Committee that assessment of the outstanding universal value of a property rested first of all with a nominating State Party, then with the Advisory Bodies and finally with the World Heritage Committee. It further noted that the divergence between ICOMOS and IUCN was probably inevitable given the nature of the heritage with which they were concerned and also considering that the credibility of the World Heritage List was based on the quality and not the quantity of sites inscribed.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that many actions summarized in the synoptic table did not have any budgetary implications and could therefore start being implemented. It further underlined the importance of Tentative Lists as a way to integrate local communities into the World Heritage system and proposed that geographical harmonization of Tentative Lists might also be an occasion to bring together different local communities for the promotion of international cooperation.

Having recalled the presentation of its strategy and approach to the concept of outstanding universal value at the 28th session of the Committee and the Special Meeting of Experts, **IUCN** welcomed the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Meeting. IUCN considered that the credibility of the *Convention* depends to a great extent on the rigorous approach adopted thus far in defining the outstanding universal value of nominated properties, and that that led the World Heritage List to be regarded highly by many governments, civil society, the private sector and international funding agencies. It noted that the key framework for determining outstanding universal value was the set of 10 integrated criteria defined by the Committee and the conditions of integrity and authenticity as applied within the context of past decisions of the Committee. IUCN further agreed with the point made by the Delegation of New Zealand that the application of outstanding universal value also required careful consideration of the values attributed to sites by local communities and indigenous people. It moreover considered that there existed clear guidance on potential new natural World Heritage sites within its global strategy and various biome and thematic studies and also best practices on the preparation of Tentative Lists by States Parties such as Norway, Japan and Canada. For natural sites, there needed to be greater use of other instruments to complement the *World Heritage Convention* including Biosphere Reserves, Geoparks and Ramsar Sites as well as other heritage designations at regional levels such as in Asia and in Africa. IUCN considered that the continued debate on and evolution of the outstanding universal value concept and its application is an intrinsic and healthy aspect of the development of the *Convention*.

**ICOMOS** pointed out that, contrary to some remarks made by the Members of the Committee, ICOMOS and IUCN had been considered to have taken a similar approach regarding outstanding universal value during the Special Meeting of Experts. It expressed its wish to take part in future discussion on the subject and proposed to prepare a joint IUCN/ICOMOS position paper on the concept of outstanding universal value, if IUCN so agreed.

The **Chairperson** observed that he had also attended the Special Meeting of Experts and expressed his gratitude to the Russian Federation and Mr Young as well as to the other participants in the meeting. He further remarked that it had been meaningful to have had a discussion on the concept of outstanding universal value before starting to examine the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List.

In response to a request by the Delegation of **Benin** for ICCROM to be asked to express its views, the **Chairperson** observed that ICCROM had not requested the floor.

The **Rapporteur** remarked that the discussion on the item had been intricate but only New Zealand had submitted an amendment to the draft Decision in writing. Summing up, he said that on the one hand the Committee called for action to implement the recommendations of the Special Meeting of Experts, but on the other hand advocated a cautious approach in order to reflect on the subject. He announced that there was no change from paragraphs 1 to 4 of the draft Decision. Paragraph 5 could not be adopted

without consideration by the Subsidiary Body on administrative and financial issues, but an addition might be made to that paragraph to the effect that the recommendations should be implemented with particular attention to the synoptic table. He then proposed a new paragraph 6 to incorporate proposals made by the Delegations of New Zealand, Argentina and Chile, and a new paragraph 7 to request the Director of the World Heritage Centre to make further proposals regarding the continuation of discussion on the issue and to report to the next session of the World Heritage Committee.

La Délégation du **Bénin** fait observer que le Comité ne s'est toujours pas prononcé sur les recommandations de la Réunion spéciale d'experts en tant que telles.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** remarked that, while the development of a corpus of past decisions of the Committee on the concept of outstanding universal value was necessary, the Committee had in the past taken some decisions that were not ideal and it was therefore also important to be able to learn from past mistakes. Supporting the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand, the Delegation emphasized again, with reference to the proposed paragraph 7, that the synoptic table would not solve all the problems at hand concerning the application of the concept of outstanding universal value.

Having emphasized the importance of the subject, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it wished to see the amendment in writing before adopting the draft Decision. It also stated that there was no consensus on the synoptic table as some thought it too long, that it lacked some points or that certain priorities needed adjusting. It therefore considered that the Committee could not request that the actions indicated be implemented.

The Delegation of **India** supported the point made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia and suggested that a small group of delegations work with the Rapporteur to revise the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Rapporteur revise the draft Decision together with the Delegations of Saint Lucia, India, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand and Benin, and, in response to a comment by the Delegation of **India**, requested the concerned Members of the Committee to agree on a convenient time for the revision.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle le problème de fond soulevé par la Délégation de Sainte-Lucie.

The **Chairperson** said it should be clear that the task of the informal drafting group was to revise the draft Decision in the spirit of the discussion in plenary and not to reopen a discussion on substance.

## **ITEM 6            REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE FOR THE 15TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/6*  
*Draft Decision 29 COM 6*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the working Document *WHC-05/29COM/6* and pointed out that the document was to be revised after the discussion on nominations at the present session. It was further to be noted that, in accordance with Rule 14.1 of the *Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention*, the Committee would need to decide, for the election during the 15th session of the General Assembly, on the number of seats to be reserved for States Parties which did not have sites on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Bénin** demande un éclaircissement concernant la proposition faite par la Nouvelle-Zélande et adoptée à la septième session extraordinaire du Comité en matière de mécanismes électoraux des membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial par l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la *Convention*.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the World Heritage Centre for producing a concise working document and requested inclusion in the document of a reference to the Africa position paper and draft proposal for the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund (*WHC-05/29COM/11C.2*).

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that it might be better to discuss the item later when the full document would be available.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** specified that the document would include a reference to the *Africa Position Paper* and draft proposal for the establishment of an African World Heritage Fund.

En réponse à la demande de la Délégation du Bénin, il rappelle que le Comité, lors de sa septième session extraordinaire, a pris une décision en réformant les mécanismes électoraux qui régissent l'élection des membres du Comité et précise que cette décision sera appliquée lors de la prochaine Assemblée générale des Etats parties en octobre 2005.

The **Chairperson** then suspended discussion on the item.

**ITEM 7 A EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF  
WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF  
CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON  
THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

*Documents: WHC-05/29.COM/7A  
WHC-05/29.COM 7A.ADD  
WHC-05/29.COM 7A.4.REV*

*Draft Decisions : from 29 COM 7A.1 to 29 COM 7A.31*

In introducing the item, the **World Heritage Centre** recalled that a document containing revised draft Decisions, relating in particular to **29 COM 7A.4. Rev** (on the five sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo), **29 COM 7A.6 Rev** (Air and Tenéré Natural Reserves, Niger), **29 COM 7A.7 Rev** (Djoudj Bird Sanctuary, Senegal), **29 COM 7A.20 Rev** (Minaret of Jam, Afghanistan) and **29 COM 7A.26 Rev** (Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, Philippines) in French and English had been distributed in the room.

The working document presented reports on the State of Conservation of all 35 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger: 16 natural properties and 19 cultural properties.

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

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the monitoring mission requested by the Committee at its 27th session and invited by the State Party on 31 March 2004 had again had to be postponed because of the security situation.

The European Union (EU) funded ECOFAC programme (“Conservation and Rational Utilization of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa” - «Ecosystèmes Forestiers en Afrique Centrale»), in close cooperation with the Wildlife Conservation Society, had conducted an aerial wildlife survey and a socio-economic study in May 2005. Data had not yet been fully analysed, but preliminary results indicated that pressure from poaching on the animal populations, both by local groups and organized groups coming from Sudan and Chad, remained high. Poaching by armed groups from Sudan was especially affecting elephant populations, whilst local poaching targeted populations of Cob and Hartebeest. Compared to the survey of 1985, elephant populations in the region had been reduced from around 5000 in 1985 to around 500 at present. Elephants were now only found in the Manovo Gounda National Park, the World Heritage site, and the hunting zone south of the park but seem to have disappeared from the rest of the area, including the Bamingui Bangoran National Park. However, counts of elephant carcasses showed that poaching pressure had diminished. Of the population of Cob, 85 percent seemed to have been lost since 1985, indicating that local poaching pressures also remained high. Eland, buffalo and roan populations, however, seemed to be recovering. Significantly,

apart from the black rhino, which had disappeared from the region in 1985 (before the World Heritage listing), all species were still found, although in reduced quantities and in spite of the losses, the site and adjacent hunting zones for many species remained probably the last stronghold within the Sudan/Guinea eco-region.

It had also been observed that poaching caravans from Sudan were increasingly focusing on the exploitation of other natural resources such as honey and wild pepper. That was probably a result of the diminishing wildlife resources. Poaching pressure was much lower in the hunting zones than in the national park, as a result of increased surveillance organized both by the sport hunting companies and local populations who benefited directly from the sports hunting.

Socio-economic studies indicated that the continuing insecurity was a major concern for local populations. There was also a growing awareness among local populations about the economic importance of the wildlife populations, since sport hunting in the hunting zones around the World Heritage sites was one of the very few activities bringing cash to the region. As a result, anti-poaching activities were supported by local communities.

**IUCN** noted that major problems persisted at the site and emphasized the desirability of a two track approach focused on strengthening on site management and the ability to control poaching and increasing engagement with local communities in relation to developing village hunting zones around the park to ease pressures on the park. It strongly supported initiatives such as that of ECOFAC, which sought to address those issues.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle qu'il est important de mentionner, dans le projet de décision, les condoléances du Comité du patrimoine mondial aux familles des garde-chasse ayant trouvé la mort dans des opérations de lutte contre le braconnage. Elle demande également qu'une lettre soit adressée aux familles concernées et propose que la décision rappelle l'importance des zones de chasse.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted that several of the conservation issues mentioned in the report had relevance to other conservation conventions. Norway strongly encouraged greater cooperation between the secretariats of those conventions with the aim of reaching a unified approach. For the site in question, the CITES Convention (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora), is particularly relevant in relation to the issue of ivory poaching.

**IUCN** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Benin to send letters of condolence to the families of game scouts and observed that references to village hunting zones could perhaps be made in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the work of ECOFAC was essentially focused on hunting zones. That innovative approach, which sought to ensure financial benefits for local communities, was reflected in paragraphs 5 and 6. It was anticipated that ECOFAC

would resume next year with the new funding phase. The World Heritage Centre fully intended to cooperate.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted that the State Party appeared to be faced with a situation beyond its control. It had tried to the best of its ability to counter the threats from poaching and the report showed that poaching by local populations was on the decrease. That was encouraging and the efforts of the State Party deserved to be commended. It further noted that there was a strong need for the monitoring mission.

The **Rapporteur** noted that he had received no written amendments and that the oral amendment suggested by the Delegation of Benin could be incorporated into paragraph 3, requesting the Chairperson of the Committee and Director of the World Heritage Centre to transmit the Committee's heartfelt condolences. Otherwise the draft Decision stood as presented.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.1** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N227)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the monitoring mission requested at the Committee's 27th session and invited by the State Party on 20 February 2004 had again had to be postponed for security reasons. The State Party had submitted a report dated 6 January 2005, noting that only 20% of the property was under Government control. As such, it provided limited information and did not allow an assessment of the impact of the conflict on the State of Conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that it would be important to mention in the draft Decision the progress made by the local communities with regard to their efforts and the discussions they had entered into with the rebel groups for the protection of the property.

La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite savoir par quel moyen les parties prenantes seront informées de la décision qui sera prise.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that it appeared that the Committee was being presented with two contrasting cases. In one, conflict and the loss of young lives resulted in the sending of a letter of condolence; in the present case it was suggested that negotiations be held with the rebels. He invited to reflect on whose side was the Committee – that of conflict or that of peace.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) remercie tout d'abord les autorités sud-africaines pour la parfaite organisation de cette 29e session du Comité. Elle précise que le gouvernement ivoirien contrôle 30 pour cent de la zone et non pas 20 pour cent comme indiqué dans le document *WHC-05/29.COM/7A*. Elle rappelle ensuite que l'UICN ne



s'est pas rendue sur place depuis deux ans malgré l'absence d'affrontements sur le terrain. Il existe une zone intermédiaire sous juridiction de l'ONU et dans laquelle une mission internationale pourrait parfaitement avoir lieu. La mission UICN pourra donc s'y rendre dès que possible et dresser un état général de ce bien car plus la mission est retardée, plus le bien souffre. Enfin, elle rappelle l'effort de l'Etat partie qui a placé de nombreux agents sur le terrain.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted that the State Party had now answered some of the concerns in relation to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision but noted it would be difficult for the State Party to comply fully with paragraph 6 when it controlled only 20% to 30% of the area.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the peace process provided a means for establishing contact with the other parties. Its experience in the Democratic Republic of the Congo showed that that could work. Failure to obtain the necessary United Nations security clearance had prevented the mission being undertaken to date. It could happen only when such clearance could be obtained. The situation was not strictly comparable with that in the Central African Republic, where the game guards were facing well-armed poaching gangs. Furthermore, while it would be acceptable to commend the efforts of the local populations, it observed that that would probably not be sufficient to fully protect the sites in the face of the ongoing conflict.

**IUCN** supported the observations of the Delegations of Colombia and Egypt, noting that it was important to work with all the channels that were opening. It also welcomed the assurances of the State Party in relation to the security of the mission and was ready to discuss practical issues for its implementation.

The **Rapporteur** said he had received no written amendments, nor any specific oral amendments. However, in view of the debate, he suggested inserting the following new paragraph between existing paragraphs 4 and 5 recognizing the commitment shown by local communities to the conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A. 2** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire / Guinea) (N155/257)**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that no new information had been received from the State Party of Cote d'Ivoire since that of 6 January indicating that the property had fallen under rebel control, nor had any new information from the State Party of Guinea regarding the restarting of mining activities in the enclave or mining exploration in the property by the Euronimba consortium.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its grave concern about the presence of rebels and questioned how the Committee could proceed on the issue of progress in effective transboundary management in the absence of relevant information.

La Délégation du **Liban** tient à faire une remarque d'ordre général inspirée par le nombre de problèmes sur ce bien : certains Etats parties ne sont pas en mesure de soumettre de rapport sur l'état de conservation des biens du fait des problèmes régionaux et de drames humains. Il ne faudrait en aucun cas demander l'extension d'un bien inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Ce serait contradictoire avec la situation réelle actuelle de ce bien. Elle propose de supprimer le paragraphe 7 du projet de décision.

La Délégation de **Sainte-Lucie** appuie l'intervention de la Délégation du Liban, et demande des précisions sur le but de ce paragraphe 7, relatif à la demande d'assistance internationale par l'Etat partie du Liberia pour la préparation de sa liste indicative. Ce paragraphe ne semble pas avoir de lien avec l'état de conservation du bien.

The **World Heritage Centre** observed that, while the listed area of Mount Nimba was a transboundary site between Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire, part of the mountain range was in the territory of the State Party of Liberia, a recent signatory of the *Convention*. The suggestion in the draft Decision was intended to enable that State Party to investigate the feasibility of including the Liberian portion of the mountains in its Tentative List. Turning to the issue of transboundary management, it noted that while any part of the site remained under rebel control it would be difficult to ask the State Party to improve its transboundary management and it clearly could not ask the rebels to do so.

The **Chairperson** said that the concern of the Committee was that a State Party could request International Assistance at any time and that the paragraph was perhaps not appropriate.

La Délégation du **Liban** demande à l'UICN de ne pas créer de problèmes supplémentaires à l'Etat partie du Liberia. En effet, elle rappelle que les biens transfrontaliers sont déjà suffisamment difficiles à gérer et se demande quel intérêt il y aurait à faire intervenir un troisième Etat partie vu tous les problèmes actuels. Il serait aberrant d'étendre les limites de ce bien.

La Délégation du **Bénin** propose au Comité de réparer l'erreur qu'il a commise à sa 28e session (Suzhou, 2004) lorsqu'il a adopté une décision par laquelle il invitait à l'extension du bien. Elle propose de se concentrer sur le Mont Nimba tel qu'il est inscrit à ce jour. Pour ce qui est de l'absence de communication de la part de la Guinée, elle tient à rappeler que l'UICN et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ont noté les efforts déployés par cet Etat partie, et elle souhaite que le Centre se mette en rapport directement avec la Délégation permanente de la Guinée auprès de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its strong support for the views of the Delegations of Lebanon and Saint Lucia. The purpose of the Committee was to safeguard

sites already on the List. Given the present situation, it was not tenable to propose adding a third party, and IUCN should discourage such moves.

**IUCN** stated that it did not wish to cause problems for States Parties. It agreed that it was impossible to have effective transboundary management in the absence of effective control. However, it should be noted that the Liberian ecosystem was intrinsically linked with the rest of the property. Demarcation of the boundary of the Liberian Nimba Nature reserve was imminent, as a result of support from Conservation International and the United States Government. IUCN could accept the deletion of paragraph 7.

Commentant l'invitation à étendre le bien à la partie libérienne, la Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) rappelle aux membres du Comité qu'elle est consciente du fait qu'il s'agit d'un bien qui s'étend sur trois pays, et qu'elle souhaite que l'ensemble de ce bien soit soumis au même régime – celui de la *Convention* - et bénéficié partout d'un statut identique. Elle informe ensuite le Comité que la partie ivoirienne du bien est celle qui a le plus souffert car étant sous contrôle des groupes rebelles. Enfin, elle invite l'IUCN à élargir sa mission au parc national de la Comoé et à se rendre sur le site du Mont Nimba. Des contacts ont déjà été pris avec les forces des Nations Unies présentes sur le terrain afin de les sensibiliser à la conservation de ce bien.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its solidarity with those who had suffered from the conflicts that afflicted so many parts of the continent. There was a need to work in partnership with African institutions that could influence matters. In that vein, consideration should be given to involving the African Union (AU). The proposed African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) could perhaps have as one of its priorities the promotion of peace. It further reiterated that in dealing with heritage it was vitally important to assist local communities in finding alternative sustainable livelihoods.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Delegations of Kenya and Benin in commenting that it was essential to demonstrate the links between peace, conflict and conservation. It noted that both South Africa and Kenya sat on the Peace and Security Council of the AU but that it had not yet addressed the issue of conservation.

**IUCN** agreed that it would be logical to link the proposed missions to Comoé National Park and Mount Nimba. It also noted that it would be essential to link State of Conservation reporting to regional and local initiatives. As IUCN saw it, a priority for the AWHF would be to apply strategic assistance to African sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Bénin** est favorable à la suppression du paragraphe 7 du projet de décision. L'Etat partie peut toujours demander une assistance internationale pour la préparation de sa liste indicative quand bon lui semble. Elle propose également d'insérer le paragraphe 6 immédiatement après le paragraphe 3.

The **Rapporteur** said that he had received a written amendment from the Netherlands proposing the addition of the following phrase to the end of paragraph 5: "to ensure the

conservation of the property and its effective trans-boundary management, as soon as the situation allows it.” Two oral amendments had been made by the Delegation of Benin to delete paragraph 7 and reposition paragraph 6 after paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.3** provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.



## **THIRD DAY**

### **FIFTH MEETING**

**Tuesday 12 July 2005**

**03.10 pm - 09.20 pm**

**Chairperson: Mr Wakashe**

Note of the Rapporteur: At its fifth meeting, the Committee continued the evaluation of the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Note du rapporteur: Lors de sa 5e réunion, le Comité a poursuivi l'étude des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

#### **ITEM 7A EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES ; STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continued)**

##### **World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)**

**Virunga National Park (N 63)**

**Garamba National Park (N 136)**

**Kahuzi-Biega National Park (N 137)**

**Salonga National Park (N 280)**

**Okapi Wildlife Reserve (N 718)**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the planned monitoring mission had had to be postponed because of the security situation in the eastern part of the country. The situation remained critical, especially in view of the upcoming elections which had originally been planned for June 2005 but were now postponed until March 2006.

**IUCN** recalled that all five sites remained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. That was a cause for concern. It commended the significant levels of support to the conservation effort provided by the international community and a network of NGOs and

noted that the situation was most acute in the eastern parts of the country, posing severe problems in relation to Garamba.

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the working document provided a report on the international conference and event “Congo, Heritage in Danger” organized by UNESCO with the support of the Governments of Belgium and Japan and the United Nations Foundation in September 2004.

At the conference, Vice-President Z’Ahidi Ngoma had announced that the Government would take action to evacuate armed troops, restore the integrity of the sites and ensure payments of guard salaries. An inter-ministerial committee had been established earlier in the year to follow up on that commitment, and ICCN (“Congolese Institute for the Conservation of Nature” - « Institut congolais pour la conservation de la nature ») had confirmed that guard staff were now paid regularly monthly basic salaries of up to US\$15 in the areas that had been under the control of the Government since the start of the war, and US\$4 per month in the former rebel held areas, where four of the five World Heritage sites were located. ICCN had also informed the Centre that they were currently negotiating a new unified salary scale with the government. The commitment on the evacuation of armed troops from the site had not yet materialized in the field but regional authorities were reported to be cooperating more with ICCN in efforts to restore the integrity of the sites.

The working document provided a detailed overview of the situation at each of the five sites. Since the preparation of the report, new information had been received on Okapi Wildlife Reserve, Virunga National Park and Garamba National Park.

### **Okapi Wildlife Reserve**

The World Heritage Centre had received information from the site manager that elephant poaching by armed groups continued to affect the site. Poaching was concentrated in the north-eastern part of the reserve. Apart from irregular armed groups, military of the armed forces based in Isiro were also reported to be involved. ICCN was currently preparing a large-scale operation with the military to address the issue. A similar operation, Operation Tango, had halted elephant poaching in 2001. ICCN had requested financial assistance to cover some of the logistical expenses of the operation.

### **Virunga National Park**

The World Heritage Centre had received information from the site manager that military from the 12th brigade of the regular army, stationed in and around the park continued to poach the park’s wildlife. Since January 2005, the military were reported to have killed 11 elephants, an average of four hippopotamus per day and numerous buffalo. The naval force was also alleged to be involved in both illegal fishing and charcoal production. Park guards were continuously threatened by the well-armed soldiers.

WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) had noted further progress on the evacuation of local populations from encroached parts of the park, especially in the Tongo region. That activity, funded as part of the UNESCO Belgium project, used a participatory methodology to convince people to evacuate the site. WWF had also commented that the provincial authorities now seemed to be more willing to cooperate on the relocation of the refugees installed in Kirokirwe.

### **Garamba National Park**

The working document highlighted the extreme threat to the property due to the increased poaching since 2003 and the imminent risk of extinction of the last remaining Northern White Rhino population in the wild. That might seriously affect the outstanding universal value for which the property had been designated as World Heritage.

In early May, the World Heritage Centre had received a copy of a letter written to ICCN by the office of the Vice President and dated April 27, announcing the decision by the Government not to allow the translocation of a small group of Rhinos proposed by ICCN on the recommendation of the IUCN/SSC Rhino specialist group, and that the Government had instead decided to send an army brigade to help secure the property. ICCN had recently informed the World Heritage Centre that the army reinforcement had not yet arrived at the site. It also reported 12 rhino sightings in May, although it was not clear if all the sightings concerned different individuals.

The conservation NGO assisting ICCN with the conservation of the property had suspended its support in March, following the commotion around the rhino translocation. Since the preparation of the working document, the International Rhino Foundation, which had been the main donor to the property, had announced that it was halting its support to the property, as it believed it was extremely unlikely that it would be possible to save the Northern White Rhino from extinction.

A workshop organized in June by the World Heritage Centre with ICCN and Fauna and Flora International (FFI) had discussed some of the issues that had led to the suspension of the activities by the NGO. ICCN stated that, after the announcement not to proceed with the translocation, the situation in the surrounding villages had returned to normal, enabling a return of expatriate advisers to the property. It had also affirmed that disciplinary measures had been taken against the rebelling guards. ICCN had also requested additional financial support from the Government as well as equipment, in particular arms and ammunition, to reinforce conservation activities.

FFI had agreed both to restart conservation support as soon as possible and to be the implementing NGO for the support UNESCO had mobilized for the property from the Government of Italy. It had also been decided that, in addition to law enforcement activities, a priority focus should be put on community conservation activities, involving the local communities closer in the preservation of the property. A second meeting was planned for September to try to mobilize additional partners for the property.



**IUCN** underlined the seriousness of the situation in Garamba in relation to the Northern White Rhino, endemic to the site, and one of the reasons for its inscription on the World Heritage List. The sub-specie was now on the verge of extinction.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime son inquiétude face à une situation qu'elle juge catastrophique, particulièrement en ce qui concerne le parc de la Garamba. Elle rappelle que ce parc national a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base de sa population de rhinocéros blancs du Nord, malheureusement en rapide déclin. Elle s'interroge sur le nombre exact d'individus survivants dans le parc, et sur la somme globale qui a été versée pour la protection de ce bien (1 million de dollars EU versé par des organisations de conservation du patrimoine, dont 300 000 dollars EU par le Centre du patrimoine mondial) et, chaque garde chasse étant rémunéré sur une base mensuelle de 15 dollars EU, elle se demande où est passé tout cet argent. Par conséquent, la Délégation du Liban ne souhaite pas que le Comité exprime sa reconnaissance à un Etat partie qui a failli à toutes ses obligations relatives à la protection du bien et à l'assistance internationale dont il a bénéficié. Enfin, elle propose de supprimer le paragraphe 7 et souhaite que le Comité, au paragraphe 10, demande fermement le transfert des quelques rhinocéros blancs du Nord qui subsistent dans le parc et qu'il envisage la possibilité de retirer ce bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial à sa 30e session en 2006.

The Delegation of **South Africa** concurred and urged the Committee and the World Heritage Centre to find creative ways of countering the threats caused as a result of poaching. However, the fact that the State Party had issued a State of Conservation (SOC) report demonstrated that it was prepared to address the issues at stake. Most of the problems emanated from insecurity and low levels of socio-economic development. It was encouraging that the ending of hostilities had permitted some progress to be made.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested that future SOC reports should provide information about International Assistance and extrabudgetary resources provided to sites. It agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon that the Northern White Rhino had been integral to the site's inscription on the World Heritage List. Indeed, the Garamba Park had been created in 1938 in order to protect the species. It was a cause of great concern that the species was now on the brink of extinction. The State Party must reconsider the issue of translocation and should understand that if the rhinos disappeared then the site's inscription on the List was no longer tenable. The draft Decision must include clear criteria as to the steps that the Committee considered necessary for resolving the issue and it should consider at its next session whether to remove the site from the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Bénin** fait part de sa préoccupation quant à la situation dans les pays politiquement instables. Elle demande que, conformément au paragraphe 11 du projet de décision, le Directeur général de l'UNESCO prenne contact avec le Président de la République démocratique du Congo de toute urgence afin qu'il accorde plus d'attention à la conservation de ces biens, et qu'il mette les rhinocéros en lieu sûr. Elle demande également si le Centre du patrimoine mondial sait pour quelles raisons les autorités congolaises refusent le transfert des rhinocéros. Elle se demande si cette réaction est liée

à la destination finale des rhinocéros, au sentiment de perte de la « propriété » des individus transférés. Elle suggère enfin de ne pas être « reconnaissant » à l'Etat partie de la République démocratique du Congo au paragraphe 7 du projet de décision, mais il convient tout de même de mentionner son engagement. Elle propose donc le libellé « Prend note de l'engagement de l'Etat partie... », et souhaite obtenir l'avis du Directeur général de l'UNESCO à ce sujet et lancer un message fort quant à la raison d'être du parc national de la Garamba sans rhinocéros.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred and proposed amending the draft Decision in order to urge the State Party to fulfill the clear commitment it had made during the international donors conference at UNESCO in September 2004; deeply regret its decision not to translocate selected individuals; request the Sudanese authorities to fully respect article 6.3 of the **World Heritage Convention**; and make clear that if the presence of the Northern White Rhino could not be established by February 2006 the site would be deemed to have lost its outstanding universal value and be removed from the World Heritage List. Finally, when the translocation took place, it would be important to emphasize that the animals should be moved to an appropriate wild location, not to a zoo.

The **Chairperson** noted that political negotiations were under way in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) to resolve the situation and wondered whether it might be possible to introduce that as an item in those negotiations. He further noted that the AU Peace and Security Council had not yet received any briefing on the impact of conflict on the conservation agenda. He hoped that the Committee would be able to assist the Director-General of UNESCO in his approaches to political leaders.

The Delegation of **India** noted that it was a very difficult issue and suggested that a paragraph be added to the draft Decision requesting the Director-General of UNESCO to approach the AU. It also sought clarification on the practicalities of translocation.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the intervention of the Delegation of India. The risk was very clear since there were so few animals surviving in the park. It reminded the Committee members that its responsibility was at stake, before the eyes of the World, and that if the property were to lose its value, the Committee would be seen as ineffective. It questioned what the value of the World Heritage List was, and how it should be managed in the case of such disastrous situations. It was clear that there would be no more rhinoceroses by the following year, and that was a flagrant case of voluntary or involuntary failure by the State Party. Emergency measures would be necessary. It also questioned the relevance of mobilizing the Director-General of UNESCO in that regard. It requested Committee members, for the prestige of the Organization, to implement a solution as soon as possible.

The Delegation of **Egypt** observed that the situation was extremely serious. The issue at stake was what concrete measures the Committee could take. It believed it was necessary to elevate the situation to the highest international levels and establish synergies with other conventions and the secretariat of the G8. It would be critical to implement

awareness-raising activities at the site. Perhaps a local solution, rather than translocation, would offer a better solution.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the Committee faced a paradox, whereby the proposed conservation solution would remove half of the remaining individuals of the species, yet the State Party was to be told that if the species was not present at the site in February 2006, it would be de-listed. More information was required to explain the State Party's opposition to translocation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the organization of a mission which would provide concrete proposals such as translocation of the rhinoceroses to another wild area to ensure their protection. It underlined the fact that the missions as well as political negotiations were urgently needed, as it was not possible to wait for another year, and that there was no alternative to the translocation of the animals. It supported the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List if there were no more rhinos in the park.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) exprime sa très grande déception et sa consternation à l'écoute du rapport de l'UICN. Elle rappelle sa présence à la Conférence pour la protection des biens du patrimoine mondial de la République démocratique du Congo qui s'est tenue en septembre 2004 au Siège de l'UNESCO à Paris. Commentant le paragraphe 9 du projet de décision, elle considère très difficile de continuer à contribuer à un effort dont les résultats sont aussi décevants. Elle est consciente des réalités politiques, anthropologiques et autres, et souhaite faire des propositions constructives, plutôt que de dresser un bilan totalement négatif, afin d'essayer de redresser la situation et de continuer à faire vivre ces cinq parcs nationaux.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** said that one of the issues bedevilling the parks was the presence of small firearms in the Great Lakes Region. Members of the Committee had expressed disappointment in relation to the decision of the State Party but they needed to understand that those parks were not zoos. Rather, they were huge areas of land threatened by highly organized, well-armed poachers. Instead of roundly condemning, the international community needed to consider its policy position in relation to national parks threatened by conflict and infiltration.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** noted that people and animals were dying as a result of such a highly unstable and complex situation. Some of the animals should be permitted to remain at the site and perhaps increase the possibility of retaining the site on the World Heritage List, noting that the process of translocation carried the risk of precipitating the death of those so moved.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** reaffirmed the commitment of that State Party to the obligations of the *Convention*. The border area remained insecure. However, it had not received any official communication as to the role it could play in the process.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** summarized the activities of the World Heritage Centre in respect of that and other sites in the DRC.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commented that it was the very scale of the effort put in by UNESCO for such little result that made the situation so worrying.

Le **Sous-Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour la culture**, M. Bouchenaki, fait part de son inquiétude quant à la situation préoccupante et rappelle qu'il faut attirer l'attention de la communauté internationale sur ce bien du patrimoine mondial, qui risque de perdre la raison même de son inscription. Il indique que le Directeur général de l'UNESCO sera sensible à la requête du Comité, et qu'il est d'ores et déjà possible de prendre contact avec les représentants de la République démocratique du Congo à l'UNESCO (Paris). Il suggère également au Comité de demander à son Président ainsi qu'au Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial d'entreprendre une mission visant à attirer l'attention des autorités congolaises à ce sujet. Il évoque aussi la possibilité d'inscrire cette question à l'ordre du jour du prochain Sommet de l'Union africaine qui se tiendra en 2006 à Khartoum (Soudan).

The **World Heritage Centre** further explained that it was difficult, in the present political climate, for the Government to honour its commitments. After the 28th session of the Committee in 2004, the management authority in cooperation with its partners had put in place emergency anti-poaching measures and had agreed that if by November that was not demonstrably working, it would propose to the Government to translocate a small group of animals as recommended by IUCN. UNESCO had participated in a mission in January 2005, which had met the political authorities in Kinshasa, including two of the Vice-Presidents and several ministers. The mission had received assurances from the Vice-Presidents that the Government would agree with the requested translocation. Unfortunately, the proposal had been opposed by certain politicians and following a disinformation campaign, political opposition to the measure made it difficult for the Government to push through the measure. Given that political context, it was not clear that demanding translocation was the best solution - it might be more effective to request the State Party to enforce the armed units. The Centre further recalled that the site had been inscribed in 1980 on the basis of a very small nomination dossier. It did have other values including the largest population of elephants in the region and the endemic Congo giraffe. If the rhinos were lost it would be advisable to request a re-examination of the outstanding universal value of the site, rather than automatically conclude that all outstanding universal value was lost. UNESCO had experience of taking political action but it was clear that supplementary bilateral action was required. On the subject of political action, it was clear that any action by UNESCO would have to be complemented by bilateral actions. Therefore the statement by Sudan was welcomed. The peace process in that State Party had put in place a unified Government which opened up another angle for examining the situation. In the same way, the suggestion by South Africa to involve the African Union should be further explored.

The Delegation of **Egypt** regretted that that information had not been made available earlier in the debate. It further noted a disproportion between the efforts of UNESCO and the international community and the reaction of the State Party to the situation.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the debate thus far in relation to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested that the proposed references to the Government of Sudan be further amended in order to seek its cooperation.

The **Chairperson** announced that he might need to invoke Rule 22.2 of the *Rules of Procedure* to impose time limits on speakers.

La Délégation du **Bénin** demande ce qui est fait de la proposition du Sous-Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour la culture, et s'il est possible d'en faire mention dans le projet de décision. Elle précise que le parc de la Garamba ne comporte pas seulement des rhinocéros blancs du Nord, mais également des éléphants et des girafes et que, par conséquent, il conviendrait de réévaluer la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien en cas de disparition du rhinocéros blanc du Nord.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its opposition to a high-level mission. It was clear that the Government could not honour its previous commitments. It disagreed with Benin. The site had clearly been inscribed because of the presence of the Northern White Rhino. If other outstanding universal values did exist, the site could be renominated.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its concern about the conflict inherent in the action the Committee wished to take and the threat of delisting Garamba. It requested that the last paragraph be amended to take into account the information provided by the World Heritage Centre.

La Délégation du **Bénin**, faisant référence au document *WHC-05/29.COM/7A*, page 10 (version française) demande si celui-ci est fiable ou non. En outre, elle considère qu'une mission pourra aider le gouvernement congolais à faire progresser la situation auprès des communautés locales.

The Delegation of **India** concurred with the United Kingdom and noted that the working document did refer to the presence of elephants and the endemic Congo giraffe as among the reasons for justifying the inscription of the site in 1980. It further considered that it would be wise to amend the proposal of the Netherlands, which had been made in advance of the statement by the State Party of Sudan.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime son profond mécontentement sur ce qui est le plus important programme du Centre du patrimoine mondial, le considérant comme un échec total. Elle ajoute que le bien n'a plus de valeur du tout et que sa population d'éléphants ne suffira pas à maintenir sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle appelle les membres du Comité à arrêter d'attribuer des financements à ce programme.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that it had been a passionate debate involving a species on the brink of extinction. It was time for the Committee to come to a decision. The draft Decision could perhaps be amended to applaud the commitment given by the State Party of Sudan. The Committee was clearly split on how to deal with the source of the site's outstanding universal value. It suggested amending the draft Decision so that if the presence of the rhino was not established in February 2006, the property would be deemed to have lost its outstanding universal value and the Committee would consider deleting it from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated its preference for a clause requesting the cooperation of Sudan.

Summarizing the discussion, the **Rapporteur** suggested that the Committee should request the cooperation of Sudan in compliance with the terms of article 6.3 of the **Convention**, and reminded the Committee of the Netherlands' proposal in respect of the final paragraph.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.4** provisionally adopted as amended.

**IUCN** commented that no natural World Heritage site had yet been removed from the World Heritage List. The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the *Convention* provided clear criteria about when and how that should happen. It was true that the Northern White Rhino was a flagship species but other factors and values needed to be taken into consideration. IUCN believed there might be a case for delisting but that would have to be assessed against a credible survey.

The **Chairperson** formally invoked Rule 22.2 of the **Rules of Procedure** imposing time limits of three minutes for members of the Committee, and two minutes for Observers.

### **Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the working document provided information on the significant progress reported by the State Party in addressing three of the four benchmarks for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger set by the Committee at its 25th session in Helsinki. However the report also indicated a lack of progress with regard to the significant reduction of the human population in the park.

**IUCN** observed that the news from the site was generally positive and considered that the conditions might exist for removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, but those should be assessed in a mission.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the State Party for the substantial progress it had made towards the benchmarks. It appreciated the difficulties inherent in balancing

human needs against conservation actions. The recent meeting of the G8 had addressed many of the issues facing the continent but had not yet addressed heritage. Consideration should be given to removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger now.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** commended the State Party for its achievements in meeting the benchmarks and suggested amending the draft Decision so that the word ‘recommends’ in paragraph 6 be replaced by ‘requests’.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** expressed its gratitude to South Africa as host for the meeting and commented that it considered the report in the working document to be objective and constructive. The Committee had recognized its efforts to rectify matters and, while the State Party wished to see the site removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, it fully understood the issues relating to human encroachment. It would continue to seek alternative sources of livelihood and simultaneously engage local populations in dialogue about World Heritage values. It went on to express its gratitude for the support offered by the international community, in particular the Government of Austria and IUCN, and hoped that Simien could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the Committee’s 30th session.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with a draft Decision in which the Committee recognized the efforts made by a State Party when it had made significant efforts. It added that the issue of people living within the National Park had still to be solved.

The **Rapporteur** stated that he had received a written amendment from the Netherlands, which had been supported orally by Lithuania.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.5** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Air and Tenere Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573)**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that IUCN had recently been able to organize the monitoring mission to the property, as requested by the Committee at its 27th session.

In presenting the findings and recommendations of the May 2005 mission, **IUCN** said that the situation at the site had deteriorated. There had been a significant decline among some of the threatened species such as the Danna Gazelle, Red-necked ostrich and Addax. Poaching continued, as did commercial extraction of natural resources such as timber and hay.

More positively, the mission had noted an increasing awareness and support for World Heritage values on the part of local residents, the tourism sector and regional authorities. That was significantly different from the situation 15 years earlier.

The mission recommended that the State Party should re-establish a physical presence in the reserve, as an essential requisite for site management. There was also a need to better engage and involve local communities and newly created municipalities. A new UNDP-GEF project had been developed to that end. IUCN recommended that the site should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.6** provisionally adopted.

### **Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that in June 2005, a transboundary biosphere reserve had been created between Djoudj and the Diawling National Park in Mauritania.

**IUCN** presented the findings and recommendations of its mission undertaken in May 2005, at the request of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The site had been placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000, at the request of the State Party, due to infestation by an introduced species, *Salvinia Molesta*. The site was also on the danger list of the *Ramsar Convention* (the *Montreux Protocol*). The mission had observed positive progress in controlling the *Salvinia*, for which the State Party deserved to be congratulated. However, persisting problems included: the absence of an effective system of water flow management, although systems had been developed and not yet implemented; lack of resources; and the presence of other invasive species which posed a threat. The mission had recommended implementing the water management system, as well as strengthening management at the site to control access and livestock. The property should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.7** provisionally adopted.

## **ARAB STATES**

### **Ichkeul National park (Tunisia)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that, following another wet winter season, the situation in the property continued to improve. However, the State Party had yet to provide written confirmation that it would guarantee a minimal water inflow into the ecosystem, as requested by the Committee at its 27th and 28th sessions.

**IUCN** noted the generally positive situation in relation to this site, which had been assisted by good levels of rainfall. If the State Party were to give its written commitment in terms of guaranteeing the minimal water inflow, there could be grounds for removing



the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, although they would have to be ascertained by a mission.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite entendre la Délégation de la Tunisie (Observateur) sur l'engagement de l'Etat partie.

The Observer Delegation of Tunisia being absent from the room, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.8** provisionally adopted.

## **ASIA**

### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a UNESCO/IUCN mission had visited the property in April 2005, as requested by the Committee at its 28th session.

In presenting the findings and recommendations of the mission, **IUCN** recalled that the site had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 on account of threats associated with insurgency in and around the park. The mission had noted that the civil unrest had ceased and an agreement had been signed between the Government of India and the Bodo people. An ecotourism venture had been started on the eastern side of the park and local communities were now working with park staff on that and other park management matters.

Nevertheless, the unrest had impacted on the wildlife population and existing information about the wildlife was of variable quality. One of the key recommendations was for the State Party to implement a comprehensive baseline survey. Other concerns related to: the lower level of control over the Panbari Range in the west of the park; the timely release of funds by the Government of Assam which should however soon be addressed following a ruling by the Supreme Court of India; and the need to explore the possibility of developing it as a transboundary site with Bhutan.

The Delegation of **India** noted that since the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the State Party had negotiated a settlement with the rebels and put in place a centrally funded programme – Project Tiger – which put emphasis on measures to improve infrastructure and other aspects. It was optimistic that it would be possible to remove the site from that List in the near future.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.9** provisionally adopted

## **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

## **Everglades National Park**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the working document summarized the report by the State Party on progress made in addressing the threats to the integrity of the property.

**IUCN** noted that the State Party had allocated significant funding to support management at the site. That was commendable. The key issue for IUCN was to give emphasis to maintain the restoration efforts along the eastern boundary of the park, to restore natural water flows and levels. It looked forward to cooperating with the State Party in moving towards a situation where the site could be considered for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Liban** signale que ce cas est très similaire à celui d'Ichkeul (Tunisie) et souhaite par conséquent que l'on demande à la Délégation des Etats-Unis d'Amérique (Observateur) d'expliquer les mesures prises pour assurer la conservation du bien grâce à un apport suffisant en eau douce.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that abundant rainfall had demonstrated that adequate freshwater flows could address the issue of salinity levels. Flood devices in Southern Florida had had the effect of restricting water flows. The conservation programme aimed to restore those flows while simultaneously protecting developed areas against flooding and providing freshwater for those who used it. Phosphorus levels needed to be further reduced. The State Party appreciated the Committee's assistance. It looks forward to working with IUCN to establish benchmarks that might permit the removal of its danger listing in the near future. US\$8.3 billion of Federal and State funding had been allocated to date, with a further US\$1.52 billion committed by the State of Florida.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that it was desirable for the Committee to see evidence of the progress being made at sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to be able to accelerate their removal from that List and to clarify its function. It was clear that in the particular case under review, progress was being made and huge amounts of money had been invested. It welcomed the move to establish benchmarks and hoped it would be possible to remove the site's danger listing at the Committee's 30th session.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** welcomed the comments of the State Party and the progress that had been made. It suggested amending paragraph 5 to reflect the aspiration that it could soon be removed from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, referring to the last paragraph of the report on the property (Document *WHC-05/29.COM/7A*, page 19 in the English version), which mentioned acquiring land, requested the Committee in its Decision to encourage the State Party of the United States of America to do so.

IUCN clarified that the benchmarks had not yet been established but that the State Party and IUCN would work jointly to establish them.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the views previously expressed, noting that some sites stayed too long on the Danger List. It was necessary to accelerate progress in addressing the threats so that sites could be removed from the Danger List at a rate commensurate with which they were put on it. For developing countries, a key issue for UNESCO's consideration was to find ways of empowering local communities around sites.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its dismay that, contrary to its previous impression, benchmarks had not yet been established, noting that the site had been in the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1993. Benchmarks played an important role in guiding the Committee in the decision-making process.

The Delegation of **India** concurred and suggested modifying paragraph 5 of the draft Decision to reflect the need for the Committee to see progress on benchmarks in order to be guided speedily towards removing the site's danger listing.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** said that there had been significant investment to date on design and engineering works to ascertain exactly what could be done to rectify the situation and to establish benchmarks. Much money had also been spent on purchasing the land it considered necessary in order to put those conclusions into practice and meet the benchmarks. It would be concerned if the Committee were to ask it to spend more money on purchases that it, as State Party, did not consider necessary.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the report had suggested that it was crucial to acquire more land for the recovery of the Everglades National Park. It added that if the acquisition of more land was not crucial, then the proposal was no longer necessary.

The **Chairperson** observed that it should be possible to merge that issue with that of benchmarks.

The **Rapporteur** did not think it could and sought clarification from the Delegation of Colombia as to whether it had withdrawn its amendment.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, supported by those of **Lebanon**, the **United Kingdom** and **New Zealand** submitted a written amendment, subsequently modified as suggested by the **Rapporteur**, to the effect that the State Party be requested to provide, by 1 February 2006, a report on how the threats had been mitigated in order to guide the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that the proposed amendment from Colombia encouraged land acquisition. That should not be problematic. However, the question

arose of whether the Committee should believe IUCN, which had said it was crucial, or the State Party, which said it had purchased all necessary land.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed discomfort with the modification suggested by the Rapporteur and requested leaving it as submitted, to urge the relevant parties to establish the benchmarks as soon as possible. It was surprising that they had yet not been established

The Delegation of **Colombia** assured the State Party of the United States of America that the Committee's intention was not to make it spend more funds, especially if that was not necessary. The role of the Committee was to focus on what was crucial.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed support for the suggestion of the Rapporteur in respect of paragraph 5, commenting that, in the absence of benchmarks at so late a stage; it might be preferable to leave the issue for the site in question.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it was prepared to agree with the Rapporteur in the interests of consensus. However, it requested that the notes record the fact that the Committee had requested benchmarks for the site at its 23rd session.

The Delegation of **India** concurred with the Rapporteur and asked IUCN to clarify its position in respect to land purchase.

**IUCN** said that the actions necessary to address the threats included land acquisition, citing the report of the National Research Council referred to in the working document.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that it had purchased substantial acreage in order to be able to restore hydrological flows.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** acquiesced with the Rapporteur on paragraph 5 but asked that its disquiet about the lack of benchmarks be entered in the record. It was prepared to give the State Party the benefit of the doubt on the issue of land purchase.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its discomfort with the procedure. It reminded Committee Members about the need to have benchmarks before removing a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Elle ajoute qu'il est possible de faire une exception, mais qu'il ne faut surtout pas généraliser au risque d'ajouter de nouvelles complications.

La Délégation du **Bénin** tient aussi à exprimer sa gêne face à l'impossibilité de faire un choix éclairé, faute d'avoir obtenu une réponse claire de la part de l'UICN. Elle demande si les informations reçues, qui sont contradictoires, sont de source fiable ou bien si elles ont été rapportées. Elle approuve le projet de décision lu par le Rapporteur, accordant le bénéfice du doute à l'Etat partie.

The **Rapporteur** said he considered that paragraph 5 was settled and that the wording suggested by Colombia could stand.

The Delegation of **India** was not entirely convinced by the explanation offered by IUCN and was also prepared to give the State Party the benefit of the doubt. Perhaps the Delegation of Colombia would now be prepared to withdraw its proposal.

The Delegation of **Colombia** explained that it would not insist on having more land acquired if that was not necessary, and therefore had no problem with withdrawing its proposal.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it was also prepared to give the State Party the benefit of the doubt. However, the Committee would expect a clear answer at its next session if it were to consider removing the site from the Danger List.

The **Rapporteur** said that as Colombia's amendment had been withdrawn the only modification to the draft Decision was that to paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.10** provisionally adopted as amended.

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### **Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 260)**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that an IUCN mission had visited the property, as requested by the Committee at its 28th session.

**IUCN** recalled that the site had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger on account of concerns about impacts associated to a road through the property, poaching and illegal grazing. The mission undertaken in February 2005 had ascertained that the road was now almost completed and that the highest possible mitigation measures had been applied. The road was 117 kilometres long, of which eight kilometres ran through the park. The mission had further ascertained that hunting and grazing levels had been reduced and that illegal timber removal was at a low level in the buffer zone. Relations with local communities were much improved. However, it noted that levels of staffing were still inadequate and there were concerns about some proposed budget reductions. Overall, the State of Conservation of the site was much improved and the report contained several specific recommendations. IUCN noted that as a success for the *Convention*.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, in light of the progress made, it and IUCN recommended removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.11** provisionally adopted.

## **Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that at its 28th session the Committee had established a series of benchmarks to be met in order for the property to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested an evaluation mission to be carried out in early 2005 to assess whether the property could be removed from that List at the current session. As limited progress had been made in respect of the benchmarks, it had been decided to postpone the mission.

**IUCN** noted that some progress appeared to have been made on benchmarks but that there were serious concerns in relation to staffing levels. The mission should address both of those issues.

La Délégation du **Liban** tient à apporter un amendement au paragraphe 4 du projet de décision, et propose que celui-ci se lise comme suit : « Demande à l'Etat partie de présenter, avant le 1er février 2006, un rapport sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations restantes formulées par la mission UICN / UNESCO de 2003 pour examen par le Comité à sa 30e session en 2006 ». Elle précise qu'il ne faut pas parler de retrait de la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril car les activités destinées à améliorer l'état de conservation du bien ne semblent pas progresser.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed concern about the progress under way, particularly on benchmarks, to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger and suggested amending paragraph 3 to express the Committee's concerns about developments which affected the outstanding universal value of the site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** shared the worries and concerns expressed and asked for more information from the State Party of Honduras.

The Observer Delegation of **Honduras** informed the Committee that its Government was making efforts to achieve the benchmarks set, and that that fact was included in a report sent to the World Heritage Centre. It added that the national authorities were working very hard towards achieving those benchmarks by the end of the year, and that there would be a need to evaluate the progress.

The Delegation of **Norway** concurred with the Delegation of the Netherlands and recommended that the State Party be encouraged to work closely with the 'Enhancing Our Heritage' project to improve communication and cooperation with stakeholders.

In summarizing, the **Rapporteur** incorporated that written amendment into to the draft Decision together with other minor changes.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.12** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its concerns about the need for benchmarks to be established as early as possible after a site had been added to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** observed that a draft Decision covering that and other issues in relation to State of Conservation reporting was being drafted for presentation at a later stage in the proceedings.

La Délégation du **Bénin** tient à adresser ses félicitations au Président et aux membres du Comité, mais rappelle qu'aucune décision n'a été prise en ce qui concerne les biens de la République démocratique du Congo, car la dernière intervention de la Délégation des Pays-Bas n'a pas été prise en considération.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to remind the Committee of the terms of the Decision on World Heritage properties in the DRC, on the understanding that it was for information only and not intended to reopen the debate.

The **Rapporteur** complied with that request.

**World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC):  
Virunga National Park (N 63), Garamba National Park (N 136), Kahuzi-Biega National Park (N 137), Salonga National Park (N 280), Okapi Wildlife Reserve (N 718)**

The **Chairperson** recalled the earlier intensive discussion on the World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the revised draft Decisions before the Committee, and invited the Rapporteur to present the relevant draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to revised draft Decision **29 COM 7A.4 Rev.**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.4Rev** provisionally adopted as amended.

**Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (proposed by Jordan) (C 148Rev)**

The **Chairperson** invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO to present the state of conservation of the World Heritage property of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls which had been nominated by Jordan.

Le **Sous-Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour la Culture** rappelle les raisons de l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 1982. Il précise au Comité que ce site est suivi par le Conseil exécutif et par la Conférence générale, avec des rapports réguliers faits à ces deux instances de l'UNESCO. Il cite notamment les rapports du Professeur Raymond Lemaire. Il poursuit en informant le Comité que, depuis la 32e session de la Conférence générale, le Directeur général de l'UNESCO a organisé une réunion d'un comité international d'experts les 26 et 27 janvier 2005, visant à préparer un plan d'action pour la sauvegarde de la vieille ville. Le rapport de cette réunion a été envoyé à tous les participants et le suivi sera effectué sous l'égide du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Il rappelle la mission accomplie en 2004 avec notamment le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Il assure le Comité que ce bien va continuer de recevoir toute l'attention de l'UNESCO. Enfin, il informe le Comité que le projet de décision **29 COM 7A.31** a fait l'objet d'un consensus entre toutes les parties concernées, avec un seul ajout au paragraphe 6 dudit projet.

The **Chairperson** requested delegations not to open the debate since all parties concerned had agreed to the amendment. He then declared Decision **29 COM 7A.31** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

**ICOMOS** endorsed the working document as an appropriate reflection of the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Japan** drew attention to the long-term conservation challenges of the property and congratulated the State Party and the World Heritage Centre for their endeavours to improve its state of conservation. It endorsed the draft Decision to maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that no date of inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was included in the English version of the working document. It acknowledged the efforts of the State Party and stressed that financial assistance should be continued.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that, during his visit to the property in November 2004, he had noted the efforts of the State Party together with the cooperation of the Government of Japan. He pointed out that the matter was of great concern to the



State Party, including its own President. He thanked the Government of Japan for its support for the rehabilitation of the property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.13** provisionally adopted.

The Vice-Chairperson (Colombia) took the chair.

### **Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 Rev)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** appelle l'attention du Président sur les contradictions qui existent entre le rapport soumis au Comité et le projet de décision **29 COM 7A.14** dans lequel est proposé le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle rappelle les principales menaces qui pèsent sur ce site : absence de mesures de délimitation et de protection de la zone tampon, absence d'un plan de gestion, pression du développement urbain, et risques d'inondation ainsi que problèmes de gestion des déchets. Elle exprime son désaccord avec le projet de décision présenté et propose que le site soit maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** endorsed the concerns of the Delegation of Lebanon, agreeing that many issues were yet to be addressed before the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger; removal should not be precipitated.

La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite obtenir des éclaircissements de la part du Secrétariat sur les contradictions évoquées par la Délégation du Liban.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** questioned how the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger without a management plan.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the reason for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was the accumulation of sand on the mosques. It sought clarification as to whether corrective measures against that threat had already been taken or not. It considered that the original reason for the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger had to be respected.

The Delegation of **India** sought clarification of paragraphs 4 and 9 of the draft Decision and asked how the documents had been prepared.

The **Chairperson** requested ICOMOS to provide clarifications.

**ICOMOS** explained that progress had been made, such as the delineation of buffer zones; however, since flooding risks remained they should be addressed by ensuring the implementation of a strategic conservation plan with a holistic approach. Such

implementation had been initiated. ICOMOS had recommended that the property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that, because the draft Decision was in error, it should be amended, as it conflicted with the ICOMOS findings.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** felt that there was a need for close cooperation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body so that they spoke with a single voice. It stressed that the Committee should provide a response to the real needs and reality of States Parties which made efforts despite difficulties in their countries. It informed the Committee that a Kenyan expert had visited the property and had been able to observe that tremendous efforts were being made by the national authorities, the local authorities and the local communities. It strongly supported the proposal to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) remercie l'UNESCO pour son aide. Elle rassure le Comité sur la volonté de son pays de voir le bien retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle détaille l'ensemble des efforts qui ont été fournis par son pays pour améliorer l'état de conservation du bien, notamment les actions entreprises par la ville de Tombouctou concernant la détermination de la zone tampon autour des mosquées et des mausolées. Elle informe également le Comité que le bien est situé dans un ensemble urbain ancien inscrit au classement national. Elle rappelle une information déjà communiquée dans le rapport du Secrétariat, à savoir que l'ensablement, raison d'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, ne représente plus un danger. Enfin, elle fait savoir au Comité que, même s'il n'y a pas de plan de gestion, un plan sommaire de conservation a été élaboré avec l'expertise de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated that, to relocate the property to the World Heritage List, more conditions should be met. It asked the World Heritage Centre to continue its support.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted the existence of a benchmark for the property. It therefore proposed that the site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger but that there be a close monitoring of the situation at the 30th session of the World heritage Committee.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** pointed out that the draft Decision had not been prepared on the basis of the views of experts and doubted the quality of the draft Decision. It stressed that the Committee worked on the basis of working documents prepared by the World Heritage Centre. It strongly requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to redraft draft Decisions on the basis of experts' reports.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, endorsing the statements of the Observer Delegations of Mali and Kenya, felt that paragraph 9 was correct. It suggested that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger but should be continuously and closely monitored.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** admitted that there was a discrepancy between the point of view of ICOMOS and the draft Decision prepared. He informed the Committee that he had assessed the property, and that the property nominated was not the City of Timbuktu as a whole, but three mosques and 16 other minor elements. They were threatened by sand accumulation and had lacked a buffer zone, and were in great need of protective measures against floods. Local Imams were capable of maintaining those mosques, but needed financial assistance. Some threats certainly remained, but similar threats existed in other sites which were not even on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He reported that the necessary buffer zone was now in place and that a management plan was to be developed for the entire buffer zone, which incorporated the whole city, but he doubted the necessity of asking for a management plan for the inscribed monuments only. There was no error in the draft Decision, although he regretted that there was some discrepancy with the viewpoints of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **India** said that this was a dark day for the Committee: the credibility of the Committee's work was jeopardized when the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS did not speak with one voice. The explanation given by the Director of the World Heritage Centre should have been reflected in the working document. The same guidelines should be followed for all States Parties, regardless of their developing situation. It expressed disappointment that the Advisory Body had not agreed with the draft Decision. It also supported the statement of the Delegation of South Africa.

La Délégation du **Liban** précise que de son point de vue, l'inscription d'un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, tout aussi bien que son retrait de cette même Liste, doit être effectuée par le Comité avec beaucoup de soin. Elle insiste sur la nécessité du respect des procédures afin de permettre au Comité de prendre des décisions claires et sans ambiguïtés.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said it did not share the view that it was a dark day nor a clear one, but rather with shades. The Delegation noted, after listening to the State Party of Mali, that there was a clear commitment towards the protection of the property

The Delegation of **China** supported removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, commended the State Party for its great efforts, and underlined the need for enforced corrective measures.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** considered that the oral report of the State Party and the Director of the World Heritage Centre explained the real situation as well as the actions taken. It supported the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Colombia** requested the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to recall, for the benefit of the members of the Committee, the reason why the site had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1990. Such clarification could help

the Committee members to reach agreement as to whether the property should be removed from that List or maintained.

La Délégation du **Bénin** reconnaît la complexité du débat qui, de son point de vue, crée des différences de point de vue entre les membres du Comité. Elle partage l'avis des autres membres sur la nature incomplète du rapport. Elle souhaite qu'à l'avenir le Secrétariat et les organes consultatifs produisent des rapports qui soient un peu plus en harmonie. Elle rappelle ensuite que si le bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, ce n'était pas pour pénaliser l'Etat partie, mais plutôt pour l'aider à endiguer le péril. Elle fait remarquer aux membres du Comité que quand un Etat partie entreprend une série d'actions dont l'impact semble reconnu à la fois par l'ICOMOS, le Secrétariat et le Comité, et surtout lorsque ce même Etat s'engage à les poursuivre, le Comité, en guise d'encouragement, devrait retirer le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. La Délégation précise en outre que même s'il a été constaté certains décalages entre les points de vue du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS, le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui a personnellement effectué la dernière mission à Tombouctou, apporte des clarifications qui satisfont le Bénin, et qui confirment la nécessité de retirer ce bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stressed that the evaluation of ICOMOS was important and that the role of the Advisory Bodies in providing technical advice to the Committee must be ensured. It had misgivings about the World Heritage Centre's mission to the property to decide on the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It proposed that ICOMOS should be requested to evaluate the property and that the Committee should reconsider in 2006 whether the removal was warranted or not.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the original reasons for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should have been clearly benchmarked, and that all benchmarks had to be met before removal of the property from the Danger List. It regretted that the World Heritage Centre had apparently not realized that the positive draft Decision presented to the State Party was in contradiction with the findings of ICOMOS. It proposed three options: 1. to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger until every condition was met; 2. to dispatch an ICOMOS mission to conduct an on-site evaluation of the state of conservation of the property; 3. to follow the recommendation of the draft Decision to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger with conditions to be met by next year. It felt that option 2 was the most appropriate.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his comments, which should have been reflected in the document and agreed to by the Advisory Body. It supported option 2 proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, which would cause no prejudice to the State Party.

The Delegation of **India** supported option 3 proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, as it reflected the sympathy expressed to the State Party by the Africa Region,

which shared its vision. It considered, however, that the Danger List should not be always taken as negative.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** wondered whether ICOMOS had been given the information which the Director of the World Heritage Centre had shared with the Committee.

A la lumière des interventions précédentes, la Délégation du **Liban** constate que le danger d'ensablement aurait donc disparu il y a plus d'un an et s'étonne que cette disparition n'ait jamais été portée à la connaissance du Comité. Elle souhaite comprendre pourquoi le site a continué à figurer sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

**ICOMOS** emphasized that the retention of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not negative. It asserted the need for support for the five-year comprehensive plan which had been drawn up by a regional meeting held on the property in July 2004 to address the threats which the city of Timbuktu faced, such as flooding, and stressed that paragraph 8 was of particular importance. A way forward should be found to implement the major programme. ICOMOS stated that there was in fact no great difference between the points of view of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. The property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger not because of the lack of a management plan but because of real threats which no longer existed.

La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite savoir quand l'ICOMOS a visité le bien pour la dernière fois et si cette mission était plus récente que celle du Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle exprime sa grande déception suite à l'intervention de la Délégation du Liban. De son point de vue, le Directeur du Centre possède bel et bien l'expertise lui permettant d'évaluer la situation de Tombouctou. Elle précise également que le Comité a déjà, dans le passé, pris des décisions contraires à celles des organisations consultatives. Sur la question des activités de conservation, elle fait savoir au Comité que le rapport du Centre montre une implication importante de la communauté, et que cette participation des communautés à la conservation des mosquées est un argument supplémentaire en faveur du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that there were no criteria for inscribing properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and for considering their removal. It requested the Advisory Bodies to produce reports specifying at what stage a property might be inscribed on the Danger List and be removed.

Following the clarifications by the Director of World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and the State Party, the Delegation of **Colombia** supported the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** raised an objection to the comments made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

La Délégation du **Liban** précise que lors de son intervention, il n'y avait aucune attaque personnelle contre une délégation particulière. Elle poursuit en expliquant que le véritable problème réside dans la nature du rapport qui a été fourni aux membres du Comité. De son point de vue, ce rapport, au lieu d'insister sur les raisons pour lesquelles le retrait était souhaité, a plutôt insisté sur les menaces encore présentes dans le site. Elle ajoute en outre que le véritable problème dont il est question est celui de deux avis contradictoires entre le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS sur la question du retrait, mais également sur l'absence d'une logique entre le rapport et le projet de décision proposé.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that the property might deserve to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, but pointed out that high standards must be observed in the Committee's working procedures [and the members of ICOMOS should stop contradicting each other and get their act together](#).

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO.

Le **représentant du Directeur général de l'UNESCO** reconnaît qu'il y a eu un disfonctionnement dans la coordination de la préparation du rapport entre l'ICOMOS et le Secrétariat. De son point de vue, il faudrait tirer des leçons du débat du Comité sur le retrait ou non de Tombouctou de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Il rappelle en outre au Comité que sa mission première est la préservation de la valeur universelle des biens inscrits, et que sur cette base, une décision de retrait accompagnée de recommandations précises pourrait être adoptée par le Comité.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** repeated its proposal of three options for the draft Decision, and made it clear that after listening to the debates it now supported option 3, requiring certain conditions to be met, to be reported on to the following session of the Committee.

The Delegations of **Norway, South Africa** and the **Russian Federation** supported the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Delegation of the United Kingdom but reiterated its request to the Advisory Bodies to provide a report on the reasons why properties were inscribed on and removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its wish to see the new information and comments provided by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and by the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO attached to the minutes of the session.

La Délégation du **Liban** appuie elle aussi la troisième option proposée par la Délégation du Royaume-Uni, et propose que le rapport sur l'état de conservation soit amendé de manière à refléter toutes les discussions qui ont eu lieu entre les membres du Comité.

La Délégation du **Bénin**, tout en soutenant elle aussi la troisième option proposée par la Délégation du Royaume-Uni, suggère que l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Liban, inclue les éléments d'information fournis successivement par le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial et le Président de l'ICOMOS. Par ailleurs, elle invite le Secrétariat à essayer autant que possible d'effectuer ses missions sur les sites du patrimoine mondial en compagnie des représentants de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO for his constructive remarks and endorsed the third option proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the Delegation of the United Kingdom, adding that a final report was crucial to support the Decision.

The **Chairperson** announced that the Rapporteur and the Delegation of the United Kingdom would redraft the Decision and report to the Committee during the morning meeting of the following day.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.

## FOURTH DAY

### SIXTH MEETING

Wednesday 13 July 2005

09.30 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its sixth meeting, the Committee continued to evaluate the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Note du Rapporteur : Lors de sa 6e réunion, le Comité a poursuivi l'évaluation des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

#### ITEM 7A EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continued)

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/7A  
WHC-05/29.COM/7A.Add

*Decisions :* from 29 COM 7A.1 to 29 COM 7A.31

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of item 7A.

#### **Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C144)**

The World Heritage Centre presented the state of conservation of the property and provided some clarification of the breakdown of financial assistance for the tourism development plan, to which various donors have contributed since 2001, as outlined in Document WHC-05/29.COM/7A. A total amount of USD 838,000 has already been received: through a bilateral agreement between the Government of France and the



United Republic of Tanzania (USD 600,000) as well as through the joint action of UNESCO and Tanzania which have mobilized USD 238,000. The Government of Japan has also requested Tanzania to submit a proposal for the conservation of the property, and at the time of the Committee, USD 600,000 were being mobilized. Finally, an amount of USD 70,836 has been granted from the Norway Funds in Trust for Emergency Assistance in 2005. The total amount devoted to the conservation of the property is then of USD 1,508,836.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party for its efforts to achieve progress and invited experts from Tanzania to participate in a meeting to be held in Coimbra, Portugal, entitled “World Heritage of Portuguese Heritage”, to share expertise with other international experts.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Governments of Japan, France and Norway, and commended the State Party for its efforts to establish the conservation plan.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie la communauté internationale, et plus particulièrement la France et la Norvège, pour leur élan de solidarité visant à assister la Tanzanie dans ses efforts de conservation du bien. Elle remercie également la Tanzanie pour la conscience patrimoniale dont ce pays a fait preuve, vu les efforts qu’il a déployés depuis l’inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle appuie le projet de décision tel que soumis dans le rapport sur l’état de conservation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commended progress from the previous year and suggested setting a date for the assessment of the management plan to ensure its efficiency with a view to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** stated that the State Party was addressing the remaining threats, notably of sea wave erosion. It appealed for further international assistance. It thanked the Governments of France and Japan as well as the World Heritage Centre, and extended its appreciation to the Government of Norway which had recently indicated its commitment to assist. It took note of the invitation of the Delegation of Portugal.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.15** provisionally adopted.

### **Tipasa (Algérie) (C 193)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente le rapport sur l’état de conservation du bien.

The Delegation of **Chile** sought clarification from the State Party on the actions it had taken to improve the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** acknowledged the work done by the State Party, and expressed an interest in hearing its comments.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** (Observateur) remercie le Chili et le Portugal pour leur invitation à écouter ses arguments. Pour la Délégation, le retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril serait un signal fort du Comité vis-à-vis des efforts fournis par les autorités nationales en vue d'améliorer la situation du bien. Elle informe le Comité que Tipasa est une circonscription qui tire ses revenus des activités liés au tourisme culturel et à l'agriculture. La Délégation remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pour leurs analyses et rassure le Comité en certifiant que les autorités algériennes sont parfaitement conscientes des menaces. Elle s'engage à présenter au Comité un rapport sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations formulées dans le projet de décision **29 COM 7A.16**, et saisit cette occasion pour inviter une mission d'experts de l'ICOMOS et de l'UICN à venir constater sur place les efforts consentis. Enfin, la Délégation rappelle l'appartenance de l'Algérie à l'Union africaine et au Groupe africain chargé de la rédaction de l'exposé de principe africain sur le patrimoine mondial de l'Afrique. Elle demande à bénéficier de l'assistance du Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'Afrique une fois que celui-ci sera opérationnel.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked whether ICOMOS might be requested to respond to the additional oral information given by the State Party.

**ICOMOS** explained that there were one or two steps yet to be taken before the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Legal protection and the buffer zone were still necessary as well as a plan to coordinate the interface between conservation and management and to ensure long-term protection.

The Delegation of **China** said that the State Party's efforts should be acknowledged and the site removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie la Délégation du Portugal qui a proposé de donner la parole à la Délégation de l'Algérie (Observateur). Elle constate que la plupart des menaces semblent endiguées, et que cela devrait être encouragé par le Comité, en attendant l'examen des phases d'étude du plan de protection et de mise en valeur.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party for its efforts and stressed that the establishment of legislation was important even though that involved a lengthy process in some parts of the world. It supported the State Party's wish to have the property removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** encouraged the efforts of the State Party and supported removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said it observed clear progress in the situation of the property. It recalled that six benchmarks had been set at the Committee's 28th session, of which only two had clearly been met. It pointed out that benchmarks should be kept to, and that an ICOMOS mission should visit the property for evaluation before, and not after, possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Liban** note que parmi les menaces identifiées se trouve la question de l'urbanisation croissante et incontrôlée. De son point de vue, l'absence d'un plan de protection et de mise en valeur risque de conduire une nouvelle fois à la dégradation du site dans le futur. Elle propose au Comité de maintenir le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en attendant l'élaboration de ce plan. Mais si le Comité prend la décision de retirer le bien de cette Liste au cours de cette session, il faudrait assortir cette décision d'une condition aux termes de laquelle un plan de protection et de mise en valeur devrait être établi faute de quoi le site serait automatiquement réinscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the statement of the Delegation of Lebanon, and suggested that the removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger should proceed on condition that the management plan would be submitted.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the statement of the Delegation of the United Kingdom. All benchmarks set should be met before removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and no exception should be made. If the Committee was to maintain its standards of professionalism, it should adhere to the conditions laid down.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It considered that inscription and removal from the List should not proceed on conditional terms.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the statements of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the Delegation of the United Kingdom and noted that at least two benchmarks were not fully met in this case. At the same time, the Delegation stated that the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not a penalty; it was rather an opportunity to reflect on and deal with the issues appropriately. It suggested that ICOMOS' visit to the property during the following year might lead to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined the fact that the State Party had made efforts, and that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, but should be assessed and monitored closely on the understanding that it could be inscribed again on the Danger List if conditions were not met.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that sound arguments had been put forward by the Committee and that the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger should not be undertaken in haste. It suggested an amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, with the addition of an invitation to a WHC/ICOMOS mission to assess the possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006.

La Délégation du **Liban** appuie la suggestion de la Délégation du Portugal.

**ICOMOS** affirmed that it would be happy to undertake such a mission.

Le **Sous-Directeur général de l'UNESCO pour la culture** rappelle les différents contacts qui existent entre l'UNESCO et les autorités algériennes. Il appuie l'invitation formulée par la Délégation de l'Algérie (Observateur) de recevoir une mission conjointe de l'UICN et de l'ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.16** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

**ICOMOS** stated that no action had been taken on the property and that an expert mission was needed, which it would willingly undertake.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its concern that the outstanding universal value of the property was in jeopardy and considered that its remaining values should be evaluated.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its deep concern and its readiness to take action to improve of the state of conservation of the property. It expressed its wish for assistance from the international community, such as had been proposed for Abomey, and recalled the value of the property as a transition between Ancient Egypt and Christian Egypt. It would prefer to submit a progress report in 2007 instead of 2006, considering the time and resources required to be able to meet the conditions.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its concern about the state of conservation of the property. It also appealed for international attention and stressed that a mission should take place as soon as possible, at least within the next two months.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its serious concern about the deterioration of the property. A report in 2007 would not be acceptable, and should be submitted in 2006. It agreed that a mission should be dispatched and that it should report on whether the site is still of outstanding universal value for the Committee to decide whether it should remain on the World Heritage List in Danger or even on the World Heritage List. The Delegation indicated that it was preparing an amendment to the draft Decision to that end.

The Delegation of **South Africa** endorsed the proposal for an urgent mission to assess the real state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed to the proposal of the Delegation of Saint Lucia to dispatch an expert mission, and suggested that such a mission should be

given a mandate to assess the outstanding universal value of the property and to recommend corrective measures.

La Délégation du **Bénin** note qu'il s'agit d'un bien unique qui mérite une attention particulière. Elle s'interroge sur l'aspect pratique de l'organisation de la mission dans les deux mois qui vont suivre la fin de la 29<sup>e</sup> session. De son point de vue, l'Etat partie n'aura pas le temps de préparer un rapport sérieux avant le 1<sup>er</sup> février 2006. Elle propose que le délai soit exceptionnellement porté au mois d'avril 2006. Enfin, elle appelle la communauté internationale à assister l'Etat partie dans ses efforts.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its surprise that no measures had been taken since the property had been inscribed in 1979. It considered that further excavation work should be carried out at the property to provide more in-depth research on its value.

The Delegation of **India** appealed for the international community to assist the State Party. It supported the wishes of the State Party, and suggested that the draft Decision mention the need for International Assistance.

**ICOMOS** explained that rising groundwater was a threat for many archaeological properties and that a thorough examination of the solution should be carried out in conjunction with high-level professionals.

The **Rapporteur** recalled the proposed amendments to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Argentina** suggested, as Benin had done, that it might be preferable for a report to be submitted on 1 April 2006 rather than 1 February 2006.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested adding the establishment of an emergency plan to the mandate of the mission.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that a programme of corrective measures with a view to removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger be adopted by the Committee in 2006, and that that should be clearly mentioned in the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** said that the date of submission of the progress report would be set at 1 February 2006, since the monitoring mission would be visiting the property within two months.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.17** provisionally adopted as amended.

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

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

**ICOMOS** added that it did not know whether the dam in question had already been constructed or not.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO** informed the Committee that the International Coordination Committee for Iraqi cultural heritage had met in June 2005. He regretted that, owing to the current security situation, it had not been possible to send United Nations missions of late, but noted that progress for the conservation of cultural heritage was expected as a result of the successful training and contracting of Iraqi experts. He reported that he had visited the property in July 2003 and that UNESCO was making efforts towards improving the situation. He thanked the donor countries and informed the Committee that 45 vehicles had been bought for site inspection and that the training of local experts was an important component of the activities. The construction of a dam had been proposed and planned during the Saddam Hussein regime but the present regime would not be proceeding with it. UNESCO was waiting for written confirmation from the State Party in that regard.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.18** provisionally adopted.

### **Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** confirme que le bien est dans une situation difficile. Il informe le Comité du développement rapide de l'habitat moderne dans la vieille ville, et précise que cette accélération est due à des choix non appropriés de la part des autorités locales. En conclusion, il précise que des recommandations visant à stopper cette expansion rapide ont été formulées par le Centre et transmises auxdites autorités.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.19** provisionally adopted.

### **Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C211 Rev)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the revised draft Decision and the state of conservation of the property as updated since the drafting of the working document. It informed the Committee that a mission, which had taken place in May-June 2005 had discovered that a new road was being constructed along the Hari River in the vicinity of the property. That was exactly the location that UNESCO had advised against during its mission in 2004.

**ICOMOS** reported that significant progress had been achieved since the previous year in the consolidation works to prevent the leaning of the minaret. It further reported that the road construction was indeed a threat to the integrity of the property and that the project was being revised by the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.20** provisionally adopted as amended.

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

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property and further acknowledged the work accomplished by the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties of Japan for the *Key issues for the establishment of a Comprehensive Management Plan 2004* which had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre during the session.

**ICOMOS** stated that the threats affecting the site were being addressed. It added that the State Party had expressed the wish to receive support for preparation of an urban development plan, and that Aachen University, in Germany, was providing assistance in that regard.

The Delegation of **Japan** stressed the very difficult situation in Afghanistan, to which should be added the forthcoming elections in the autumn. While no legal authority or regulatory framework existed in the State Party to ensure the protection of the property, it was not possible to wait for such a framework to be in place if the site was to be preserved. In that context, UNESCO should have played a strong role to ensure guidance and coordination.

The Delegation of **India** encouraged protective action for the property and congratulated the Government of Japan on its support. It suggested that an appeal be made to the international community to support efforts to safeguard the cultural heritage of the site, and that that be reflected in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its satisfaction at the progress made on the site, but it suggested that a programme of corrective measures and benchmarks for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger be defined and presented to the following session of the Committee in 2006.

**ICOMOS** pointed out that differences in terminology such as “master plan” and “management plan” could cause confusion to the State Party, and suggested amending the draft Decision to ensure consistency.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO** informed the Committee that a programme specialist for culture had been appointed at the UNESCO Office in Kabul while the programme specialist for culture at the UNESCO Cluster Office in Teheran would also be able to provide assistance to the property. UNESCO’s action to safeguard the Afghan cultural heritage was greatly reinforced in that way.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.21** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property as well as new information concerning the results of a mission carried out in May 2005, thanks to the financial support of the French Government. The mission had been organized to test a methodology for urban conservation while training a number of local technicians and staff from concerned institutions, with a view to the elaboration of a comprehensive management plan for the property.

**ICOMOS** explained that the definition of the property in the original nomination was a Group of Monuments. However, in the light of recent studies, more consideration should have been given to the significance of the surrounding cultural landscape. It recommended therefore that the management plan currently under preparation should give priority to ensuring the effective protection and presentation of the inscribed property, but in future integrate also other values referring to the broader context.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee and the World Heritage Centre for their support in the protection of the property. It stressed its great effort to implement all the past recommendations by UNESCO missions and to comply with Committee requests, and accordingly suggested amending paragraph 5. It hoped that, through the continued efforts of relevant authorities, the property would be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the following session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **China** commended the State Party for its efforts, notably for having established a management authority for the property. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India. It hoped that the property would be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the following session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **South Africa** sought clarification on whether or not the reduction of the size of the commercial complex being built within the site would significantly mitigate its negative impact.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the design and the size of the complex, which had in fact been considerably modified through consultations with the State Party, was not the real issue. As for the bridge, the problem was rather the lack of any building and land-use regulations within the area defined to ensure the protection of its heritage and landscape value, which created a situation of continuous potential risk. Moreover, the development of a pole of attraction in the vicinity of the temples, in the absence of clear land-use regulations, might have sparked uncontrolled development along the main roads crossing the site.

La Délégation du **Bénin** félicite l'Etat partie pour la qualité de la coopération qu'il a mise en place avec l'UNESCO. Elle considère que cette coopération est un modèle à suivre, et soutient par ailleurs l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Inde au paragraphe 5 du projet de décision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment.



The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.22** provisionally adopted as amended.

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

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property, referring to the working document distributed to the Committee. It explained that the site, which had been inscribed by the Committee in 2004, corresponded to an area of 2300 hectares, while the text of the nomination file referred to an initial submission for 80 hectares. That situation had to be corrected by the State Party by preparing a revised nomination with a description for the entire property inscribed as well as appropriate management provisions. The World Heritage Centre provided further information concerning a technical meeting that had taken place in Rome in May 2005, with participants from Iran, Italy and other countries, to review all the points raised in the working document.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested clarification of the difference between the area of the property inscribed (25 ha) and the much larger area (about 230 ha) indicated in the nomination file. The Delegation also considered necessary to have a set of benchmarks, corrective measures and a time framework for the possible removal of Bam from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that in 2004 the Committee had agreed to inscribe the larger area which had been recommended by the ICOMOS evaluator following the visit to the site, but that the State Party had not been able to update the dossier, hence the discrepancy. Concerning the requirements to remove Bam from the World Heritage List in Danger, the issue was very complex, as a vision for the rehabilitation of the property following the earthquake had not yet been determined.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) rappelle au Comité qu'une réunion a été organisée à Rome (Italie) afin de donner suite aux recommandations formulées par le Comité au moment de l'inscription du bien, lors de la 28<sup>e</sup> session. Au cours de cette réunion, un certain nombre de projets ont été examinés, et l'Italie a pris l'engagement d'en financer plusieurs. La Délégation rappelle au Comité et à l'ensemble des pays représentés la nécessité de financer la mise en œuvre des différents projets présentés au cours de cette réunion.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** thanked the Governments of Italy and Japan as well as the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their cooperation in the safeguarding of Bam. It expressed its commitment and readiness to undertake all necessary actions.

**ICOMOS** specified that the extended nomination of Bam included the important traditional Qanats irrigation system.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.23** provisionally adopted.

## **Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property as well as some of the maps showing the ongoing redefinition of the boundaries of core and buffer zones which had been provided by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended the World Heritage Centre for the rapid and substantive response to the Decision of the 28th session of the Committee. It sought clarification as to why the revised boundaries had not been submitted to the Committee at the current session, although it appeared that much of the work had been accomplished.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that the initiatives were still ongoing, and had not yet been finalized by the time of the 29th session.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its satisfaction about the preservation of the outstanding universal value of the property, and asked for clarification as to what procedure should have been followed for the change of the name of the property.

The **World Heritage Centre** referred to paragraph 167 of the *Operational Guidelines*, describing the procedure for requesting the Committee to authorize a change of name of a World Heritage property.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose que, dans le paragraphe 4 du projet de décision **29 COM 7A.24**, l'expression «modification du nom» soit utilisée au lieu de «modification mineure».

The Delegation of **Japan** commended the State Party and the World Heritage Centre for the great efforts made. The protection of traditional landscape in rapidly developing countries was a question to be addressed for many other properties, and solutions should be sought.

The Delegation of **India** commended the achievements of the State Party and of the World Heritage Centre. It wondered what would be the opinion of the State Party on the possibility of changing the name of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed great appreciation of the progress made on the property, and joined the Delegation of Saint Lucia in requesting explanations as to why the proposal for the redefinition of the boundaries could not have been presented to its 29th session. It suggested an amendment to the draft Decision to incorporate a request to identify ways and resources required to monitor the effectiveness of the management system and legislation put in place.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Committee, and reiterated its commitment to respond to the recommendations of the Committee. It affirmed that all recommendations of the Committee would be taken seriously. Concerning the reason why the revised boundaries had not yet been presented, it explained that the seven monument zones inscribed were located in five

different municipalities, requiring therefore a complex consultative process. On the issue of the change of the name of the property, the decision of the Committee would have been accepted by the State Party of Nepal.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** agreed to the suggestion of the Delegation of Lebanon that the name of the property be modified, and suggested that consideration might be given to “Historic Monument Zones of the Kathmandu valley”.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the proposed amendments and suggested including a reference to the deadline of 1 February 2006 for the submission of redefined boundaries as well as a new name for the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed an amendment to the draft Decision, requesting the State Party to submit “legally redefined core and buffer zones of the property”.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled the provisions of paragraph 167 of the *Operational Guidelines* which provided that States Parties requesting authorization to change the name of a property should submit a proposal in writing at least three months before the session.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.24** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C171-172)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted that cooperation between the Government of Norway and the UNESCO Office in Islamabad contributed to the protection of the property. It requested a joint mission by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to evaluate the state of conservation of the property with a view to its possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that there were still measures to be taken and suggested a mission by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to the site to recommend to the 30th session of the Committee a set of corrective measures that would be necessary to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The **Chairperson** declared the Decision **29 COM 7A.25** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C722)**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property and provided new information concerning the findings of a mission which had been undertaken by a hydro-engineering expert and a staff member from the UNESCO Bangkok Office to assess the impact of a flood control project recently executed. The mission had found that the walls erected to control the floods were structurally inadequate and had a negative impact on the aesthetic quality of the landscape. A series of mitigation measures had been recommended, including some involving the use of bioengineering techniques. It further reported that a management plan had indeed been prepared by the State Party, but could not be operational as no institution was responsible for its implementation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the State Party for responding to the recommendations of the 2001 mission, and requested that that be reflected in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision. It also suggested that a reference to the recommendations of the UNESCO mission of May 2005 be included in paragraph 5.

La Délégation du **Bénin** félicite l'Etat partie pour les progrès significatifs accomplis depuis la mission UICN/ICOMOS. Elle suggère que soit rajouté au paragraphe 4 du projet de décision **29 COM 7A.26**, le terme «UNESCO» afin d'apporter des précisions sur l'organisation qui a effectué la mission. De son point de vue, il a souvent été observé que lorsque l'UNESCO appuie les efforts d'un Etat partie, l'intérêt pour le patrimoine s'en trouve renouvelé. Enfin, elle rappelle aux membres du Comité les raisons de l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.26** provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.



## FOURTH DAY

### SEVENTH MEETING

Wednesday 13 July 2005

03.00 pm – 08.30 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its seventh meeting, the Committee finished the evaluation of the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and started the evaluation of the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Note du Rapporteur : Lors de sa 7e réunion, le Comité a achevé l'évaluation des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et a débuté l'évaluation des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

#### ITEM 7A EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES : STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER (continued)

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/7A  
WHC-05/29.COM/7A.ADD

*Decisions:* from 29 COM 7A.1 to 29 COM 7A.31

The **Chairperson** announced that the evening session would end at 8 p.m. and invited the World Heritage Centre to present the state of conservation report on Butrint (Albania).

#### **Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that there were two options in the draft Decision based on the findings of the

UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission to the site of March 2005, the first of which involved retaining the property on the List and the second of which involved removing it. While considerable progress had been made and most of the problems which had led to the inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1997 had been addressed, some members of the mission had considered that the updated management plan would have to be submitted before the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that looting had already stopped in 1998, and that it disagreed with the statement in the working document that the management plan for Butrint could not be considered to be either a practical and efficient working tool because it had not been officially adopted. It sought the opinion of the Advisory Bodies on the situation, but considered that the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger since the original reasons for its inclusion were no longer relevant.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party on the efforts made in improving the state of conservation of the property and supported the position of the Delegation of the United Kingdom that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger (the “Option 2” in the draft Decision), since most of the corrective measures required had been undertaken. It also sought comments from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Chile** endorsed the positions of the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Portugal.

**ICCROM**, which had been a part of the mission in March 2005, said, with the backing of **ICOMOS**, that it supported the position of the Delegation of the United Kingdom and confirmed that the original reasons for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger no longer existed. The Committee needed to be rigorous in clearly identifying necessary corrective measures to be undertaken when inscribing sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** said that there was a consensus in the Committee that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de l'**Albanie** (Observateur) tient tout d'abord à remercier le pays hôte pour son accueil et se félicite du travail accompli par le Comité du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que par les organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'énergie déployée en vue de protéger le bien. Elle déclare en outre son engagement à présenter vers la fin de l'année un plan de gestion révisé et détaillé pour examen par le Comité. Elle précise enfin que toutes les structures de sauvegarde sont en place et qu'il n'y a plus de construction qui mette en péril le bien.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended to delete Option 1 and retain Option 2.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.27** provisionally adopted as amended.

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

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to present the state of conservation report on the Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan).

The **World Heritage Centre** said that it had no new information to add.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.28** provisionally adopted.

### **Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292rev)**

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to present the state of conservation report on Cologne Cathedral (Germany).

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that although a definition of a buffer zone had been discussed by the working group established by the State Party, that definition had not been submitted officially to the Committee for approval. A slide submitted at the time of inscription indicated a buffer zone which consisted of a zone including the neighborhood of the cathedral, the railway station and half of the bridge. According to the World Heritage Centre, a fax dated 12 June 1996 from the Ministry for Urban Development, Cultural Affairs and Sports (*Ministerium für Stadtentwicklung, Kultur und Sport des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*) in Düsseldorf had said that the "Lower Historical Monuments Authority" in the City of Cologne, which was responsible for the protection of the historical monuments and sites in the town, had established special protection for the Cathedral and its surroundings. There could be no change in the buildings in the greater neighborhood without the express authorization of that Authority. Protection of the Cathedral's surrounds came under the "Historical Monuments Protection and Preservation Act" of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia dated 11 March 1980. The Ministry for Urban Development, Cultural Affairs and Sports, who was responsible for the protection and the preservation of historical monuments and sites in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia, had instructed the municipal council of Cologne to take care of the city's panorama especially with regard to the Cathedral. All municipal planning had to take into account the interests of the visual integrity of the Cathedral and its environment.

No hard copy map indicating any zones of protection or buffer zone had been on file when the Committee had examined the state of conservation of the property at its 28th session, and therefore the Cathedral building alone had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger without a buffer zone. A letter dated 15 April 2005 had been sent to the State Party as part of the World Heritage Centre's retrospective inventory project requesting a cadastral map of the property and of any planned buffer zone. The World Heritage Centre concluded that no buffer zone had been officially adopted by the World Heritage Committee, but that the State Party was in the process



of establishing one and the revised boundary would have to be examined through the normal procedure for minor boundary changes.

The World Heritage Centre further informed the Committee that the City of Cologne had presented the issues relating to visual impact and height of buildings in respect of proposed construction projects in the City at the Conference “World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture: Managing the Historic Urban Landscape” (12-14 May 2005, Vienna, Austria). An evaluation of the August 2003 visual impact study of the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning of the RWTH Aachen University had been presented during the Conference in Vienna, stating changes in the urban policy concerning (a) the number of towers to be built on the right bank of the Rhine (two instead of five), (b) the height of certain construction projects on the left bank of the Rhine, though not of the towers on the river’s right bank, and (c) the future effort to define a special “due care” area.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee of a letter in German dated 30 June 2005 from the representative of the City of Cologne, recalling measures taken by the City concerning (a) preparation for the establishment of a buffer zone around the cathedral for the protection of the Rhine River panoramic view and the churches; (b) preparation for the establishment of a “due care” area for the inner city and the urban additions of the nineteenth century as well as the right bank of the river protecting the visual impact of the cathedral; (c) definition of a height restriction for the left bank for future construction projects; (d) development of a checklist specifically for the high-rise concept; (e) a review of projects on the right bank, including urban competition for north of the railway; (f) a skyscraper south of the railway, which had met all legal requirements and could not be changed without incurring major financial claims from the investor.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that, after the decision taken by the 28th Session of the Committee to inscribe the Cologne Cathedral on the list of World Heritage in Danger and after attending the meeting with the Mayor of Cologne and the Minister of Culture of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia during the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee, some members of the Committee decided to visit the City of Cologne in order to better understand the situation on the ground. It reported to the Committee that the Cathedral itself was in good condition with regular rehabilitation work and that the monument with its two towers was the icon of the city, dominating the urban landscape over the Rhine and visible from a long distance since, with few exceptions, the main corpus of the city has developed to heights that do not compete with the prominence of the Cathedral. The delegation further explained that, despite the decision taken by the Committee at its 28th Session, one of the four towers foreseen by the project around ICE terminal was close to completion and that the building permit for the second tower was due to be delivered in August or September 2005. It emphasized that the location of the proposed project was an ancient industrial area that was undergoing major changes, with plenty of vacant land where an urban development project could be undertaken with lower constructions that would offer the same floor space, thus transforming what is now a left over space into a lively quarter of the city. The Delegation further declared that the availability of land space has been confirmed by all stakeholders consulted during the visit, including city officials, developers, urban planners and the Mayor of Cologne. It concluded that the

reason for the high rise development was to provide iconic office building towers facing the towers of Cologne cathedral. The Delegation also referred to the visual impact study prepared by the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning of the RWTH Aachen University and read out part of the assessment which concluded that, since the planned constructions would “significantly reduce the visual prominence of the monument (...) it is recommended that the City of Cologne refrains from all high rise building construction”. All those consulted during the visit considered that the problem lies in the fact that no adequate buffer zone had been defined at the time of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation further informed the Committee that, upon consultation of the original nomination file, it appears that ICOMOS had strongly insisted upon having a clear delimitation of a buffer zone, in order to protect the property from the threats of construction projects that were already planned at the time examination by the Committee of the nomination file. In answer to this demand, the State party informed the Committee, during the Bureau Meeting on 24-29 June 1996, of its firm commitment to “set up a special protection of the Cathedral and its surroundings”, whereby “no changing of the buildings in the greater neighbourhood is allowed without a definite concession by responsible authorities(...) and all municipal planning is to be checked up with the interest of the invulnerability of the Cathedral and its environment” (additional information contained in the fax sent by the Ministry for Urban development, Cultural Affairs and Sports in Dusseldorf on 12 June 1996 and already mentioned by the World Heritage Centre). The Delegation further added that the decision of the Committee in its 20th session in Merida to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List includes a specific recommendation to set up “protective legislation which would insure that new constructions around the property would be in conformity with the architectural significance of the Cathedral”

The Delegation concluded that, since the high rise buildings project is in total contradiction with the State Party commitments and the recommendations of the Committee at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, if no action was taken to stop immediately this project it would be a typical case for deletion in the terms of paragraphs 116 and 194 of the *Operational Guidelines* of the *Convention*. Following a similar rationale that the one applied by the Committee for the historic centre of Vienna, the Delegation proposed a detailed amendment to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it had serious concerns as to the possible impact of the proposed high-rise project on the World Heritage property but considered that the Committee did not have enough information to assess the situation properly.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the property should definitely be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Having made a reference to the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture, it reiterated the importance of setting a buffer zone for the property.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon and sought the opinion of the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** also sought the opinion of the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that the Government of Germany had considered the concerns expressed by the Committee at its 28th session with extreme seriousness. Having endorsed the illustrated presentation by the World Heritage Centre, it informed the Committee of the efforts made to prepare buffer zones which covered an area larger than that recommended by the Committee at the time of the inscription and which also included a monitoring zone on the right bank of the Rhine. An assessment of the high-rise development projects should keep in mind that a) the site of the cluster of high-rise buildings was situated about one kilometre from the cathedral b) of five buildings projects only one had already been completed, the second had not received a building permit, the third had already been completed at the time of the inscription and its current height of 60 metres would not be extended, and the fourth and fifth buildings would not be built as planned. Furthermore, the second visual impact study commissioned by the State of North Rhine-Westphalia and carried out by the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning of the RWTH Aachen University had concluded that the construction project would have no major impact on the old city landscape except when approaching from the east on the elevated highways. The Delegation wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the state of conservation of the cathedral building itself was good, and reported that there was a new urban design to restore the impression of the original elevated location of the Cathedral. Emphasizing that the outstanding universal value that had justified the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List was not compromised, the Delegation stressed that the Government of Germany had addressed the preoccupations of the Committee and that consequently the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger for the time being. Clarification was required as to what, if anything, had constituted a buffer zone at the time of the inscription and what the State Party meant by special protection of the Cathedral and its surroundings. It asked for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon in writing and pointed out that the amendment did not cover the left bank, which was the area where future construction projects would have a major impact on the Cathedral.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that it too had had the opportunity to visit the site. It stressed the fact that the Cathedral was in very good condition but endorsed the concern raised by the Delegation of Lebanon as to the absence of buffer zones. Allowing the State Party time to take the appropriate actions was reasonable in principle, but the threats were imminent and grave - the construction of the building was taking place faster than Committee decisions could be taken and implemented. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Portugal** questioned whether removing the Cathedral from the List of World Heritage in Danger would help the City of Cologne and supported retaining the property on the List. It also acknowledged that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon had useful elements and asked to see the proposal in writing. Having sought comments from ICOMOS, the Delegation also suggested that the draft

Decision might be amended to take note of the good conservation status of the Cathedral itself.

After stating that many World Heritage properties were facing the challenge of urban development pressure, the Delegation of **Lithuania** emphasized the importance of keeping the commitment made by the Government of Germany at the time of inscription and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, who had also visited Cologne, read out a passage from the afore-mentioned fax dated 12 June 1996 from the Ministry in Düsseldorf instructing "the municipal council of Cologne to take care to the impression of the city's panorama especially with regards to the Cathedral. All municipal planning is to be checked up with the interests of the invulnerability of the Cathedral and its environment." The delegation remarked that from what was observed on the site, the projected construction of high-rise buildings would be like building a high-rise wall in front of the Cathedral. Recalling that the Cathedral had been inscribed with conditions, the Delegation urged the Committee to be principled and act in line with the decision it had taken at the time of inscription. It therefore strongly supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon. .

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its serious concern as to the visual impact of the projected high-rise buildings on the integrity of the property. Referring to the photo simulation included in the visual study, it said that the projected high-rise building would stand in the direct line of sight of the cathedral. Having emphasized the iconic nature of the property, it considered that the Committee did not have enough information to judge the situation, particularly with regard to the overall situation of the construction plan in the area, and to aspects of height and visual impact on the Cathedral. It requested ICOMOS to assess such new information. It expressed its support for retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon in writing.

The **Chairperson** said that there seemed to be consensus in the Committee to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India**, echoing the intervention by the Delegation of Colombia, expressed its anxiety that time was not on the side of the Committee. It was the Committee's duty to send out a signal to the City of Cologne and to the international community regarding the potential threat of high-rise construction to the property. It proposed that the Delegation of Lebanon should submit its amendment to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** considered that the Committee lacked information on the condition in which the property had been inscribed originally regarding the definition of the buffer zone and the commitment on the part of the Government of Germany. It said that the proposed high-rise construction would be in the direct line of sight to and from the Cathedral. Although the monument itself was not under threat, the Delegation considered that the general setting of the property as well as its visual integrity was nevertheless important for a monument of such high

calibre. Management of development projects in the historic area of the left bank was more important than in the right bank.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that it had submitted its amendment to the Rapporteur. It recalled the conclusion of the afore-mentioned visual impact study, namely that the proposed construction would have a visual impact on the Cathedral.

**ICOMOS** said that laws in Germany protected not only monuments themselves but also their environment. It drew the attention of the Committee to its role in the assessment of the proposed construction project at the invitation of the Government of Germany, and of its position against the project. ICOMOS further advised the State Party not to construct high-rise buildings on the left bank where other cultural monuments existed and highlighted the fact that the Cathedral itself was in good condition.

The **Rapporteur** read out and showed on-screen the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that the new paragraphs proposed in the amendment were based on the Decision the Committee had taken at a previous session on the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Vienna in Austria (**26 COM 21 (b) 35**).

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** sought clarification concerning the deadline by which the State Party was requested to submit supplementary information. It said that 1 October 2005 was not realistic and while 1 February 2006 would be preferable, the deadline for the end of 2005 would be acceptable.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed 15 December 2005 for the deadline.

The **Chairperson** said that it was to be assumed that the State Party and the Advisory Bodies would engage in high-quality consultations as they had done in the past.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that Germany should be given enough time to prepare the information requested and that a deadline of 1 February 2006 would be appropriate.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.29** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)**

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to present the state of conservation report on the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru).

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of a letter dated 19 April 2005 from the Committee of the Farmers of Chan Chan claiming the free use of lands protected by national law as national heritage since 1967, when, by means of Supreme Resolution No. 518, the Ministry of Education had extended the protected area of

Chan Chan from 300 to 1470 hectares. Almost all the dwellings illegally constructed *in situ* had been demolished in 1998, but illegal cultivation had continued at the site and the Government of Peru had not yet identified a satisfactory solution. Recalling the recommendations of the Committee over the previous five years to the State Party that it finalize the legislative procedure and take appropriate measures to relocate squatters, the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee of an unfortunate event in 1998 when some of the squatters had been obliged to abandon the protected area. The World Heritage Centre said that the Committee of Farmers viewed National Law No. 28261, mentioned in the working document, as unconstitutional because it sought the reallocation of private properties and did not support the ancestral rights of farmers. In addition, by Supreme Resolution 005 2005-ed of 30 March 2005, the Peruvian Government had set up a multi-sectoral commission, lead by the National Institute of Culture, to develop operative guidelines for the law, foreseeing the relocation of farmers who could prove ownership of property before 1998.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recalled that the property had been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for almost twenty years and commended the State Party concerned for the numerous actions undertaken for the protection of the property which should be considered as good examples. It then expressed its wish to hear the opinion of ICOMOS concerning the threats represented by the illegal occupation of the land and, in particular, whether that should be considered an adequate reason for retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Chile** agreed with the Delegation of Colombia in commending the impressive efforts made by the State Party in order to minimize the negative impact of the illegal occupation of the land on the border of the property.

**ICOMOS** expressed the view that illegal squatting was a threat to the property and also stated that an assessment would need to be made as to whether the corrective measures taken by the State Party had been effective.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the efforts made by the State Party and supported the position taken by the Delegation of Colombia.

The Delegation of **Argentina** acknowledged the tremendous efforts undertaken by the State Party and stressed that the principal remaining threats were human in nature. It then asked to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger but suggested indicating clear corrective measures to be undertaken by the State Party. It would submit its amendment in writing.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the report prepared by the World Heritage Centre and reminded the Committee that, although new legislation had recently been approved, additional efforts were to be undertaken in the future in order to implement the legislation. It expressed its agreement with the retention of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed an amendment to the draft Decision, in particular introducing the possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** presented an amendment to the draft Decision reflecting the proposals made by the Delegations of Colombia and the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Colombia** did not agree with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and said that if the main threats were considered solved, the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** sought clarification as to whether the Committee wished to include in the draft Decision any corrective measures to be taken by the State Party.

La Délégation du **Bénin** exprime son accord avec la proposition faite par la Délégation de la Colombie et, se référant à l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Royaume-Uni, affirme ne pas comprendre quel autre type de mesures correctives le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS pourraient envisager.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that its proposal had been made in order to follow usual procedure, but agreed to withdraw the proposal.

The **Rapporteur** clarified that there would be no addition to the draft Decision regarding corrective measures to be taken by the State Party, and read out the amended draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7A.30** provisionally adopted, as amended.

## **ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Rev  
WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Add  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.7B

*Decisions :* **29 COM 7B.a, 29 COM 7B.b, 29 COM 7B.c and from 29 COM 7B.1 to 29 COM 7B.103**

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the relevant documents and reminded the Committee that the working document proposed a number of properties for discussion by the Committee on the "A" list, while the other properties, on the "B" list, were proposed for noting by the Committee. However, Committee members could request that certain properties proposed for noting would be discussed.

Following a written request received by the Chairperson and oral requests made at the beginning of the session, the Committee had agreed to discuss the following properties that had originally been proposed for noting: Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania), Kakadu National Park (Australia), Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France/Spain), Mount Athos (Greece), Palace and Gardens of Schonbrunn (Austria), Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia), Old Town of Vilnius (Lithuania), Old City of Salamanca (Spain), Tower of London (United Kingdom).

The **Chairperson** said that, before discussing the properties in the document, a number of general issues relating to threats to World Heritage would be presented, in particular issues related to climate change and natural and human-made disasters.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that climate change was considered one of the greatest environmental, social and economic threats facing the planet; scientists considered that during the last century the earth's average surface temperature had risen by around 0.6°C. There was growing evidence that most of the global warming that had occurred over the previous 50 years was attributable to human activities. It was stressed that, at the G8 Summit in Gleneagles the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr Kofi Annan, had called the Plan of Action on climate change, clean energy and sustainable development "an important step forward".

The current item had been included in response to the request for danger listing by a number of non-governmental organizations of four properties in different regions of the world and covering different ecosystems. Additional petitions had been received by the World Heritage Centre to place Mount Everest on the List of World Heritage in Danger because of the impacts of climate change. It was also recalled that climate change issues had been raised in different forums and different contexts.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that it was pleased that that important issue was covered in the working document, as it was an issue that affected all mankind as well as natural and cultural heritage. It noted, however, that climate change was different from other problems the Committee was dealing with, as its potential impacts were global and indirect, not local and direct. It had put forward an amendment to draft Decision **29 COM 7B.a Rev** for the purpose of establishing a working group to review the nature and scale of the risks posed to World Heritage properties arising from climate change and developing a strategy to assist States Parties in implementing appropriate management responses. To give more immediacy to the problem, it also asked for a report to the next session. It further offered to host the meeting and called upon other States Parties and partners to support the initiative.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the revised draft Decision as proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, but insisted that such an initiative should be coordinated with other Conventions and relevant forums, in particular the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). That had to be included in the draft Decision. It also proposed that the expert group would be requested to start identifying the properties that were most threatened.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and considered that the establishment of the working group was an essential step forward for the *World Heritage Convention* to work with the



international community on the problem. It noted that the proposal was also consistent with recommendations from the Convention on Biological Diversity concerning Protected Areas, and the Fifth World Parks Congress. It recalled that that within the next one hundred years the world could warm between 1 and 5.8 degrees centigrade, placing greater pressures on food production, fresh water supply, sea level rises and coastal stresses. Climatic stress would not only affect the most spectacular of the world's natural sites but might bring about massive ecological change resulting in unmitigated impacts upon some countries. As an example, it cited the Small Island State of Tuvalu in the Pacific which was facing a very perilous future in the wake of a possible one-metre rise in sea level. The Delegation noted that, although the problem of climate change could not be solved in the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, it could provide the evidence to the correct forums of what the impact on the properties could be. Therefore, the 149 natural and 23 mixed properties could become the indicators for the global community of the advance of climate change. Such evidence would help build support within the global community for halting the problem.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that the Committee should keep within its mandate and requested therefore that the decision reflect the need to cooperate with UNFCCC.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** applauded the efforts of Tony Blair to put climate change and poverty alleviation on the world agenda and was strongly in favour of the proposed decision by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It warned that the result of study would probably show a grim picture for many properties and might affect especially the poorest nations of the planet. It stressed that the results of the study should be made available to a wide public.

The Delegation of **Portugal** acknowledged the intervention of the Delegation of India, stating that that was why it had proposed the amendment.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** welcomed the initiative by the NGOs and the fact that Huscaran National Park had been selected as a study site, but regretted that its Government had not been consulted and pointed out that national research institutes had already done substantial research in that area.

An Observer for the **Climate Justice Programme** said that, while he acknowledged the important work done through the *Convention* for the conservation of World Heritage properties, he feared that climate change might jeopardize the results achieved. He noted that an international scientific consensus existed that emissions of greenhouse gases were the cause of climate change and that the impacts were current, immediate and potentially catastrophic. He also insisted that, despite the global nature of the problem, the Committee could help to make a difference. He noted that, while the *Convention* placed the legal duty of protection primarily on host States, the drafters also recognized the legal obligations of other parties. In the case of the properties concerned by the petitions, the host developing countries were only a minor cause of global warming and developed countries needed to reduce their emissions drastically to address that cause and assist those developing countries in the management actions needed to confront its impacts.

The floor was further taken by an Observer of **Friends of the Earth - Nepal**, who expressed the gratitude of the people of Nepal for considering the impact of global warming on the Sagarmatha World Heritage property. He expressed fear for the indigenous communities which were threatened by a possible outburst of glacial lakes and did not know how to conserve the beauty of Mount Everest which was holy to them and provided their livelihoods. He therefore appealed to the Committee to consider those concerns of the local people. He accepted the decision by the Committee to defer a decision on danger listing and welcomed the establishment of a working group that would include representatives of the petitioners. He also thanked the Delegation of the United Kingdom for its proposals and its offer to host the meeting.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** pointed out that, since it was a global problem, it should be addressed globally and that Nepal's contribution to the causes of global warming was negligible.

The **Chairperson** summarized the debate by concluding that a working group would be established but called upon the Committee not to enter into a debate on specific properties, as the working group would deal with that.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the establishment of a working group and proposed that it should also discuss possible adaptive measures.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Committee for its support on the matter and agreed that the issue should be considered in conjunction with other Conventions.

La Délégation du **Bénin** ne formule aucune objection à la proposition de création du groupe, mais tient à préciser qu'il ne faut pas minimiser les propos de la Délégation du Népal au sujet du réchauffement de la planète dû à l'effet de serre. Il s'agit d'un phénomène planétaire qui a été longuement discuté lors de la Conférence de Rio en 1992. Elle poursuit en indiquant que le réchauffement a une incidence dans de nombreux domaines sur toute la planète.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the amendments proposed by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.a Rev** provisionally adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to present the input on the issue of natural and human-made disasters.

The **World Heritage Centre** pointed out that disasters were threatening World Heritage properties and at the same time undermining development. Not only was the number of disasters increasing, for example as a result of climate change, but so was their impact as a result of human development. Several actions had already been taken by the Centre and others, including the development of guidelines and training kits

and the establishment of the International Committee for the Blue Shield, a network of professionals in support of risk preparedness for cultural heritage. Within the framework of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, held in Kobe (Japan), the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan and ICCROM, had organized a Thematic Session on “*Risk Management for Cultural Heritage*”. Among the recommendations resulting from the Thematic Session a very important outcome was the recognition of heritage as an invaluable resource for reducing the impact of disasters on lives, properties and livelihoods and for establishing a culture of prevention and contributing to sustainable development. Those recommendations would form the basis for the elaboration of the risk preparedness strategy that was requested by the Committee.

**The Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.b Rev** provisionally adopted.

**IUCN** informed the Committee that it had prepared with ICOMOS a short presentation on threat analysis of World Heritage properties but that, given the time constraints, it proposed that it should be distributed to the Committee as a hard copy.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was an agreement on that proposal and declared Decision **29 COM 7B.c Rev** provisionally adopted.

He invited the Committee to proceed with its discussion of the state of conservation of the properties.

### **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)**

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that it had received a detailed report by the State Party on 13 July, the day before the presentation of the item. The report had been transmitted to IUCN, but the information had not yet been evaluated.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.1** provisionally adopted.

### **Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.2** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **W National Park of Niger (Niger) (N 749)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.3** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

#### **Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.4** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

#### **Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)**

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that it had no new information on the property. As stated in the working document, a round table meeting had been held in Paris on 29 and 30 November 2004. Concerning the oil exploration issue, no further documents had reached the Centre from the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that the property was very important to the Netherlands, as many waders wintering in the area also migrated through its territory and spent time in the Wadden Sea. It recalled that there were many threats to the property: oil exploration, management issues and the impact of the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road. It therefore proposed to change the wording in paragraph 3, replacing “congratulates” by “notes”. He further proposed to amend paragraph 10 and add wording to reflect effects on the local populations.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.5** provisionally adopted as amended.

#### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)**

The draft Decision **29 COM 7B.6** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

#### **Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N1039)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the issue concerning the property was the proposed dam construction within and adjacent to the World Heritage property. It noted that the report received from the State Party did not address the specific request of the Committee relating to the status of dams in Yunnan Province and that it continued to receive alarming information on the progress of the proposed construction of dams within and adjacent to the World Heritage property. A letter had been received from the State Party in May 2005 reassuring the Centre of its commitment to the protection of the property.

The Delegation of **China** said it appreciated the concerns of other States Parties as well as the media and NGOs about the conservation of the property. It noted that it

would carefully study all proposed projects and assess all possible impacts of any proposal but that at the time of the discussion no official proposal for a dam had been proposed or approved by the central Government. So far, proposals only existed at the level of the electricity companies. According to Chinese law, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) were only conducted after a proposal was approved. In the event that such an Environmental Impact Assessment concluded that the impact could be negative, the project would either be altered to take that into account or it would be abandoned. As it was for the moment impossible for the Government to impose an EIA since no project had been approved, it requested a revision of the decision according to the amendment it had submitted to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that it was reassured by the declaration of China and concluded that the information that had been disseminated in the media was purely speculative. To prevent such speculative information in the future, it proposed to amend the draft decision, asking the State Party to report on all dam projects that were considered in the property and adjacent areas. It also proposed to include a general paragraph in the decision, recalling that any dam within a World Heritage property was unacceptable.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it considered the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom inappropriate. The State Party had reassured the Committee and that explanation should be sufficient. It therefore accepted the amendment proposed by China. It also did not agree with the proposal to ask for information on dams adjacent to the property as the Committee was only concerned with the property itself.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its satisfaction with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It also proposed to ask for the report to give information on the legal status of the proposed projects.

The Delegation of **Russia** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of China and agreed with the comments made by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its thanks for the additional information provided by the Delegation of China and welcomed the amendment proposed by it. It stated that the assurances given by the State Party were sufficient.

Considérant l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la Chine comme pertinent, la Délégation du **Bénin** tient à l'appuyer. Elle indique qu'il sera toujours temps à la prochaine session de revenir sur l'évaluation de l'état de conservation de ce bien. Elle souhaite faire confiance à la Délégation de la Chine qui a par ailleurs encouragé tous les membres du Comité à se rendre sur le site des Trois rivières parallèles du Yunnan.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It reminded the Committee that abandoning of the dam project had been a condition for the inscription of the property and that if that condition would no longer be met, the property would have to be delisted.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the views expressed by the Delegations of Japan, India and Benin.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that it accepted the information provided by the State Party and clarified that it had proposed the comprehensive review of all dam projects for the benefit of the State Party and the Committee as it would prevent speculations as it had witnessed today. It also stressed that dam projects outside the property should be considered as they could have an impact on the values of the property.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the State Party and supported the comments by the Delegations of Japan, India and Benin.

The Delegation of **India** proposed in view of the comments made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom to amend paragraph 5 and replace “progress report” by “comprehensive report”.

The Delegation of **China** thanked all States Parties which had spoken and in particular the Delegation of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom for their concern for the conservation of the property. It stressed that, as a State Party, it was responsible for all World Heritage properties in its country. It reiterated its assurance that no project had been approved. It agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia that if such a project were approved, the property would have to be delisted. It also thanked the Delegation of India for its suggestion and agreed with that amendment.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the amended paragraph 3 proposed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, and agreed with the proposal to request a “comprehensive” report from the State Party of China.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and the **Netherlands** supported the proposals by the Delegations of India and Colombia.

The **Chairperson** enquired if the Delegation of China was in agreement.

At the request of the Delegation of **China**, the **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision as amended.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its request to include in the draft Decision a general paragraph recalling that any dam within a World Heritage property was unacceptable.

The **Chairperson** enquired if the Delegation of China was in agreement.

He declared Decision **29 COM 7B.7** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a mission had been organized to the property on 29 and 30 March 2005 on the occasion of the monitoring mission to the Manas National Park. Conservation at that wetland property had been adversely affected by a recent decision of the State Government of Rajasthan not to release any

water from the Panchana Dam on the River Gambhir, the only natural source of water for the park. Without that water the survival of the wetland ecosystem and maintenance of the values of the property was in doubt.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that it was an ongoing issue that could not be solved in the short term but needed a long-term solution.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested the State Party to give a clear commitment to release sufficient water and asked the State Party if it could give that commitment.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its gratitude for the concern for the property. It explained that the property faced two problems: there had been a drought in the State of Rajasthan for five consecutive years and therefore the villagers were opposing the water release as they themselves needed water. Additionally, the issue of water release was a State matter. Fortunately, rains in the current year had been abundant and it hoped that that would help the State Government to agree to the requested water release. It also proposed to change the wording of paragraph 3 from “prevail upon” to “encourage” to take into account the impossibility for the State Party to enforce such a water release on the State Government.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stressed that, in terms of the *Convention*, there was only one State Party. It therefore opposed the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India and preferred to delete the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Chile** agreed with that proposal in order to avoid legal problems.

**IUCN** expressed the opinion that the paragraph was very important and pointed out that the same requirement was requested by the Committee on the State Party of Tunisia in the case of Ichkeul. It reiterated that the commitment of water release was necessary to restore the property.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the proposal to delete the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** indicated that its statement had not been correct as there was a federal clause in the *Convention*.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to put the paragraph in a neutral form of words in order to accommodate India’s concerns. It would then read: “Considers it necessary to ensure that the required quantity of water is released to the National Park ...”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.8** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Tropical Rainforest of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that on 26 December 2004 the tsunami in the Indian Ocean had hit the island of Sumatra, with devastating effects. The natural

resources of the World Heritage property had not been affected although unfortunately several staff members of the Nature Conservation Unit were reported missing and considerable damage had been caused to the infrastructure of the Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP). The World Heritage Centre had offered assistance to the Indonesian authorities and had requested them to provide further information concerning the state of conservation of the property. In response, the Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia had submitted on 14 April 2005 an international assistance request to the World Heritage Centre seeking Emergency Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to restore and improve basic management capacities in Gunung Leuser National Park and the Conservation Units located in Banda Aceh and Tapak Tuan. The Centre and IUCN had requested the State Party to provide additional information to complete the request, which had been approved by the Chairperson.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed understanding that the State Party had not been able to provide the report requested by the Committee and suggested that a mission should be undertaken to the property and that the report could be prepared by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed concern about the damage caused by the tsunami but emphasized that the property faced a number of other problems, which needed to be addressed. It therefore suggested that the mission should assess not only the impact of the tsunami but also the impact of the other threats.

**IUCN** agreed that it is possible to assess both impacts associated with the tsunami and the overall state of conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed condolences for the staff who had lost their lives.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment and asked for clarification as to whether the mission was to be conducted by the World Heritage Centre or IUCN.

**IUCN** responded that it had an IUCN tsunami taskforce on the ground already, which could provide information.

The **Rapporteur** concluded that the mission could therefore be organized by the World Heritage Centre in cooperation with IUCN.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.10** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a UNESCO/IUCN mission had visited the property from 25 March to 12 April 2005. The mission had concluded that the values of the property were intact, but that necessary legislation and management had to be prepared and implemented, including an ecotourism plan for the benefit of the local people.



The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.10** provisionally adopted.

**Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.11** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

**Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.12** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

**Tubataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.13** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

**Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park (Viet Nam) (N 951 rev)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.14** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

**Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) (N 33-267)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled the recommendations of the joint IUCN/UNESCO mission in 2004 and the specific follow-up actions requested by the World Heritage Committee by Decision **28 COM 15B.20** (Suzhou, 2004). Both States Parties had provided reports in March 2005 on improvements in the conservation of the property, the need for the implementation of the joint management plan and progress made concerning the removal of the fence along the national boundaries, in particular along areas where the migration paths of animals were concentrated.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.15** provisionally adopted.

**Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada) (N 304 bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** noted the detailed State Party report of February 2005 and informed the Committee that no new information had been received since then.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** specified that the mine of Cheviot was near the Park, and not in the Park.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.16** provisionally adopted.

### **Miguasha National Park (Canada) (N 225)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that information had been received about a project for a toxic waste incinerator in Belledune, 36 km from the Park, and proposed oil and gas exploration in the Miguasha National Park buffer zone. Following a request by the State Party, an IUCN mission to the site had been carried out in June 2005 and the mission report had just been received. Consequently, a revised draft Decision (**29 COM 7B.17 Rev**) was proposed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.17 Rev** provisionally adopted.

### **Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of a Ukrainian navigation project on the Bystroe Canal located within the UNESCO Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve, on the Ukrainian side of the border. Although the canal did not pass through the Romanian World Heritage property, likely downstream impacts were planned. The two States Parties concerned were keen on resolving the issue through a series of consultative meetings and workshops using a number of available international agreements and conventions such as the Espoo (EIA), Bern and Ramsar Conventions, to which both were signatories, as well as UNESCO's Programme on Man and the Biosphere (MAB). An international conference for the conservation and sustainable development of the Danube Delta was being organized by the Ukrainian authorities and was due to take place in Odessa from 5-9 September 2005.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** suggested an amendment to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision requesting an in-depth analysis of the development issues.

The Delegation of **Netherlands** stressed the immense importance of the Danube Delta in the European natural context, but also expressed its concerns as to the canal projects, the pollution and the management of tourism. It therefore proposed inserting, after the phrase "other development issues" in paragraph 5, the words "and all the other threats".

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** said that the work on the development of the canal had been stopped and regretted the fact that the Committee had not been properly informed in time. In addition, a special working group had been created to monitor the issue and the Minister of Environment Protection of Ukraine had already met the Romanian authorities on two occasions. It expressed the hope that international organizations would come to understand the need for the canal to be navigable and called upon Romania to engage in mutual respect for each other's rights.

The Observer Delegation of **Romania** supported the draft Decision and said that it was the best possible solution to ensure the preservation of the property.

The **Rapporteur** read out revised paragraph 5 of the draft Decision and noted that the other paragraphs would not change.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.18** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the report by the State Party of 27 January 2005 outlined key actions, including the Federal Law “On the Protection of Lake Baikal”, ongoing protection programmes, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) project and the re-profiling of the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill. However, no information had been received concerning the explicit request by the Committee regarding the planned Eastern Siberia – Pacific Ocean oil pipeline through the Lake Baikal region. However, new information had been received from other sources that the company Transneft had submitted three alternative routes around Lake Baikal for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The responsible authorities had selected the route furthest from Lake Baikal. The route passed more than 80 km away from the Lake, but illegal clear-cutting had started to make way for a route passing within a couple of kilometres of the Lake, and orders from the regional authorities halting the work had been ignored. The Russian Ministry of Natural Resources had investigated the violations and filed lawsuits against Transneft subcontractors working near Lake Baikal.

The World Heritage Centre furthermore informed the Committee that the MAB Bureau (27-29 June 2005) had also discussed the matter, as the Kedrovaya Pad Biosphere Reserve formed part of the World Heritage site.

During the present Committee session, on 11 July 2005, the Centre had finally received a letter from the Director of the Department of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia referring to the issues not covered by the original report, including the identification of water protection zones, the reestablishment of the Baikal Commission, a meeting of June 2005 in the Buriat Republic with a resolution on the sustainable development of Lake Baikal, as well as the long-awaited issue of the Eastern Siberia-Pacific Ocean pipeline construction. On 5 May 2005 a control mission by the Natural Resources Management Service had revealed violations of the route of the oil pipeline and all logging had been stopped. Another control mission had taken place from 7-8 June 2005.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the additional information it had presented and provided some clarification concerning the three projects on the pipelines. With the help of a projected slide indicating the above-cited projects on a topographic map, it said that the project marked with a yellow line had been rejected, while the one marked by red and black lines had been

submitted and adopted but was outside the Baikal inscribed area. Also, it specified that all the activities in the area, including the clear-cutting, had been stopped. It added that the Ministry of Natural Resources had undertaken a series of activities in order to protect Lake Baikal and additional administrative measures had been taken in that respect.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the map, expressed its concern as the route that had been chosen for the pipeline, indicated by a red line, passed through the inscribed property and quite close to the Lake itself. The route is extremely advanced and although it was said that the work has stopped, there was information that it might start again. It would be necessary to know what was really happening and therefore an independent mission should be dispatched. If the mission was not supported by the State Party concerned, the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation proposed that, in future, in the event of lack of cooperation or information by the State Party concerned, the Committee should refrain from inscribing new properties for that State Party.

The Delegation of **Netherlands** stressed the importance of Lake Baikal and noted that the plans for the pipeline were constantly being changed. The Committee needed to know what was actually happening with regard to its construction, and concurred with the Delegation of Saint Lucia's call for an independent mission. With that in mind, it proposed amendments to paragraphs 7 and 10 of the draft Decision that would require the State Party to provide more detailed information on the construction of the pipeline.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the proposal made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia with regards to the Committee refraining from inscribing new properties from a State Party in the event of lack of cooperation should be referred to the Working group on working methods chaired by the Ambassador of Lithuania.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that Lake Baikal had already been indicated as a suitable case for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger at the Committee's 27th session. It supported the statements by the Delegations of Saint Lucia and the Netherlands requesting an independent mission. If such a mission could not take place, then the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked for clarification as to the accuracy of the term "Global Environmental Fund" in the working document.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that it should read "Global Environmental Facility".

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed concern about the property and agreed with the statements of the Delegations of Saint Lucia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

La Délégation du **Bénin** soutient fermement la suggestion faite par la Délégation de Sainte-Lucie. Même si des progrès ont été réalisés par l'Etat partie, il faut qu'une mission soit effectuée pour que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et le Comité aient

une vue globale de ce qui se passe sur le terrain afin de prendre une décision à la prochaine session.

The Delegation of **China** welcomed the submission of a report, even if it had arrived late, and acknowledged the progress made by the State Party. It would prefer to await the next Committee session in order to receive more information before proceeding with a mission.

The Delegation of **India** also acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party and proposed amending paragraph 6 of the draft Decision to reflect the fact that the State Party had indeed provided an update.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** apologized for the late submission of information and announced that a mission could be scheduled for August. The authorities concerned would do everything within their power to ensure its success.

The Observer from **Greenpeace Russia** expressed concern about the construction of the pipeline a mere two kilometres from the site. According to some information, the construction had only been suspended and was due to resume in the autumn. It was also hard to know how it could be possible by August 2005 to find out more about the project. It might be too early for the mission to go because actual construction might start later.

The **Chairperson** said that the date of the mission should be arranged by the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, and the authorities.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** recommended that the mission take place later than August, possibly in spring 2006.

The **Rapporteur** read out revised paragraphs 5, 7 and 9 of the draft Decision and the new paragraph 10; the other paragraphs would not change.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.19** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed satisfaction with the decision as amended, but wished to hear again from the Observer of Greenpeace Russia.

The Observer of **Greenpeace Russia** said that a mission in spring 2006 might be too late.

### **Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that a number of recommendations by the IUCN/World Heritage Centre mission to the property of May 2004 were still to be addressed. A letter had been received from the authorities during the Committee session on the issue of salmon poaching and the management plan preparations in the

framework of the UNDP/GEF project had been received and transmitted to IUCN for review.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** confirmed that there were five protected areas and that the volume of salmon poaching could be considered negligible. It also proposed a small change in paragraph 4 so that it read “Bystrinsky Natural Park” instead of “Bystrinsky Zakaznik”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.20** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Durmitor National Park (Serbia and Montenegro) (N 100)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that following information received in November 2004 on the hydropower plant project Buk Bijela in Bosnia and Herzegovina with potential impact on the World Heritage property located in Serbia and Montenegro, the Director-General of UNESCO had decided to dispatch an IUCN/UNESCO mission in January 2005. Following the results of the mission which recommended inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the detailed report and recommendations had been transmitted to both States Parties for comment. The reaction had been rapid and information received on 1 April 2005 from Serbia and Montenegro that the project had been halted. Furthermore, the Permanent Delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to UNESCO had confirmed in writing on 7 July 2005 that its authorities would not authorize any project that was not in conformity with international conventions. The World Heritage Centre noted that it had been one of the speediest interventions seen by the Committee in the previous 10 years.

The **Committee** congratulated the State Party by acclamation on its swift action and on the approach taken in support of World Heritage conservation.

The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia-Herzegovina** said that in fact the project that was threatening the Park had never been authorized by the central government of its State.

The Observer Delegation of **Serbia and Montenegro** expressed its gratitude to the Centre and the Committee and said that the construction of two large sport venues in the neighbouring natural areas had also been brought to a halt. It was to be hoped that fruitful cooperation to preserve the Park would continue.

The Delegation of **Portugal** suggested an amendment deleting paragraph 5 of the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** said that the paragraph 5 of the draft Decision would be deleted, and that the other paragraphs would not change.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.21** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the State Party had provided a detailed updated report on the situation of Yellowstone National Park (YNP) and had requested that the yearly reporting be suspended.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que dans le cas de sites qui viennent de sortir de la Liste du patrimoine en péril, il est préférable d'avoir un rapport annuel pendant deux ou trois ans, avant de réduire la pression.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded the Committee that the property of Yellowstone had been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger subject to a strong commitment by the State Party and a very tough decision by the Committee. It is therefore too premature to postpone the reports. A report should therefore be submitted in 2006.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its appreciation for the statement made by the Delegation of Lebanon and assured the Committee that its Government took all the necessary steps when it came to environmental plans. It requested the deletion of paragraph 4 from the draft Decision as in fact there was no longer any imminent threat of the kind which had led to the property being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.22** provisionally adopted.

### **Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.23** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **Skocjan Caves (Slovenia) (N 300)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.24** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.25** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.26** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom) (N 369)**

The Decision **29 COM 7B.27** was provisionally adopted without discussion.

### **Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)**

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the UNESCO/IUCN mission of March 2005 had reviewed illegal road construction, transboundary cooperation with Argentina, which had improved, aircraft traffic with helicopters taking off and landing outside the park, and a proposed dam project.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether it was reasonable to ask for a report in 2007 when there was a risk of a dam being built.

The Delegation of **Portugal** welcomed the efforts made by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Argentina** reminded the Committee about the intensive bilateral cooperation between its country and Brazil on environmental issues such as climate change, sustainable development and the Igaçu / Iguazu National Parks. It added that this bilateral cooperation resulted in a bilateral agreement on the work to be carried out in the properties, including poaching, illegal tree cutting, helicopter flights, etc... with the final aim of signing a joint management plan for both properties. The Delegation emphasized that this management plan would require an even closer cooperation between both States Parties.

The Delegation of Argentina added that the IUCN mission report mentioned several problems, including the recurrent and worrisome issue of the flight of helicopters over the properties. It requested that this particular issue be reported in the final Summary Records of the session, and also requested the State Party of Brazil to definitely solve this issue. Furthermore, the Delegation informed the Committee that it was not aware of the construction of the hydroelectric dam as mentioned in paragraph 6 of the draft Decision. It also supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Saint-Lucia regarding the submission of the report in 2006 instead of 2007.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil**, taking the floor for the first time in the present session, thanked the authorities of South Africa for the excellent organization of the session. It also thanked IUCN for producing a high-quality report on the property and assured the Committee that Brazil possessed the political will to solve issues affecting the Park. It announced that an impact study had already been completed and that the State Party would do everything possible to preserve the value of the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the State Party on its efforts.



The **Rapporteur** presented two proposed changes, namely the deletion of the words “with significant potential impacts on the World Heritage property” from paragraph 6, and the modification of the date in paragraph 7 to 1 February 2006.

The Delegation of **Argentina**, supported by the Delegations of **Saint Lucia** and **Lebanon**, said that it would prefer to maintain paragraph 6 of the draft Decision as it stood in the working document.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that it was important to obtain a report on the potential impact of the construction of a dam.

The **Rapporteur** said that the paragraph 6 of the draft Decision would not change.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.28** provisionally adopted.

### **Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a World Heritage Centre mission had taken place from 14 to 21 April 2005, which had involved in-depth meetings with all stakeholders across the Galapagos community. The impression was that the situation was problematic due to the lack of leadership and tensions between different groups - not only the fishing community, but NGOs and other bodies. The mission had held further discussions in Quito and New York and it had concluded that considerable efforts were needed to develop a broad vision for the Islands. That was why an additional paragraph 9 was proposed in working Document *WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Add*.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed concern as to the continuous change in site managers. On paper the Galapagos seemed well-protected, but in reality that was not the case. He announced the launch of a new initiative in collaboration with UNESCO’s Natural Sciences Sector and the United Nation Foundation that would address the issues concerning the lack of management of the property.

**IUCN** welcomed the new initiative. However it noted that a long-term programme for the sustainable development of the islands has been developed, through a fully participatory process, therefore this new initiative should not replicate the work already done by the State Party on this.

The Delegation of **Netherlands** recognized the central importance of the property. However, it noted, there were a number of problems such as the uncontrolled fisheries and limited effective control over significant migration and it wondered whether the proposed draft Decision was strong enough to address those problems. It proposed inserting a deadline of 1 February 2007 in paragraph 4. It also noted that, while the new initiative should be applauded, the multiplication in the number of missions should be avoided by combining them.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the Galapagos Islands was a key property for the whole of humanity. It expressed concern about the issue of the fishing companies and proposed deleting the word “sports” from paragraph 8 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the Delegation of Colombia and wished to hear from the State Party about those issues.

The Delegation of **Egypt** also stressed the importance of the Galapagos Islands. It criticized the wording of paragraph 7 of the draft Decision, since it should be the State Party that invited the mission. Also, the mission should examine more than merely the state of conservation, as the problem was not lack of money, but lack of organization. Accordingly, the mission’s main task should be to address a report to the Government of Ecuador on how to organize the management of the property.

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed full agreement with paragraph 9 and supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 7.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remarque que ce site a beaucoup retenu l’attention du Comité par le passé. La possibilité d’inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril a déjà été discutée, mais l’Equateur a fait des efforts : il faudrait donc écouter ce que l’Etat partie a à dire, bien qu’il soit dommage qu’il n’ait pas fourni de rapport. La Délégation du Bénin est en outre d’accord avec celle de la Colombie à propos du paragraphe 8 du projet de décision : c’est la pêche illégale qui est en cause, plus que la pêche de loisir. En revanche, les paragraphes 7 et 9 font référence à deux missions différentes qui ne peuvent donc pas être fusionnées.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the report had just been received.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of the Netherlands that missions be combined.

The Observer Delegation of **Ecuador**, taking the floor for the first time at the present session, thanked the authorities of South Africa for the excellent organization of the session. It acknowledged that the report had been submitted late, but at least it was now available. It also noted that the Park Management Plan had been approved that year and, as to the concerns regarding the high turn-over in the post of Park manager, it said that a new mechanism to look for qualified personnel had been introduced.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** reminded Committee members that a State Party should send its report to the World Heritage Centre by 1st February, and should not do it orally during the Plenary. This practice should not be accepted.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 4, 7 and 9 of the draft Decision as amended; the other paragraphs would not change.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.29** provisionally adopted as amended and suspended the session.

The meeting rose at 08.30 p.m.





## FIFTH DAY

### EIGHTH MEETING

Thursday 14 July 2005

09.30 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: In order to meet various constraints in the time-management of its agenda, the Committee at its eighth meeting had to suspend the examination of the state of conservation reports of properties inscribed in the World Heritage List, in order to: a) receive an oral progress report on aspects of the evaluation currently being undertaken by a consultant on the assistance provided in the framework of the World Heritage Fund; b) take note of the current status of the Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties to the *Convention*; and c) start the evaluation of the nominations to the World Heritage List.

Note du Rapporteur : Pour répondre aux nombreuses contraintes de temps de la gestion de son ordre du jour, le Comité, à sa 8e réunion, a suspendu l'examen des rapports sur l'état de conservation de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial afin de : a) écouter le rapport d'avancement oral sur l'évaluation actuellement entreprise par un consultant sur l'assistance fournie dans le cadre du Fonds du patrimoine mondial ; b) prendre note de l'état actuel des Listes indicatives soumises par les Etats parties à la *Convention*, et c) débiter l'examen des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

#### ITEM 14B INFORMATION ON THE EVALUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND'S PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE, TECHNICAL COOPERATION, TRAINING, AND PROMOTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

*Document* : WHC-05/29.COM/14B

*Decision* : **29 COM 14B**

The **Chairperson** recalled that the progress report on the evaluation of Emergency Assistance had been examined at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in Suzhou. On that occasion, in Decision **28 COM 10B**, the Committee had taken note of the excellent Progress Report prepared and had requested the World Heritage Centre to develop an evaluation of the other components of the International Assistance to be presented to the 29th session of the Committee. He invited Ms June Taboroff, the consultant who had prepared the progress report on the item in close

cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, to present her report. The discussion on the final report would be included in the agenda of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee. In view of the time constraints at the 29th session, the Chairperson invited the States Parties to send their comments to the World Heritage Centre before the 30th session.

**Dr Taboroff** gave a PowerPoint presentation of Document *WHC-05/29.COM/14B*. She drew special attention to the background of the evaluation, the achievements of the four types of International Assistance and challenges in resources and delivery, and concluded with recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. She stressed that International Assistance was a system from which many States Parties benefited, and that the amounts granted, albeit small, played a critical role in the visibility and credibility of the *Convention*. Nevertheless the effectiveness of International Assistance could be improved. The evaluator thanked the States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their cooperation.

The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Taboroff for her presentation. He reiterated his invitation to States Parties to submit their written comments on the document and the presentation to the World Heritage Centre.

The **Rapporteur** proposed amendments to the draft Decision not affecting its substance, which he read out.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 14B** provisionally adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8 A ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER: TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (2005) AND AS OF 30 MAY 2005.**

*Document :* *WHC-05/29.COM/8A*

*Decision :* **29 COM 8A**

Following the presentation by the **World Heritage Centre**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the importance of Tentative Lists as planning tools, as well as the need to give much more consideration to Tentative Lists in order to achieve a better balance and credibility of the World Heritage List. It suggested two actions that could be taken in that respect. First, when States Parties reconsidered their Tentative Lists, in accordance with paragraph 65 of the *Operational Guidelines*, they should reevaluate the category and the potential outstanding universal value of the sites contained therein. Secondly, the World Heritage Committee should find ways and means of allowing for the Advisory Bodies to assess the outstanding universal value of sites included in the Tentative Lists even before they were submitted through a nomination. Finally, as had been stressed in the conclusions of the Vienna and Kazan meetings, the Delegation emphasized the importance of Tentative Lists in establishing

a link with community concerns as well as with other local, national and regional sites.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed concern about the apparent lack of adequate representation of natural heritage sites on the Tentative Lists. It commended the 39 States Parties which had submitted Tentative Lists since the previous session. Out of a total of 121 sites, 57 were natural, thus indicating a positive trend. It noted however that 43 States Parties still did not have Tentative Lists, while 35 States Parties did not have any natural heritage site in their Tentative Lists, meaning that 78 States had not identified any natural heritage site with potential outstanding universal value, i.e. 43% of all States Parties to the *Convention*. The Delegation wondered whether there was any reason for this indifference, assuming that significant natural heritage sites still existed in these countries. The Delegation encouraged States Parties to submit complementary information in order to redress that imbalance.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the item under examination required the Committee to simply take note of the information provided in the document, and encouraged members of the Committee not to open a debate on the issue of the Tentative Lists.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel**, recalling its role as moderator of the working group on Tentative Lists at the Kazan meeting, recommended that the valuable comments by the Delegations of the Netherlands and Norway be incorporated into the records of the session.

Following assurances by the **Rapporteur** that that would be the case, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8A** provisionally adopted and declared the item closed.

## **ITEM 8 B NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER.**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/8B  
WHC-05/29.COM/8B.Add  
WHC-05/29.COM/8B.Add 2  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.1  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.2  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.2 Add

*Decisions :* **29 COM 8B.1 to 29 COM 8B.55**

The **Chairperson** introduced the item and made reference to the relevant working documents.

### **I. Changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the section of the working document related to the proposed change of name of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and the related draft Decisions, **29 COM 8B.1** and **29 COM 8B.2**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 8B.1** and **29 COM 8B.2** provisionally adopted.

## **II. Examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List**

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, in addition to the four nominations indicated in the working document, six further nominations had been withdrawn at the request of the State Parties concerned. It read out an up-to-date list of withdrawn nominations.

A ce point, la Délégation du **Liban** demande que le Centre du patrimoine mondial remette à tous les membres du Comité la liste exacte des propositions d'inscription retirées par les Etats parties.

The **Chairperson** assured the Committee members that a written version of the list would be distributed in the room.

The Vice-Chairperson (Colombia) took the chair.

### **A. NATURAL PROPERTIES**

#### **A.1 New nominations**

#### **AFRICA**

Property	<b>Vredefort Dome</b>
Id. N°	<b>N 1162</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (i)</b>

*Decision: 29 COM 8B.4*

**IUCN** recalled its main principles and procedures in evaluating nominations. It then presented the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite tout d'abord faire une remarque d'ordre général en soulignant que l'utilisation des nouveaux et des anciens critères d'inscription provoque une grande confusion, et qu'il serait bon d'y remédier. Elle ajoute que le



critère (i) sous lequel l’UICN recommande l’inscription du bien devrait en fait être le critère (vii) d’après les nouvelles *Orientations*.

**IUCN** explained that for the current year the old system of numbering still applied, and the new one would be used starting from 2006. It said that the criterion referred to in its recommendation concerned major stages in earth history.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that the site was without any doubt an extremely important one, but it would like to know whether the three zones indicated as containing the most value were all actually included in the nominated area. It would also like some clarification as to the potential threats to the property caused by issues related to land claims. The Delegation wondered whether those issues been taken into account in the management plan of the property.

The **Chairperson** asked Committee members, in the interest of time, to concentrate on the draft Decision and only take the floor to propose modifications.

Comme il n’existe que trois sites de ce genre de par le monde, la Délégation du **Bénin** se félicite de cette proposition d’inscription. Elle rappelle que les terrains qui composent ce bien appartiennent à 59 propriétaires différents et qu’il est par conséquent difficile d’obtenir le concours de tous. Elle appuie fortement l’inscription de ce bien, qui serait le 7e bien sud-africain à figurer sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial depuis la ratification de la *Convention* par l’Afrique du Sud en 1997.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that it rejoiced at the nomination and congratulated South Africa on it. It supported the draft Decision. On the issue of the criteria, it said that in the future in all relevant documents the World Heritage Centre should indicate next to each criterion the corresponding “old” criterion in brackets.

The Delegation of **Chile** said the site showed the most important meteoritic impact on Earth. It expressed its strong support, endorsed by the Delegations of **Portugal**, **China** and **India**, for the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** joined the previous speakers in supporting inscription, noting in particular the importance of strong support for the nomination from the local community.

The **Rapporteur** recalled the decision taken by the Committee at its 28th Session in 2004, concerning the new numbering system for the criteria set out in the Operational Guidelines of the *Convention* for assessing the outstanding universal value of a nomination. He announced that, for the purposes of better orientation, clarifying the correspondence between old and new criteria would be included in the corresponding section of the draft Decisions of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.4** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its gratitude to the members of the Committee, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, as well as local stakeholders, for

the support received in the nomination process. It assured the Committee that it would continue its efforts to strengthen the protection of the property in close consultation with the local community, including by developing interpretation facilities and opportunities for local development.

## ARAB STATES

Property	<b>Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley)</b>
Id. N°	<b>N 1186</b>
State Party	<b>Egypt</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (i)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.5**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Chile**, stressing that the nomination was in a category not yet represented on the World Heritage List, and supported by the Delegations of **China, India, Norway** and **South Africa**, strongly commended the State Party on the remarkable site and endorsed the draft Decision to inscribe it on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.5** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked all those involved in the process for inscribing the site of Wadi Al Hitan. It also assured the Committee that a management plan for the property was already in place and a visitor centre would shortly be developed. The Delegation dedicated the inscription of the site to the memory of the late Ms Mervat Omar, former Secretary-General of the Egyptian National Commission for UNESCO, whose last wish had been to see the property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

## ASIA / PACIFIC

Property	<b>Shiretoko</b>
Id. N°	<b>1193</b>
State Party	<b>Japan</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.6**

The Chairperson resumed the chair.

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Chile**, seconded by the Delegations of **China** and **Nigeria**, expressed its enthusiastic support for the nomination and commended Japan in particular on the involvement of the local community in the process.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.6** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked all Committee members for their support, as well as IUCN for its cooperation. The governor of Hokkaido explained that local concern about the protection of the precious site was the very reason it had been preserved thus far. The governor also stated that the indigenous people of Hokkaido, the Ainu, indeed, had always had a religious respect for nature, and this spirit of preservation lived on in the residents of this area, who pioneered a grass-roots movement for conservation. The Delegation provided assurances that current efforts to protect the property would be continued and even strengthened."

## EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	<b>West Norwegian Fjords - Geirangerfjord and Nærøyfjord</b>
Id. N°	<b>1195</b>
State Party	<b>Norway</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (i)(iii)</b>

*Decision:* **29 COM 8B.7**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, supported by the Delegations of **Chile** and **Benin**, enthusiastically supported the proposal to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, noting that the site had unquestionable outstanding universal value, commended the State Party for having prepared the nomination in close consultation with neighbouring countries.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.7** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, rising to a point of order, asked for sufficient time to be allowed for clarifying technical issues. It did not have any difficulty in supporting the inscription of the Norwegian site, but regretted that the current conduct of business had prevented it from obtaining information on certain aspects of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the pertinence of the point made by the Delegation of the Netherlands and agreed to ask first in future discussions whether there were any requests for clarifications or technical points before considering the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its delight at the Committee's decision, which marked the inscription of the Norway's first natural heritage site on the World

Heritage List, and thanked the members of the Committee and all other parties involved for their support in the nomination process.

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.8**  
**Withdrawn to the request of the State Party**  
**Retiree à la demande de l'Etat partie**

## LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

Property	<b>Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California</b>
Id. N°	<b>1182</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.9**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked for additional information on the creation of additional marine reserves within and around the nominated property, which it considered to be essential for the safeguarding of the value of the proposed site. It also asked about measures being taken against intensive fishing and to control the reef barriers, and for cartographical information.

**IUCN** said that a map was included in the document provided to the Committee showing some of the marine reserves, which **IUCN** had considered fully sufficient to ensure the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. **IUCN**, however, had understood that additional marine reserves would be established to further extend the protected areas.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** confirmed that that was indeed the case. Indeed, since the **IUCN** evaluation, two more marine reserves had been established.

Se référant au paragraphe 2 du projet de décision, la Délégation du **Liban** se demande si la citation d'un auteur est bien appropriée dans une décision comme justification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et préférerait que la phrase soit supprimée.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether it was appropriate to have both “Islands” and “Protected Areas” in the name of the nominated property.

In the light of the discussion held for the nomination of the Wadi Al Hitan (Valley of the Whales), the Delegation of **Egypt** noted that the site was a “Whale Valley in the

making”, and therefore of great heritage significance. It expressed its full support for the inscription.

The Delegation of **Chile** seconded the Delegation of Lebanon and commended the good work achieved by both the federal and local governments of Baja and Alta California within the State Party, especially by involving the local communities over the previous ten years and strongly supported the inscription of the site, composed of more than 255 exceptional islands.

The Delegation of **Colombia** concurred with the Delegation of Lebanon as well as with the Delegation of the Netherlands, with reference to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision requesting the State Party to submit information on a regular basis on the creation of marine reserves. It supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.9** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** said that it was deeply moved by the Committee’s decision to inscribe the Gulf of California on the World Heritage List, and considered it to be an incentive to continue conservation work with the local communities, NGOs, private sector and researchers in order to ensure that the unique heritage could be maintained. It added that the Gulf of California was one of the most extraordinary places on Earth. Quoting Jacques Cousteau on the marine world, it reminded all present of the need to keep such a legacy. It would ensure that any proposals that might have a negative impact on the property were resisted.

Property	<b>Mbaracayú Forest Nature Reserve</b>
Id. N°	<b>1190</b>
State Party	<b>Paraguay</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.10**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** commended Paraguay on the very interesting nomination, and reminded those present that, if inscribed, it would be the first natural World Heritage property in Paraguay. Referring to the statement made by IUCN, it wondered whether it would be possible to consider the inscription of the Mbaracayú Forest Nature Reserve as an extension of the Iguazú National Park (Argentina) and Iguazu National Park (Brazil). It also commended the Bertoni Foundation on the quality of the work it had been conducting in the region. It added that the Chaco ecoregion was under-represented on the World Heritage List, and that it would be useful to develop a tool for the presentation of a transboundary nomination, along the lines of the IUCN proposal of establishing a biosphere reserve. In that regard, it proposed adding the two States Parties of Argentina and Brazil to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, commending the State Party on its efforts in preparing the nomination, asked for clarification as to why the latter had been considered as complete by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body since it appeared that no criteria were provided to justify its possible inscription on the List. If the World Heritage Centre had sent it back as incomplete, perhaps the State Party might have given some consideration to the whole nomination and would have come back with a different proposal altogether.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that it had at first been in favour of the deletion of paragraph 4, since the Chaco region was not even included in the Tentative List of the State Party, and the Committee did not have enough information in that regard. However, having heard the Delegation of Argentina, it considered that the paragraph was relevant. The decision should encourage the State Party to start working on its Tentative List, in any case, considering the significant costs involved in developing a full nomination.

In response to the question asked by the Delegation of Argentina, **IUCN** confirmed that the site of the Mbaracayu' Forest Nature Reserve could have potential for inscription on the World Heritage List, if it were submitted as an extension of the Iguazu World Heritage property. On the issue of the completeness of the nomination file when submitted to the World Heritage Centre, it stated that it was a professional judgment made bearing in mind a number of factors, including the fact that it was the first nomination from the State Party concerning a natural heritage site. IUCN had identified the Chaco region as one that was still not adequately represented on the World Heritage List, but said that substantial work would be required for a nomination to be put forward in terms of identification of a site within this region.

The **Rapporteur** suggested an addition to paragraph 4 to reflect the comment made by the Delegation of Colombia on the importance of the Tentative List.

The Delegation of **Argentina** recalled that paragraph 4 “encourages” studies to focus on the Chaco eco-region, since there was a real potential for an extension of the site if all States Parties involved were in agreement. It seconded the proposed amendment and proposed an amendment to paragraph 2 that read “*Encourages the State Party, in consultation with the States Parties of Argentina and Brazil, to consider the extension of the Iguazu/Iguazú National Parks*”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.10** provisionally adopted as amended.

## ASIA / PACIFIC

Property	<b>Dong Phayayen - Khao Yai Forest Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>590 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Thailand</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.11**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** commended the State Party on the efforts made since the Bureau had deferred the nomination 14 years previously. It also said that it supported the inscription of the site on the List and commented on necessity for quantifying of the property's carrying capacity and monitoring number of visitors, to prevent the property from losing its value.

The Delegation of **China** commended the State Party on the efforts made since the Bureau had deferred the nomination 14 years previously, in particular by developing a national system of protected areas. It supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.11** provisionally adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** thanked the Committee for its decision. It had not been easy to take on board all the recommendations made by the Bureau in 1991, including extending the protected area, and meet the requirements for inscription. However, Thailand had gone beyond those requirements by establishing a new wildlife sanctuary up to the border with Cambodia with a view to a possible future transboundary nomination to link up with the protected areas of that country. The Observer Delegation provided assurances that it would fully implement the recommendations included in the decision.

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.12**

**Withdrawn to the request of the State Party**  
**Retiree à la demande de l'Etat partie**

## **LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

Property	<b>Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection</b>
Id. N°	<b>1138 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Panama</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.13**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** acknowledged the enormous amount of work carried out by the State Party to upgrade the nomination file. It would have appreciated more information in the document prepared by IUCN on the comparative

analysis and on the reasons why its negative recommendation of 2004 had become positive one year later. However, it had no problem in supporting the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Following some clarifications by IUCN, the Delegation of **Colombia** stressed the major importance of the site, especially in relation to the numerous endemic species it contained, and supported its inscription on the List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.13** provisionally adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** expressed its gratitude to the South African authorities for their hospitality. It commended the Smithsonian Institution for the great support it had provided. Referring to paragraph 5 of the Decision, it stated that the current management plan would serve as a management tool for the area and that it would develop various management plans for other reserves. It also suggested going beyond national borders in considering the establishment of a main corridor on the eastern tropical Pacific from Panama to the Galapagos Islands. Finally, it pointed out that international recognition would facilitate its efforts to ensure the protection of Coiba National Park, and welcomed the comments and recommendations of UNESCO and IUCN.

### **A.3 Extension of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

#### **ASIA / PACIFIC**

Property	<b>Valley of Flowers National Park (Extension to Nanda Devi National Park)</b>
Id. N°	<b>335 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.14**

**IUCN** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked about the state of progress of the new master plan for the site. As mentioned in the report, it should have been completed by June 2005.

**IUCN** said that, according to information received from the State Party the plan was almost ready. The new plan was related to the very effective management plan for the Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve which provided the overall management framework for the period 2003-2013.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the extension of the property of Nanda Devi National Park. It stressed that the Eco-Development Committee was a good example of heritage management with local community participation.



The Delegation of **China** noted that since there were minor modifications, the Delegation supported the extension proposed by India.

The Delegation of **India** explained that the management plan was being updated to reinforce collaboration between stakeholders and would be finalized very soon.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.14** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee and explained that the site was under the highest level of protection in India, which would ensure that international standards were respected in the conservation of the property. The World Heritage Committee had encouraged the Government of India to extend the boundaries of the Nanda Devi National Park in 1988 on its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.



## FIFTH DAY

### NINTH MEETING

Thursday 14 July 2005

03.00 pm - 11.15 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: At its ninth meeting, the Committee continued the evaluation of the nominations to the World Heritage List.

Note du Rapporteur : A sa 9e réunion, le Comité a poursuivi l'examen des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

#### ITEM 8 B NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (Continued)

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/8B  
WHC-05/29.COM/8B.Add  
WHC-05/29.COM/8B.Add 2  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.1  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.2  
WHC-05/29.COM/INF.8B.2 Add  
*Decisions :* 29 COM 8B.1 to 29 COM 8B.55

#### A.4 Minor Modifications of Boundaries to Natural Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

##### EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	Durmitor National Park
Id. N°	100 Bis
State Party	Serbia and Montenegro
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (ii)(iii)(iv)

*Decision:* 29 COM 8B.15

IUCN presented the site.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if clarifications were needed. As there was no request for additional information from the Committee, he gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

After hearing the **Rapporteur**, he declared Decision **29 COM 8B.15** provisionally adopted with no changes.

Property	<b>Doñana National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>685 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>N (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.16**

**UICN** presented the site.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if clarifications were needed. As there was no request for additional information, he gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

After hearing the **Rapporteur**, he declared Decision **29 COM 8B.16** provisionally adopted with no changes.

## **B. MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **B.1 New nominations**

#### **AFRICA**

Property	<b>Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda</b>
Id. N°	<b>1147</b>
State Party	<b>Gabon</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iii)(iv) N (ii)(iv) CL</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.17**

**ICOMOS** and **IUCN** presented the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** a souligné le problème général posé par les sites mixtes et par les évaluations de l'UICN et de l'ICOMOS. Il serait souhaitable que les deux évaluations suivent une logique identique et cohérente. Les évaluations de l'UICN indiquent les dates de réception du dossier et des informations demandées, ainsi que la bibliographie. En revanche celles de l'ICOMOS ne contiennent pas toutes ces indications, ce qui ne permet pas de comprendre aisément si de nouvelles

informations ont été reçues ou non. En outre les cartes présentées pour ce site ne sont pas les mêmes chez les deux organisations consultatives : l’UICN utilise la dernière carte révisée, alors que l’ICOMOS utilise la première carte avant révision. La Délégation du Liban souhaite également savoir pourquoi l’UICN exclut le critère (iv) pour ce site, alors que la présence d’une race de cercopithèque endémique au Gabon à la Lopé pourrait justifier son emploi. Enfin, la Délégation du Liban fait remarquer que lorsque l’ICOMOS recommande que l’inscription d’un site soit différée, il n’analyse pas les critères potentiellement valables, alors que l’UICN le fait. Par conséquent, il est difficile pour le Comité de se faire une opinion.

IUCN explained that criterion (iv) have been applied to biodiversity in a holistic sense and in terms of the number and diversity of species enclosed within the limits of the property. It considered that the nominated property did not meet criterion (iv).

The Delegation of **Lebanon** turned to the issue of the uniqueness of the *black colobus* –the sun-tailed monkey - and wondered to which criteria its uniqueness could correspond.

IUCN said that as far as it knew Gabon was the only country in which the species lived, but that it might be possible to find the *colobus* in other areas of the country. Current scientific information was not sufficient. Moreover, applying a single-specie approach seemed to be limited according to the spirit of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked for clarification regarding paragraph 4 of the draft Decision on the need to produce a Tentative List that more clearly identified priorities for World Heritage in Gabon.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the site was of outstanding value in Africa. It underlined the need to use a special approach in the examination of the site which would take into consideration the local cultural meanings of the natural environment. Beyond the rock art and the archaeological remains it was important to promote that type of site. It would prefer inscribing the site to deferring the nomination.

IUCN said that the Tentative List had been mentioned because IUCN had been informed that it might be possible to find other sites in Gabon of equal or better quality. Without more in-depth scientific information, the outstanding universal value could not be assessed. According to the present analysis, the site was of regional value. The issue of integrity continued to pose a problem since the information provided was not complete. The universal significance of the area had yet to be demonstrated.

La Délégation du **Bénin** remercie les Organisations consultatives pour leurs rapports. Elle souligne que le Gabon n’a encore aucun site inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; que de ce fait, elle souhaite l’inscription de celui-ci, tout en veillant à bien suivre les procédures. Elle se rallie aux Délégations du Liban, de l’Afrique du Sud et du Nigeria. Elle rappelle que d’après l’UICN et l’ICOMOS, ce site aurait une valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle, mais elles n’ont pas eu le temps de s’en assurer complètement. L’UICN a reçu une inscription révisée au 31 mars, ce qui est en contradiction avec le fait qu’il est recommandé de différer la décision tant que l’inscription révisée n’a pas été formulée. Si l’inscription de ce site était différée, il

faudrait alors reprendre tout le processus, ce qui pourrait prendre deux ou trois ans ; la Délégation du Bénin se demande si cela est nécessaire puisque la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est potentiellement présente. La Délégation du Bénin appuie donc la Délégation du Nigeria. Il sera possible d'avoir un avis définitif sur ce site à la prochaine session du Comité. Enfin la Délégation du Bénin fait remarquer que l'ICOMOS souhaite que le périmètre du site soit plus étendu, et s'interroge par conséquent sur ce qu'il sera souhaitable de faire si le Gabon n'a pas les moyens de gérer une superficie plus grande.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the fact that one needed to look at the unique species, as it was an endangered species that might be lost for ever. The site should be inscribed - it was important for Africa, and its inscription was supported by Nigeria and Benin. For the time being, the nomination should be referred back to the State Party, which should work in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies to improve the design and provide comprehensive information. It asked to hear the opinion of the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** said that the State Party would need time to carry out that task.

The Delegations of **Lithuania** and **Colombia** recommended referring the nomination back to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether there were any objections to the proposal.

The Delegation of **China** suggested fixing a deadline for the submission of the additional information.

La Délégation du **Gabon** (Observateur) remercie le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, le Président et les membres du Comité. Il déclare que depuis plusieurs années son pays mène une politique systématique de protection des forêts tropicales et des aires protégées afférentes. Ainsi, en 2002, treize parcs nationaux ont été créés, celui de la Lopé étant un des plus importants. En ce qui concerne l'agrandissement du site, un sanctuaire culturel a été créé à l'est du parc de Lopé-Okanda après la visite de l'ICOMOS en 2004, ainsi qu'un sanctuaire naturel au Sud. L'ensemble du personnel sur le site est passé à 80 personnes. Diverses organisations non gouvernementales comme le WWF et la WCS ("Wildlife Conservation Society" – « Société pour la Conservation de la Faune») travaillent sur le site. Il existe un plan d'aménagement avec un budget et un plan de travail sur cinq ans ; ce plan devrait être révisé en 2007. Enfin, la Délégation du Gabon sollicite l'aide des Organisations consultatives afin de présenter des documents qui seraient à la hauteur des exigences du Comité.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of Benin and suggested that the country should request international assistance from the World Heritage Fund to carry out the necessary tasks.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its conviction as to the outstanding regional value of the site and its desire to support the State Party in facing the challenge with international assistance.

The Delegation of **China** noted that the State Party had no site inscribed to date on the World Heritage List and that therefore international cooperation was needed.

**IUCN** explained that it might take more than one year to provide all the information required.

**ICOMOS** said that it would be delighted to help the country seek a proper system of protection for a larger area and to provide guidelines for the management plan. Apparently the protection of the cultural sanctuaries was under way and could be finalized by the end of 2005.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS and IUCN to prepare a revised draft Decision, in consultation with the Rapporteur, to be submitted to the Committee later that session. [The draft Decision was submitted to the Committee on 16 July.]

Property	<b>Ecosystem and Cultural Landscape of the Minkébé Massif</b>
Id. N°	<b>1148</b>
State Party	<b>Gabon</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (v)(vi) N (ii)(iii)(iv) CL</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.18**

**ICOMOS** and **IUCN** presented the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que ce site pose un problème méthodologique intéressant. En effet, il s'agit d'un site mixte dont l'inscription devrait être différée du point de vue des critères naturels, et non inscrit du point de vue des critères culturels. Si ce site doit un jour être inscrit comme site naturel, et si une autre partie du site est inscrite comme paysage culturel, les deux ne coïncideront que partiellement. L'autre problème concerne la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de la culture Baka.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that due to the loss of the traditional way of life, the cultural resources of the site could be examined under the "Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity" and the natural part of the nomination submitted separately.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the two sites submitted by Gabon should be considered together. Both shared the same main threats: looting, mining, hunting and inadequate management. In the case of Lopé-Okanda the ecology was not quite as endangered. The Delegation was not sure whether the cultural and natural resources should be included in the same nomination or split into two nominations.

The Delegation of **India** wondered whether it would be possible to combine the two nominations for the sites of Lopé-Okanda and the Minkébé Massif.

**IUCN** did not see any methodological problem, on the contrary, it could be considered as a challenge. It could become a serial cultural landscape nomination,

which could better convey the natural and cultural complexity of the site. This could offer a good opportunity for ICOMOS and IUCN to work more closely together. The State Party should gather more information and assess all different proposed options, including the possibility of a serial nomination, before taking a decision on how the nomination could be submitted.

**ICOMOS** said, with relation to the statement of the Delegation of Colombia, that knowledge of the forest could not be divorced from the cultural life of the community. Cultural knowledge was not independent of the natural environment in which human life evolved, according to the spirit of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that it was impossible to separate culture and nature since the outstanding universal value was founded on the relation between them. A plan of preservation should combine the two aspects; otherwise it would not be possible to develop a framework of integrated conservation. The Delegation expressed its doubts concerning the concept of integrity and wondered if all the Baka culture would have to be included in the nomination in order to ensure a sustainable future for their culture and nature. It was of the opinion that the integrity of the property did not depend on the temporal depth of the cultural/natural relationship of Baka culture with its natural environment.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by the Delegation of **New Zealand**, was in favour of referring the nomination back to the State Party and reconsidering the inscription of the site at the Committee's next session.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that Gabon needed support to prepare the nomination and set up a management plan. The Delegation was in favour of referring the nomination back to the State Party and providing the State Party with the support of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the idea of referring the nomination back to the State Party for completion.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the previous speakers.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that threats could lead to increased commitment on the part of local people. In the event that the site was not inscribed at the present session, the Delegation would agree to refer the nomination back to the State Party for completion.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that in the case of referral back to the State Party, the criteria under which the nomination would be resubmitted should be made absolutely clear. The Advisory Bodies should work together and provide the Committee with an amended text of the draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Bénin** se rallie à celle du Liban : le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives devraient présenter un projet de décision révisé. Le Comité pourra décider ensuite.



The Delegation of **Colombia** wondered to what extent a nomad community met the criteria for eligibility as a world cultural property to be inscribed on the World Heritage Site.

The **Chairperson** asked the Advisory Bodies to prepare a revised draft Decision, in consultation with the Rapporteur, to be submitted to the Committee later that session [The revised draft Decision was submitted to the Committee on 15th July 2005]. He added that such text should reflect the suggestion made by the Delegation of Argentina.

## EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	<b>St Kilda (renomination to include cultural criteria)</b>
Id. N°	<b>387 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<i>N (ii)(iii)(iv) C (iii)(iv)(v)</i>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.19**

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it heartily endorsed the nomination and requested additional information concerning the conservation plan for archaeological remains.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the inscription of the site.

**ICOMOS** said that the stone structures referred to by the Delegation of Lithuania were a key component of the outstanding universal value of the site and their conservation should be prioritized.

The Delegation of **Chile** congratulated the State Party on the efforts made following the recommendations made by the Committee at its 28th session and supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the State Party on submitting a nomination that represented a unique way of life of outstanding value, and said that it strongly supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **India** said that the site was exceptional and that it supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the site warranted inscription as a cultural landscape even though the fauna was much more evident than human life.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and the **Russian Federation** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Netherlands** also supported the inscription, but drew the attention of the Committee to the missing archaeological conservation plan mentioned by the Delegation of Lithuania.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM B.19** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Committee and stressed how impressive the site was for foreign visitors. It would have been unfair if the nomination had not included the cultural outstanding universal value of the site. The nomination recognized that all the local isolated unique values were of outstanding universal value as well.

## C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

### AFRICA

Property	<b>Harar Jugol, the fortified historical town</b>
Id. N°	<b>1189</b>
State Party	<b>Ethiopia</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(v)</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.21**

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked why criteria (ii) and (v) had not been reported upon and emphasized that the Committee would have preferred the criteria to be evaluated by the Advisory Body and presented clearly so that it could then take an informed decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that Harar was a unique Islamic city with its own indigenous people and could not be compared to the World Heritage properties of Lamu and Zabid Old Town. Although Harar was geographically isolated, it had been able to survive into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and was a major centre of the coffee trade. Indeed, Harari coffee, an arabica variety, had acquired a global reputation on account of its exceptionally high quality. A story like that, of human civilization extending to a global scale, should be mentioned in the nomination file. It had not been made clear as to why criteria (iii) and (v) were not convincing but criteria (ii) and (v) were.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the site should be inscribed and/or referred back to the State Party, but not deferred, as proposed by ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Liban** trouve tout à fait valide l'inscription sur la base des critères (ii) et (v), mais considère que l'emploi du critère (iii) n'est pas convaincant et conteste

le critère (iv). Elle avoue être séduite par l'inscription immédiate du site mais pense qu'il est probablement plus sage d'en demander le renvoi afin que l'Etat partie puisse préparer un plan de gestion et préciser les raisons justifiant chacun des critères retenus. Elle propose enfin l'ajout d'un paragraphe e) justifiant l'emploi du critère (iv).

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the site was worthy of inscription, but on certain conditions, as described by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it supported referring the nomination back to the State Party. It proposed adding to paragraph 2 a recommendation that the State Party undertake an impact assessment study on the infrastructure to be built.

L'**ICOMOS** indique que les critères (ii) et (v) n'ont pas été rejetés, et qu'il suivra de toute manière l'avis du Comité. L'**ICOMOS** dit ne pas être pas convaincu par les critères (iii) et (iv), et estime que l'Etat partie devrait clairement montrer qu'ils sont justifiés, auquel cas il n'y aurait pas de problème. L'**ICOMOS** rappelle également la nécessité de conduire une étude d'impact sur la construction de la route.

La Délégation du **Bénin** tient tout d'abord à féliciter l'Etat partie pour la proposition de ce site remarquable. Elle demande si, en cas de renvoi, l'**ICOMOS** et le Centre du patrimoine mondial seront en mesure d'aider l'Etat partie à réviser le plan directeur en un an. Dans le cas contraire, elle propose que le Comité encourage l'Etat partie à soumettre une demande d'assistance internationale dans ce but.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that it supported the referral of the nomination back to the State Party, rather than its deferral.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it had found the report of ICOMOS confusing and considered that it should have shown why criteria (ii) and (v) were not convincing. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site on condition that it could be shown in the future that criteria (ii) and (v) had been met. It wondered as to whether there were associated sub-soil archives that could be studied and proposed that some archaeological information should be added to the nomination.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that it would have agreed to the immediate inscription of the site, but would abide by the consensus for its referral back to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee was unanimous in supporting the referral of the site back to the State Party, with the request that additional information on the archaeology of the site and the application of criteria (iv), and the impact assessment study of the road and infrastructure construction were included in the nomination. The Committee further requested that the State Party seek international assistance from the World Heritage Fund to enable its requests to be addressed, and asked ICOMOS to provide justification for criteria (ii) and (v).

He declared Decision **29 COM 8B.21** provisionally adopted as amended.

ICOMOS additionally requested that both criteria (ii) and (v) should be further demonstrated by the State Party.

Property	<b>Chongoni Rock Art Area</b>
Id. N°	<b>476</b>
State Party	<b>Malawi</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iii)(vi)</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.22**

ICOMOS presented the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the State Party had made quite significant efforts and that the Committee had been provided with a great deal of information. It proposed that the site could be inscribed at the 30th session of the Committee and that for the moment, the nomination should be referred back to the State Party as recommended by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the site was outstanding and it was also fragile. It recalled a former experience, where the Matobo Hills National Park in Zimbabwe had been inscribed without a management plan. Two years later, the site was being conserved and the management plan had been fully developed with the participation of the local communities. It suggested that the Committee should follow the same rationale with the nomination under discussion: it should inscribe the site and trust that the preparation of the management plan would follow.

La Délégation du **Bénin** demande s'il existe une protection coutumière du bien, en dehors de toute protection juridique.

ICOMOS said that the people lived at the edge of the forest and not in it and that there were no traditional mechanisms for the protection of the site. Accordingly, that kind of protection had not been considered in the evaluation of the site.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it agreed with the Delegation of Colombia that the Committee should follow the recommendation of ICOMOS and refer the site back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that it too agreed with the Delegation of Colombia. The draft Decision should include a paragraph congratulating the State Party on its efforts, but also request the resolution of issues concerning the legal protection of the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.22** provisionally adopted.

The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and resumed at 7.15 p.m.

Property	<b>Osun-Osoḡbo Sacred Grove</b>
Id. N°	<b>1118</b>
State Party	<b>Nigeria</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iii)(v)(vi) CL</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.23**

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

La D l gation du **B nin** souligne que cette proposition d'inscription est un  v nement pour la communaut  africaine en ce sens qu'elle d montre l'alliance entre le tangible et l'intangible, entre le mat riel et l'immat riel, dans la cosmogonie yoruba, et estime que l'inscription de ce site ne ferait que renforcer la connaissance et la compr hension de cette alliance. Elle remercie la D l gation du Nigeria en langue yoruba, et soutient fortement l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed support for the inscription of the site, which was highly significant for African people, on the World Heritage List. It commended the State Party on the good state of conservation of the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed full support for the inscription of the site, which was an important holy site for the Yoruba people. However, it questioned the emphasis on a single artist and that artist's integration into Yoruba culture in the justification for inscription under criterion (ii).

**ICOMOS**, in clarification, said that it considered that the art work embodied a fusion of ideas.

The Delegation of **Chile**, supporting the nomination, thanked ICOMOS for its comprehensive report. The religious culture referred to had been transferred to Latin American countries by the Yoruba Diaspora.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it had great pleasure in supporting the site and its inscription in the World Heritage List.

La D l gation du **Liban** soutient les propos de la D l gation des Pays-Bas quant   l'int gration de Suzanne Wenger   la culture yoruba. Elle consid re que l'importance du site vient de beaucoup plus loin et qu'il conviendrait de mettre en avant un mouvement, celui des Artistes du Nouvel Art sacr , et non pas un seul artiste.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** wondered whether 40 years was a long enough period to properly assess the impact to the site of the paintings of the Austrian artist Suzanne Wenger. Criterion II is not usually used for such short period.

The Delegation of **India** said that it supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it fully supported the nomination, but proposed the insertion of a reference in the draft Decision to the conditions in which the tarmac road referred to in the evaluation report would be built.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.23** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Nigeria**, represented by the Minister of Culture and Tourism and the Governor of the Region, thanked the Committee on behalf of the people and the Government of Nigeria.

Property	<b>Kondoa Rock Art Sites</b>
Id. N°	<b>1183</b>
State Party	<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(vi)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.24**

**ICOMOS** presented the site and told the Committee that new information had been received from the State Party within the previous week clarifying some of the issues that had led to the ICOMOS recommendation to defer inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that the site was obviously of outstanding universal value. The Committee should invite the State Party to explain how it would address the issues raised in the evaluation by ICOMOS.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** read out a statement referring to the grounds on which it had been recommended to defer the inscription of the site. The Delegation said that all the issues raised by ICOMOS were important and pertinent to the proper and effective conservation and protection of the rock art site. The same issues had been identified during the preliminary condition survey in 2000 and both the approved conservation and management plans took them into consideration. As regarded the preparation of a site record system, the process for the construction of an information and documentation centre, which had begun in 2001, had been completed in 2004, and the complex was intended to house all the documents related to rock painting, and in particular Kondoa rock art, in the country. A proper recording system would be put in place starting from July 2005. On the preparation of a conservation plan for the site, the plan already existed, it had been prepared in 2001 by the Department of Antiquities. With regard to the appointment of a site manager to undertake the implementation of the management plan, the Delegation informed the Committee that a site manager had been appointed in April 2005 and was expected to take up managerial functions in July 2005. With respect to the establishment of the buffer zone, a declaration order for the preservation and conservation of the Kondoa rock art site defining the buffer zone had been signed by the Minister responsible for antiquities in October 2004.

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed that the site should be inscribed under criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Egypt** drew the attention of ICOMOS to one of the differences between IUCN presentations and ICOMOS presentations, namely that IUCN justified each of the criteria proposed for inscription. The criteria proposed for inscription did not automatically follow on from the description of the property, and the Committee was left to accept ICOMOS's conclusions without justification. A comparative analysis should be undertaken and there was a need to demonstrate why the criteria to be applied had been selected. The Delegation wished to know how long the Committee would have to wait until the nomination file was satisfactory. Finally, it proposed referring the nomination back to the State party, rather than deferring it.

**ICOMOS** replied that criteria (iii) and (vi) would be appropriate if the Committee decided to inscribe the site at the present session. The extra information submitted and the appointment of the site manager were substantive developments.

The Delegation of **Egypt** emphasized that it was not for the Committee to decide under which criteria a site should be inscribed, it was for ICOMOS to evaluate the site and the criteria and then propose to the Committee the most appropriate criteria and state whether the proposed criteria had been met or not.

La Délégation du **Bénin** se déclare perplexe après cette présentation et avoue ne pas comprendre ce qui est demandé à l'Etat partie. Elle souligne que le site possède une valeur universelle exceptionnelle très claire, pour son art rupestre atypique. Elle s'interroge sur les raisons pour lesquelles il faudrait différer la proposition d'inscription alors que l'Etat partie a déjà rempli toutes les conditions. A défaut d'inscription immédiate, elle propose que la proposition soit renvoyée à l'Etat partie, mais en aucun cas différée.

The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the new information supplied by the State Party. The Committee was facing an entirely different situation to that described in the evaluation. The site should be referred back to the State Party rather than being inscribed at the present session.

The Delegation of **China** said that the Committee had all the additional information required, as confirmed by ICOMOS, and consequently it would support inscription at the present session.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Committee had before it a site of outstanding universal value with all the necessary documentation. The Committee was asking a great deal of the State Party. The Delegation supported the proposal put forward by Egypt on the need for ICOMOS to clearly identify the criteria proposed and to justify them. It stressed that the Committee could not wait until the very last minute, information should be provided in time and included in the working documents. The Committee should either to go ahead with the inscription or wait at least one year to ensure that all measures were actually in place, which would mean referring the site back to the State Party. The Delegation observed that the provision of alternatives for firewood for the villagers would take a long time. It would, nevertheless, support the immediate inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** déclare avoir de gros problèmes avec ce site, en raison du rapport fait par l'ICOMOS, et informe le Comité qu'un projet de décision sur la rigueur escomptée des Organisations consultatives dans leurs évaluations est en cours de préparation. Elle souligne qu'il est impossible pour le Comité de continuer à travailler dans des conditions aussi laxistes, et que chaque critère, retenu ou non, doit être justifié de manière claire et précise. La Délégation demande si l'ICOMOS a reçu le rapport qui a été présenté par la Délégation de la République-Unie de Tanzanie, si les mesures conservatoires présentées ont été mises en place à temps, et si l'ICOMOS a eu le temps d'analyser ce rapport. Enfin, elle rappelle que les documents doivent être remis à temps aux membres du Comité et appelle au respect de la méthodologie établie.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that on listening to the ICOMOS presentation it had appeared that all the necessary information had been submitted. Accordingly, the site should be inscribed immediately.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, in support of the statement by the Delegation of Egypt, proposed adding a subparagraph (f) to paragraph 3 of the draft Decision calling for a more detailed comparative analysis of the property. Such an analysis was required before the Committee could continue its consideration of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the assessment made by ICOMOS was quite clear and that the property could be inscribed under criteria (ii) and (vi). It disagreed with the views expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon regarding the submission of information after the deadline. It was satisfied by the information provided by the State Party and considered that the site should be referred back to the State Party, if not inscribed immediately.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed inscription under criteria (iii) and (vi).

**ICOMOS** told the Committee that it had yet to see a conservation plan of the site. It understood that the question of firewood provision could not be solved overnight, but a plan for its resolution had to be requested. The late submission of relevant information was indeed problematic - information received after the 31 March deadline had not been taken into account – but lack of information was not the only obstacle to the inscription of the site, there were other issues that needed to be addressed before it could be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it was clear that information received after the deadline of 31 March could not be checked or evaluated and it was not clear whether such information would justify the inscription of the site. Accordingly, the nomination should be referred back to the State Party and not deferred.

La Délégation du **Liban** remarque que l'ICOMOS n'a pas répondu à la question de savoir si, oui ou non, le site possède une valeur universelle exceptionnelle, car celle-ci semble conditionnée dans le rapport de l'organisation consultative. Elle souligne de nouveau le manque de professionnalisme, de méthodologie et d'esprit scientifique avec lesquels sont faites les évaluations. Elle rappelle qu'afin d'éviter d'inscrire des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril quelques années après leur



inscription comme bien du patrimoine mondial, il convient de ne pas accepter des informations complémentaires qui seraient soumises après la date butoir. Si l'ICOMOS n'est pas convaincu de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, il doit proposer que la proposition d'inscription soit différée ; si en revanche l'ICOMOS en est convaincu, alors il doit proposer le renvoi à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it would go along with the consensus in the Committee.

**ICOMOS** said that its evaluation report was quite unambiguous about the outstanding universal value of the site – indeed, it did not see how it could have been clearer.

The **Chairperson** recalled the need for evaluation of the property and of new information, and the need to respect the deadline of 31 March, even though the State Party had confirmed that it had complied with the requirements. The provision of the firewood required clear thinking in view of the fact that it was of such importance to the local population.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.24** to refer nomination of the Konda Rock Art Sites provisionally adopted.

### **Extensions of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Makapan Valley and Taung Skull Fossil Site (Serial extension to Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs)</b>
Id. N°	<b>915 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iii)(vi)</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.25**

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it would like to know why this part of the site was not part of the first nomination. It also wanted to know whether there was a management plan in place for the site.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that, based on the report of ICOMOS, it supported the extension of the site under criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that the extension site under consideration had the same values as the area already inscribed. South Africa had decided to nominate the entire site for inscription in phases, ensuring that legal protection for the proposed area of extension was already in place before it was brought before the Committee.

**ICOMOS** said that despite its initial concerns the State Party had recently demonstrated that it was managing the site, and ICOMOS had furthermore requested the State Party to set up a local management coordinating body. ICOMOS thanked the State Party for its prompt adherence to its request, as shown by a letter received before the deadline of 31 March 2005 in which the State Party undertook to put in place the requested management mechanisms.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.25** to extend Makapan Valley and Taung Skull Fossil Site (Serial extension to Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs) provisionally adopted.

## ARAB STATES

### New nominations

Property	<b>Qal'at al-Bahrain Archeological Site</b>
Id. N°	<b>1192</b>
State Party	<b>Bahrain</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.26**

**ICOMOS** presented the property and informed the Committee that it had received, at its request, additional information before 31 March, in which future excavation and conservation plans were described as well as specific legislation for the palm groves. It also mentioned two projects which represented threats to the site: an artificial island and urban development, yet to be approved. It recommended the inscription of the property, but proposed amending the draft Decision with the addition of a third paragraph that would read as follows:

“Requests the State Party to prepare a full management plan, including a proper management mechanism to be able to implement the plan and [to ensure] that no more land reclamation should take place along the coast flanking the site”.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that the fort and architectural remains possessed outstanding universal value, which could eventually lead to the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. However, it did have some concerns despite the clarifications given by ICOMOS. It asked why all the recommendations made in the evaluation were not reflected in the draft Decision. It suggested adding extra safeguarding measures for conservation and consolidation of the excavated area, to be integrated into the conservation and management plan, and a legal structure to be put in place to ensure that no more land reclamation could take place. The nomination should be referred back to the State Party to allow it to implement the suggested recommendations.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** agreed with the Delegation of the Netherlands. It observed a discrepancy between the ICOMOS evaluation and the draft Decision and said that the evaluation had seemed to lead more to a referral back to the State Party than to inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, having listened to the presentation of the site, said that it strongly supported the inscription, and congratulated the State Party on the work done.

The Delegation of **Norway**, referring to the statements made by the Delegations of the Netherlands and Lithuania, observed that two of the ICOMOS recommendations, requesting a conservation plan and a management structure, had been complied with. It proposed referring the site back to the State Party in order to ensure that all the recommendations were applied. That would also be for the benefit of the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** reminded the Committee that if the nomination was successful, it would be the first property of Bahrain to be included in the World Heritage List. It supported the recommendation of ICOMOS to inscribe the important archaeological property, with the conviction that the Advisory Body's recommendations would be implemented in full.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** was convinced of the outstanding universal value of the property. Having listened to the debate, it recalled the importance of not setting double standards, and therefore supported referring the property back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, acknowledging the outstanding universal value of the property, said that it agreed with previous speakers who had advocated referring the property back to the State Party. The comparative analysis in the evaluation was poor, and some additional paragraphs should be added.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, supported by the Delegation of **China**, said that it was in favour of the inscription of the property and the adoption of the draft Decision with the amendment proposed by ICOMOS. It mentioned the development pressure and conservation problems, and invited the State Party to give a guarantee on the establishment of a management plan.

The Delegation of **India**, supported by the Delegation of **Nigeria**, endorsed the inscription of the property, as its outstanding universal value warranted recognition. On a general point, it said that ICOMOS draft Decisions should have the same format as those of IUCN and include the recommendations of the evaluation study. The Delegation recalled that when evaluating earlier nominations, the importance of a site manager had been stressed, and it disagreed with ICOMOS that the size of the country should have any influence on the need for a site manager. It reiterated that ICOMOS should use the same standards for all properties in order to enhance the credibility of the work of the Committee.

**ICOMOS** replied that the decision to refer the nomination back to the State Party, rather than to inscribe it, was to be made by the Committee. ICOMOS had received the requested additional information on time. Although it had been informed that the

management system was in place and functioning, it still recommended that the State Party should complete a management plan. In response to the Delegation of India, it stated that, from a professional point of view, it considered that the size of a country did matter. There was no need to ask for a site manager, as the site was well-managed. It confirmed its earlier recommendation for the property to be inscribed, as lacking information was no longer a reason for referring the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** emphasized that proper management arrangements should already be in place when a property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, as otherwise it might soon return to the Committee for consideration in the form of a state of conservation report. It detected some inconsistencies in the ICOMOS evaluation and noted that the same rigour did not appear to have been applied for all properties. The Delegation agreed that the property had outstanding universal value, but as earlier properties had been referred back to the State Party because of management issues, it was in favour of doing so in the case in point, as not all the relevant recommendations had been implemented.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the inscription of the site on the basis of the criteria recommended by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed that ICOMOS should review the present recommendations, explaining what information had been received before 31 March 2005, deadline for receiving information on nominations. It stressed that if new information had been received by ICOMOS, the Committee should receive an Addendum to the working document, and should have the possibility to review the information, after which a decision could be taken.

The Delegation of **Argentina** stressed that ICOMOS needed to be more consistent in its evaluations, but otherwise had no objection to the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle que l'ICOMOS affirme que les risques principaux sont l'urbanisation et le projet de nouvelle île. Elle souhaite savoir si l'ICOMOS a des informations supplémentaires sur ce projet qui la préoccupe beaucoup. Elle n'a en revanche aucune inquiétude sur la gestion du site.

The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** clarified the issues regarding developments on the reclaimed land and stated that commitments from the authorities had been received and a buffer zone established to protect the property, which would be under governmental regulations and within which no high-rise buildings would be allowed. It further responded to the Delegation of Lebanon with regard to the management plan, recalling that the property had been run for 30 years by the Directorate of Archaeology and Heritage, where 60 persons were working, including in a special department for the management of the property.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that having heard the State Party and the discussion, it could agree with the inscription of the site. It reiterated the request to ICOMOS made by several other speakers to ensure greater consistency in its evaluations.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the Delegation of the United Kingdom had asked for greater consistency on the part of ICOMOS, but the Committee too should also be more consistent. The property should be inscribed following the normal procedures, with information being submitted on time, after which a proper evaluation could be made.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegation of the Netherlands and supported the referral of the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Norway** regretted the inconsistency in the working document, and said that the property should be referred back to the State Party until the new information had been reviewed.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne le fait que l'absence de consensus au sein du Comité est une nouvelle fois due au rapport de l'ICOMOS. Appelant les membres du Comité et les organisations consultatives à plus de professionnalisme, elle propose à l'ICOMOS de faire un nouveau rapport et de suspendre cette décision jusqu'au lendemain matin.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it maintained its position and reiterated the appeal for both ICOMOS and the Committee to be consistent. It proposed suspending the discussion until ICOMOS had reviewed its recommendations, which should be included in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, said that the Committee could reach a consensus by agreeing to examine the information, which had been received on time, before making a decision.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Committee agreed that the property was of outstanding universal value, but as the extra information had not been circulated, it should be made available to the Committee as an addendum.

The **Chairperson** suggested suspending the discussion until the following day so that the information could be reviewed, after which the property could be inscribed in good conscience.

It was so decided.

Property	<b>Azougui, Oasis and Almoravid Capital</b>
Id. N°	<b>1157</b>
State Party	<b>Mauritania</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(v) CL</b>

*Decision:*     **29 COM 8B.27**

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** said it was with regret that it had read the report in the working document and the recommendation that the property should not be inscribed. It asked the State Party for its reaction to the suggestion of ICOMOS to consider an extension of the nomination of Azougui as part of a wider trans-Saharan Trade Routes nomination.

La Délégation de la **Mauritanie** (Observateur) rappelle son souhait, au vue de son importance et pour le rayonnement culturel de toute une nation, de voir le site d'Azougui inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** asked the Observer Delegation of Mauritania whether it agreed with the proposal of considering an extension of the nomination file as part of a wider trans-Saharan Trade Routes nomination.

La Délégation de la **Mauritanie** (Observateur) indique que cette option n'est pas envisageable pour elle.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the ICOMOS report contained some information that had not yet been checked, and that with additional information, such as a comparative analysis, the site could be seen as having outstanding universal value. Therefore, it supported deferral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by the Delegation of **Nigeria**, said that the site should be better defined, and proposed referring the site back to the State Party. It suggested that the State Party should request International Assistance as well as technical assistance from the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation** and **Chile** agreed with the proposal of Egypt that the property should be referred back to the State Party for additional information, including with reference to its outstanding universal value. It could be considered at the Committee's 30th session.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it agreed with the ICOMOS recommendation that the property should not be inscribed and an extended nomination considered. It recognized that the property as presented had no outstanding universal value. It disapproved of deferring the nomination or referring it back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia. It said that instead of referring the property back to the State Party, a new nomination should be drawn up and submitted.

La Délégation du **Liban**, après avoir souligné que le Comité est partagé entre deux avis - à savoir une nouvelle proposition plus large, transnationale, et le renvoi de la proposition d'inscription - indique qu'en l'état actuel des choses, la proposition ne peut faire l'objet d'une inscription. La valeur universelle exceptionnelle doit être démontrée, et les limites doivent être élargies afin de donner plus de consistance à la proposition. Cependant, la Délégation fait part de son inquiétude à passer à une proposition à plus grande échelle, vu la difficulté pour les pays en développement de

traiter ces dossiers très complexes. Elle indique qu'il serait toutefois possible de considérer une proposition nationale d'inscription en série. En tout état de cause, elle refuse d'accepter un simple renvoi, la date butoir du 1er février étant trop proche pour constituer un dossier correct. Elle suggère donc que la proposition d'inscription soit différée afin que l'Etat partie puisse prouver la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, modifier les limites du site (en série), travailler sur la gestion du site et, pour ce faire, elle recommande à l'Etat partie de demander une assistance internationale.

The **Chairperson** observed that there were not two positions, but three, as the Delegation of Colombia clearly supported the deferral of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Bénin** se rallie à la proposition des Délégations du Liban et de la Colombie pour différer la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **India** said that it agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Egypt that the nomination should be referred back to the State Party – it could be discussed at the Committee's 30th session. It also noted the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon to defer the nomination, and wondered whether the two proposals could be merged.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee seemed to agree that the property should not be inscribed at the present session, and that some Committee members supported referring the property back to the State Party as its outstanding universal value had not yet been proven.

The Delegation of **China** said that it had originally been in favor of referring the nomination back to the State Party, but having listened to the discussion, and although it would rather see the nomination deferred than not inscribed, it would adhere to any consensus the Committee might reach. It suggested adding a paragraph 3 to the draft Decision encouraging the State Party to provide further information.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the best solution would be not to inscribe the site as it had not been clear under which criteria outstanding universal value could be justified. The Delegation agreed with the ICOMOS recommendation that the State Party should prepare a wider nomination, which might take more than one year.

The **Chairperson** explained that a deferral allowed the State Party an indefinite number of years to prepare a new nomination proposal, whereas a referral limited to three years the period within which a (revised) nomination proposal should be presented to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that the property had some good values, but no outstanding universal value. In the light of the discussion, it considered that a deferral could be agreed on, but not a referral.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** agreed with the ICOMOS evaluation, and said that any other decision would give the State Party false hopes. However, it would agree to a consensus to defer the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would not join the consensus. The Advisory Body had been scientific, rigorous and objective. It further observed, referring to the *Operational Guidelines*, that a referral would not be applicable to the case in point, whilst a deferral could be if more in-depth study was undertaken. Without wishing to give the State Party false hopes, it advocated the adoption of the draft Decision proposed by ICOMOS, as that would give the State Party the best start for a new nomination. It added that if the Committee was in favour of a deferral, the Delegation of the United Kingdom would not call for a vote.

The Delegation of **Argentina** said that the matter had been discussed extensively. It said that, looking at the issue of the capital of the Almoravid State as described in the ICOMOS evaluation, if the outstanding universal value could be demonstrated, then the site should be inscribed, but the Delegation was of the view that it would not be easy to do so.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of Argentina and said that as the property had no outstanding universal value a deferral was not applicable. It did not approve of reaching a consensus on the deferral of the property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** observed that the property was very interesting, but that the nomination needed improvement. It suggested that further study should be requested from the State Party. It stressed that ten countries had withdrawn their nominations with similar evaluations, and although the proposing State Party had maintained the nomination, it should not be inscribed. The Delegation would abide by a consensus.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** was in favour of not inscribing the property, as the nomination lacked clarity and no outstanding universal value had been reported by the Advisory Body.

La Délégation du **Bénin** soulève une motion d'ordre, et se demande pourquoi elle ne se voit pas donner la parole comme elle le devrait. Elle précise que selon les *Orientations*, la notion de proposition « différée » est très claire. La Délégation lit le paragraphe 160 des *Orientations* : « Le Comité peut décider de différer une proposition d'inscription pour effectuer une évaluation ou une étude plus approfondie, ou demander une révision substantielle à l'Etat partie ». Elle indique également qu'il est clair pour tous que ce site ne peut pas être inscrit en l'état.

The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser of UNESCO to take the floor.

The **Legal Adviser** observed that no consensus had been reached. The recommendation from the Advisory Body had been to not inscribe the property. The Committee should decide on a deferral or an inscription of the property. For such a vote, a two-thirds majority was needed as it concerned a matter covered by the provisions of the *Convention*. If a consensus could not be reached, and there was no vote, the property would not be inscribed. The Committee could put the deferral of the nomination to the vote. If the Committee voted on whether to vote, a simple majority was required as it was a procedural decision.



The **Chairperson** said, in summary, that after 17 speakers had taken the floor, six Committee members were in favour of not inscribing the property, five members were in favour of a referral and six members in favour of a deferral.

The **Legal Adviser** added that two positions were needed for a vote, but that it was not possible to vote on not inscribing the property. The two positions could then be for a deferral or an inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Legal Adviser might have misunderstood the point raised by the Delegation of Benin, which had appeared to ask about the implications of referrals and deferrals - it had not sought information on a vote.

The **Legal Adviser** explained that a deferral of the nomination would mean that the matter or debate would remain open. If it was decided that the property should not be inscribed, the matter would be closed. The nomination could then be resubmitted to the Committee at its following session.

The **Chairperson** read out paragraphs 159 and 160 of the *Operational Guidelines* on the referral and deferral of nominations.

La Délégation du **Bénin** exprime sa profonde déception en faisant remarquer que le Conseiller juridique de l'UNESCO ne semble pas connaître les textes fondamentaux du Comité, et propose de différer la proposition d'inscription, mais en aucun cas à la prochaine session.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked the Legal Adviser whether the State Party could still withdraw its nomination.

The **Legal Adviser** said that in the case of a deferral, a State Party could always withdraw its nomination.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** invited the State Party to withdraw its nomination, which would mean that the Committee did not have to vote.

The **Chairperson** drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 152 of the *Operational Guidelines* which stated that a nomination could be withdrawn 'at any time prior to the Committee session at which it is scheduled', which he explained meant that the nomination could not be withdrawn at that moment.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** regretted the lack of progress in the debate, as both deferral and a decision not to inscribe the property would mean that the State Party should submit a new nomination. The Delegation recalled that the Loire Valley World Heritage property had been inscribed after a vote. It called for a vote on whether to refer the property back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **India** said that it supported the proposal to defer the property and called for a vote thereon.

La Délégation du **Liban** indique avoir soumis un projet de décision par écrit au Rapporteur, et propose que le vote se fasse sur ce projet de décision.

The Delegation of **India** said that it had called for a vote on the deferral of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** said that the amendment submitted by Lebanon took precedence as it had arrived earlier.

The Delegation of **India** protested that it had asked for a vote on the deferral of the property first.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the Delegation of Lebanon whether its amendment proposed a deferral - if so, the Committee could vote on the amendment.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of India whether it would agree to the amendment submitted by the Delegation of Lebanon being read out.

La Délégation du **Liban** clarifie son projet de décision, indiquant qu'elle propose de différer la proposition d'inscription et précise ce qui est demandé à l'Etat partie avant que celui-ci ne soumette une nouvelle proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that it seconded the proposal by the Delegation of India.

The **Rapporteur** read out the text of the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon, paragraph 2 of which deferred the nomination.

2. Diffère l'examen de la proposition d'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de soumettre de nouveau la proposition d'inscription en incluant :
  - une étude comparative afin de prouver la valeur universelle exceptionnelle,
  - des modifications des limites afin de l'inclure dans une proposition plus large.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there was any strong opposition to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite obtenir clarification de la part du Conseiller juridique sur la majorité nécessaire à ce vote, deux-tiers ou majorité simple.

The **Legal Adviser** said that if the vote was on a postponement of the debate, a simple majority would suffice. The situation would be different if the vote was held on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon, or the proposal of India.

The Delegation of **India** said that if it had understood correctly, a two-thirds majority would be needed in a vote on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon as it would be a vote on substance. It called for a vote on that amendment.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it might be possible to find a consensus and suggested that the Rapporteur and ICOMOS could work out the conditions in the light of the debate. It favoured a consensus on a new draft decision.

The Delegation of **India** said that it could withdraw its motion.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it doubted whether a more reasoned motion would be possible, and favored a vote on the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the Legal Adviser to clarify what form a vote not to inscribe the property could take.

The **Legal Adviser** confirmed the conclusion reached by the Delegation of India, that a two-third majority was needed in a vote on a deferral of the nomination. If that majority was not obtained, the property would not be inscribed.

The **Rapporteur** suggested a compromise solution that would consist in an amendment to the draft Decision summing up the debate, with which the Delegation of the United Kingdom might be able to agree. Accordingly, he suggested replacing paragraph 2 by the words to the effect that the Committee would defer consideration of the nomination in order to allow the State Party to submit a substantially revised, wider nomination and provide further information on the justification of the outstanding universal value of the property, as well as a detailed and complete management plan and a wider inventory, and invite it to request international assistance. If a compromise could not be found, the draft Decision should be voted on.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the text read out by the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Chile** said that the Committee was left with only a procedural issue, and not a substantive matter to solve. It recalled the different proposals made so far - the Delegation of India's call for a vote, the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon, and the Rapporteur's proposal - and observed that the Committee could also consider the option of not inscribing the site and deferring the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that it had proposed a vote in order to speed up the proceedings. Although the amendment proposed by the Rapporteur did not reflect the opinion of the Delegation, it could agree to it.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.27** provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 11.15 p.m.



## SIXTH DAY

### TENTH MEETING

Friday 15 July 2005

09.30 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: The Committee at its tenth meeting continued the evaluation of the nominations to the World Heritage List. Due to constraints in the time-management of its agenda, it subsequently had to examine the periodic report on the implementation of the *Convention* in North America.

Note du Rapporteur: Le Comité, à sa 10e réunion, a poursuivi l'examen des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Du fait des contraintes de temps pour la gestion de l'ordre du jour, il a par la suite examiné le rapport périodique sur la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* en Amérique du Nord.

### ITEM 8 B NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (continued)

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of the revised schedule for the day proposed by the Bureau. The Committee would continue with Nominations (Item 8B), State of Conservation of World Heritage properties on the World Heritage List (Item 7B), Items 6, 9, 8, 19 and 20. The Subsidiary Group would meet that morning to discuss and decide on Items 10, 12, 13, 14A, 15, 16 and 17. Item 11A, Presentation of the Periodic Report for North America, would be addressed towards lunch time.

#### ASIA / PACIFIC

##### New nominations

Property	<b>Historic Monuments of Macao</b>
Id. N°	<b>1110</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(v)</b>

##### *Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.28*

Draft Summary record (Durban, 2005)  
Projet de Résumé des interventions (Durban, 2005)

WHC-05/29.COM/INF.22, p. 158

En présentant le site, le représentant de l'ICOMOS tient à rassurer la Délégation du Royaume-Uni quant à la présence d'habitations dans ou près du site. Il existe seulement un village qui est complètement en dehors du site. Il tient également à rappeler que l'UNESCO et l'ICOMOS ont insisté auprès de l'Etat partie sur ce point. De plus, vu que celui-ci dispose de peu de moyens, il serait souhaitable qu'il soumette une demande d'assistance internationale.

Les Délégations du **Bénin** et de la **Colombie** se déclarent convaincues de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site et soutiennent cette proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, concerned about the delay in the proceedings, suggested that the Chairperson should give the floor only to those with questions, comments or objections concerning the draft Decision. It was not necessary for Committee members to speak only to congratulate inscriptions.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that Macao was a special urban model as a melting pot of the influence of different cultures from several parts of the world. It was with pride that it strongly supported inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Norway** congratulated the State Party on its preparation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.28** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude to the Committee and ICOMOS, and reaffirmed its standing commitment to the protection of the property. It agreed with ICOMOS's recommendation to inscribe the site as the Historic Centre of Macao.

Property	<b>Soltaniyeh</b>
Id. N°	<b>1188</b>
State Party	<b>Iran</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.29*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the outstanding universal value of the site was beyond question. Together with the Delegations of **Norway**, **Egypt** and **India**, it supported the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.29** provisionally adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** expressed its gratitude to the Committee for its support.

Property	<b>Kunya-Urgench</b>
Id. N°	<b>1199</b>
State Party	<b>Turkmenistan</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B. 30*

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation du site.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** sought clarification on the difficulty mentioned in making the necessary resources available for the management of the site and on the settlements that might affect its protection.

The Delegation of **Colombia** declared being convinced of the outstanding universal value of the site and supported this nomination.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that it supported the inscription of the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.30** provisionally adopted.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that the site was the eight-hundredth property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

### **Extensions of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Nilgiri Mountain Railway (Extension of the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway)</b>
Id. N°	<b>944 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.31*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the inscription of the site with its exceptional value, and said that it appreciated the enhancement of an under-represented category of industrial heritage and the outstanding evolution of technology.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the nomination was a good example of the conservation and management of sites with similar values.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.31** provisionally adopted.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its gratitude to the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. It explained once again the values of the nomination and stressed that it had been a crucial development of technology which had permitted major population movement in the region where the property was located. It said that it hoped to identify more such sites in the future to add to the property as a serial nomination.

## **EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

### **New Nominations**

Property	<b>Gnishikadzor Area Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1092</b>
State Party	<b>Armenia</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(v) CL</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.32*

**ICOMOS** presented the site. It had concluded that the site could not be inscribed as a cultural landscape, but that the protection of the lantern-roof houses was to be encouraged.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** said that the site should be inscribed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it would not support inscription as recommended by the Delegation of Russia.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the draft Decision and suggested adding to paragraph 2 the words “in its present form”.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the draft Decision in agreement with the Delegations of Lithuania and Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.32** provisionally adopted as amended.



Property	<b>Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh</b>
Id. N°	<b>1196</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.34*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that a great many cultural crossroads had already been inscribed in the World Heritage List. It considered that the Esterhazy family should have been included in the comparative analysis. The nomination should be referred back to the State Party, pending a management plan and a clearer restoration policy.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked ICOMOS in what way the Radziwill family compared to the Medici family in Italy, and to whom the Radziwill family had given their patronage. It questioned the justification of the universal value of the site, and said that the management plan should have been prepared before the nomination came before the Committee if ICOMOS had deemed it necessary. It seconded the proposal for referral back to the State Party.

**ICOMOS** explained that the Radziwill family was the reference point for various activities that had been transmitted from western and southern parts of Europe to eastern and central Europe. Referral back to the State Party could be appropriate if the Committee so desired.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that if ICOMOS agreed the nomination should be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** pointed out that the family was extremely important for Eastern and Central Europe. Due to political reasons a history of noble families from this region for quite a long period of time was not known for world history nor for art history of the world. But Radziwill family was very influential and supported a big number of famous artists and intellectuals of this part of Europe.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported inscription, and said that certain statements by some members were unfair to relatively unknown parts of the world.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that if referral of the nomination back to the State Party was not going to be possible, the site should be inscribed with certain conditions, such as clarification of restoration policies.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would be uncomfortable with an inscription as there was no academic justification to enhance the recognition of the outstanding universal value of the site.

**ICOMOS** said that Europe was fragmented and that it would be a good opportunity to recognize the outstanding universal value of that part of Europe, where the site had outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that those remarks made it even more reluctant to accept the universal value of the site. It reiterated its opinion that the nomination should be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported inscription and endorsed the statement by the Delegation of Lithuania.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that the discussion had emphasized the continuous question of what outstanding universal value meant. It too endorsed the statement by the Delegation of Lithuania.

The Delegation of **Argentina** approved the remarks of the Delegation of Lithuania. Indeed, as it was said during the first days of the session, the primary aim of World Heritage is to give Man a better personality, not only with what we know, but also with what is less well known or disseminated, such as the history of Eastern Europe or other parts of the world. The Delegation of Argentina considered the ICOMOS report clear and precise, and the comparison with the Medicis family in particular convinced it of the relevance of this nomination.

The **Chairperson** said that there seemed to be a consensus among the Committee members to inscribe the property with the conditions suggested by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** observed that ICOMOS should have been able to defend the case by itself.

The Delegation of **Norway**, supported by the Delegation of **Portugal**, drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the site had been recommended for inscription based upon its value as a monument, and not upon its connection with a particular family. It did consider that the management plan was absolutely vital.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it concurred with the consensus position. It should be stressed that several current trends in heritage value studies, such as industrial heritage or modern architectural movements, were based on western points of view.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment to the draft Decision which consisted of an additional paragraph 3 requesting the State Party to review its restoration policy and management provisions.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.34** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Belarus** expressed its gratitude to the Committee.

Property	<b>Struve Geodetic Arc</b>
Id. N°	<b>1187</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus / Estonia / Finland / Latvia / Lithuania / Norway / Republic of Moldova / Russian Federation / Sweden / Ukraine</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.35*

ICOMOS presented the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** demande à l'ICOMOS de réduire la durée de ses présentations des évaluations des biens proposés pour inscription. Concernant le bien qui vient d'être présenté, elle affirme qu'il s'agit d'une proposition très intéressante et rappelle les nombreux efforts déployés par les dix Etats parties dans la préparation du dossier d'inscription. Elle soutient donc avec enthousiasme l'inscription du bien.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the inscription of the site.

Recognizing that proper mapping had been a significant contribution to science, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it was strongly in favour of the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the inscription of the site and encouraged the States Parties to work together on a possible extension of the site to include the properties relating to the triangulations of South Africa.

The Delegation of **South Africa** fully supported the amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.35** provisionally adopted by acclamation, as amended. He congratulated all the States Parties concerned.

The Observer Delegation of **Finland** thanked the Committee, on behalf of the ten countries that had nominated the property, for having considered that the site represented significant scientific achievement. It also expressed gratitude to the other nine nominating countries for the excellent cooperation.

The **Chairperson** announced that the newly-inscribed site was the first World Heritage property for the Republic of Moldova.

Property	<b>Plantin-Moretus Museum</b>
Id. N°	<b>1185</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.36*

L'ICOMOS présente les détails et l'évaluation du bien proposé pour inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** en citant l'article 48 des *Orientations* rappelle que les propositions d'inscription concernant le patrimoine immobilier susceptible de devenir mobilier ne sont pas prises en considération. Elle estime que le bien proposé pour inscription relève plutôt du patrimoine mobilier de nature immatérielle. Elle considère en outre que seul le critère (vi) – parmi ceux qui sont proposés pour inscription – pourrait être retenu par le Comité mais, à ce dernier sujet, elle rappelle que ce même critère doit de préférence être utilisé conjointement avec d'autres critères. Elle propose donc que la proposition d'inscription soit renvoyée pour permettre à l'Etat partie de mieux expliquer la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, supported by the Delegations of the **Netherlands**, **New Zealand** and the **Russian Federation**, said that it was in favour of the inscription of the site. The site nominated was not a museum but consisted of monuments associated with the history of writing and should be viewed as covering the workshop complex as a whole.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.36** provisionally adopted.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) exprime sa satisfaction pour l'inscription du site.

Property	<b>Třeboň Fishpond Heritage</b>
Id. N°	<b>1171</b>
State Party	<b>Czech Republic</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.37*

The **Chairperson** said that the members of the Committee would receive a letter dated 27 June 2005 from the State Party identifying factual errors in the evaluation by ICOMOS, in accordance with Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.1**.

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the nominated area was extensive with a buffer zone of 70,000 ha and suggested inscribing the site with a view to extending it at a later stage.

The Delegation of **Japan** agreed with the Delegation of Colombia and wondered about the size of the extension suggested by ICOMOS. It said that it would like to hear from ICOMOS as to whether it would be acceptable to inscribe the property with a recommendation to extend it at a later stage.

**ICOMOS** said that it was of the opinion that the area nominated did not have outstanding universal value but that the nomination should be revised to include more of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century network of ponds.

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered that the evaluation of criteria by ICOMOS was unclear and that the letter from the State Party had been distributed too late. It questioned the size of the recommended extension and suggested inscribing the site with a view to extending it at a later stage.

The Vice-Chairperson (Colombia) took the chair.

**ICOMOS** explained that it did not evaluate criteria when the nominated site was considered not to be of outstanding universal value - that might be an issue that needed to be further explored by the Committee. It was not responsible for the distribution of the letter from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the letter had been distributed by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification from the State Party as to whether the recommended extension of the core zone would be possible.

The Observer Delegation of the **Czech Republic** said that the core zone as defined was extensive in size, but that it would be possible to extend it. It considered that the nominated area was of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, rising to a point of order, said that in accordance with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure, representatives of a State Party should not speak to advocate the inclusion in the World Heritage List of a property nominated but only to deal with a point of information in answer to a question.

The Delegation of **India**, supported by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, called for the Committee to be consistent in its approach and referred to the recommendation of the ICOMOS that the larger area had to be linked in order to demonstrate the outstanding universal value of the site. It also stated that procedure had to be respected regarding the submission of additional information. The Delegation proposed retaining the draft Decision as contained in the working document.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that it agreed with the statement made by the Delegation of Portugal.

While acknowledging that the nomination was interesting, the Delegation of **Argentina** supported the draft Decision as it stood, which would mean deferring examination of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** said that there would be no change to the draft Decision as contained in the working document but that it might have been useful to add to it a

paragraph recalling Decision 28 COM 14B.57 concerning the deadline for the submission of the additional information.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.37** provisionally adopted.

Property	<b>Le Havre, the City rebuilt by Auguste Perret</b>
Id. N°	<b>1181</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.38*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the inscription of the property. It was one of the most important examples of cities which had undergone post-war construction, and it differed fundamentally from Warsaw and Krakow in Poland where the cities had been totally reconstructed.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the statement made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, particularly since Le Havre had been rebuilt with a determination to avoid pastiche.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.38** provisionally adopted by acclamation.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) remercie tout d'abord les autorités de l'Afrique du Sud pour l'accueil et l'organisation de cette session du Comité. Elle se réjouit de la décision du Comité, qui sera accueillie avec bonheur et orgueil par la ville du Havre et la France entière. Elle rappelle que la ville du Havre – étudié comme modèle de reconstruction urbaine dans toutes les écoles d'architecture du monde – représente le premier témoignage de l'architecture moderne française à être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle aussi la mobilisation dans la préparation du dossier d'inscription de beaucoup d'experts renommés dans le domaine de l'histoire de l'architecture. Elle rassure enfin le Comité à propos du haut niveau de qualité dans la restauration des composantes en béton armé des bâtiments principaux de la ville.

Property	<b>Heidelberg Castle and Old Town</b>
Id. N°	<b>1173</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.39*

L'ICOMOS présente les détails et l'évaluation du bien proposé pour inscription.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** sought clarification as to whether ICOMOS had recommended referral of the nomination back to the State Party or deferral.

ICOMOS said that its recommendation was to defer examination of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Bénin** se dit d'accord pour différer le bien mais néanmoins demande à l'ICOMOS combien de temps il lui faudra pour évaluer la nouvelle analyse demandée à l'Etat partie.

L'ICOMOS considère que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien pourrait être raisonnablement démontrée dans la période de dix-huit mois correspondante au cycle d'évaluation.

La Délégation du **Bénin** suggère donc de renvoyer à l'Etat partie la proposition d'inscription et non pas de la différer.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **India** agreed with the proposal to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested deferring examination of the nomination since justifying the site's outstanding universal value would be a major undertaking.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the Delegations of Portugal and India, and said that it would like to hear from the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** informed the Committee that the Mayor of Heidelberg had confirmed that the additional information would be available by the end of 2005.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the referral of the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that ICOMOS had requested a substantial amount of information, but despite its misgivings, it would go along with the majority if it wished to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the proposal to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether referral meant that the site would be automatically inscribed on the World Heritage List if the State Party was considered to have fulfilled the conditions required of it.

ICOMOS assured the Committee that it would carry out a full evaluation of all nominated sites that had been referred back to State Parties.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would agree to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that referral would be acceptable and sought clarification as to whether ICOMOS would be able to carry out an evaluation of such a large amount of new information within the limited time implied by referral of the nomination.

ICOMOS assured the Committee that it would be able to carry out a full evaluation if the State Party submitted the new information by the deadline of 1 February 2006.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.39** provisionally adopted as amended.

Property	<b>Qal'at al-Bahrain Archeological Site</b>
Id. N°	<b>1192</b>
State Party	<b>Bahrain</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Decision :*     **29 COM 8B.26 (continued)**

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee would resume its consideration of Qal'at al-Bahrain Archaeological Site which had been suspended the previous day.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, rising to a point of order, said that the revised draft Decision had not yet been distributed to the delegates.

The **Rapporteur** said that the Committee had asked ICOMOS to clarify the measures already undertaken by the State Party to conserve the site and the actions that were still expected. The revised evaluation by ICOMOS indicated that the State Party needed to complete a management plan and also refrain from approving any land reclamation or constructions in the sea anywhere in front of the site. In the light of the new information provided by ICOMOS, the Committee could decide either to inscribe the site with conditions, or to refer the nomination back to the State Party. He suggested combining the points raised earlier by the Delegation of the Netherlands and the revised evaluation by ICOMOS in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** said it did not have the correct version as one page was missing, and that the entire document should be circulated.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the Rapporteur to read out the amendment it had proposed.

The Delegations of **India**, the **Netherlands**, **Saint Lucia**, **Egypt** and **Kuwait** supported the inscription of the site with the conditions stipulated in the revised draft Decision.



The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision as it appeared in the working document would be proposed for adoption, with the addition of the paragraphs proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that the deadline for the submission of the complete management and conservation plans should be changed from 31 January to 1 February so as to bring it into line with all other the decisions adopted.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.26** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked the Committee members for the inscription of Qal'at al-Bahrain Archeological Site on the World Heritage List and said that it counted on their future support for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the country. It also emphasised the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to ensuring the proper safeguarding of the site.

The **Chairperson** announced that the next item would be 11A and requested the Delegation of Colombia to take over the chairpersonship.

The Vice-Chairperson (Colombia) took the chair.

## **ITEM 11 PERIODIC REPORTS**

### **ITEM 11A PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA**

*Document:* WHC-05/COM29/11A

*Draft decision:* **29 COM/11A**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced Document *WHC-05/COM29/11A* which had been prepared following the decision of the 25th session of the World Heritage Committee (Helsinki 2001) to separate the reports of Europe and North America and to present North America in 2005. For the preparation of the Periodic Report for North America the Centre had participated in the meetings in North America and had been available to provide advice, but otherwise it had been a completely State Party-driven exercise, to be presented by the two States Parties, Canada and the United States of America.

The representative of **Canada, Ms Cameron**, and of the **United States of America, Mr Morris**, explained the structure and the process of preparing the report, which reviewed the World Heritage sites in North America, reactive monitoring and danger listing, the Tentative Lists, participation in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges; it also presented recommendations and a Plan of Action.

The North American Periodic Report was divided into three parts: the North American Regional Report, Section I with the national reports for Canada and the United States of America and Section II with the site-specific reports for existing sites, with the exception of Miguasha. It was described in full on the following web-sites: [http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pm-wh/rspm-whsr/index\\_e.asp](http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/pm-wh/rspm-whsr/index_e.asp) and <http://www.nps.gov/oia/topics/periodic.htm>.

Ms Cameron and Mr Morris informed the Committee of the three-year collaboration, with two joint site managers' meetings, the joint regional report prepared jointly and a stakeholder consultation process. They reported on World Heritage activities over the years: reactive monitoring covering six Canadian sites, one transboundary site and five United States sites of which two sites in the United States were on the List of World Heritage in Danger and one had been removed. Whereas the Canadian Tentative List had been updated in 2004 with a thorough consultation process, the United States Tentative List submitted in 1982 had been updated in 1990 and a new one was in preparation. Both States Parties had participated actively in the Committee and expert groups. Among the strengths and weaknesses as well as challenges were: professional and technical capacity, standards, visitor services, awareness of World Heritage, networking, cultural values associated with natural sites, jurisdictional co-ordination and management challenges.

They then highlighted the recommendations, in particular the recommendation that the World Heritage Committee should undertake research on how to recognize the importance of local populations residing within and/or adjacent to natural World Heritage sites; clarify requirements for management plans; pause in the cycle of periodic reports to develop strategic direction on the forms and format of reports, training priorities, international cooperation priorities, and consider the possible inclusion of Mexico in the North American region; and develop guidelines for evaluating visual impacts on World Heritage properties.

They also addressed the issue of future decisions by the Committee on the new or revised statements of significance, which concerned all sites covered by the report, name changes (7 sites), criteria adjustments due to revisions of criteria (5 sites), clarification of initial inscription (3 sites), changes to criteria for inscription and exploration of how to recognize local populations and the recognition of cultural criteria for some natural sites.

In conclusion the presenters noted that the exercise was worthwhile but time-consuming and led to increased understanding and awareness on the part of site managers, and to a strengthened North American network.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the presenters for an interesting presentation and asked how the Committee could deal with the statements of significance coming back for review, while it could barely finish its regular agenda. It was difficult to develop guidelines on the visual impacts, as that had to be seen on a case-by-case basis.

The **World Heritage Centre** acknowledged the huge workload for the Committee in following up Periodic Reporting, including statements of outstanding universal value,

boundary changes, etc. The Committee at its Seventh Extraordinary Session had already agreed to a year of reflection in 2007 and the Centre would be looking into those questions with a small expert group in November 2005 in order to bring proposals to the next session in 2006. It was pointed out that those issues also had budgetary and workload implications, in particular for the Advisory Bodies.

The Representatives of **Canada** and the **United States of America** emphasized that the statements of significance were essential to guide site managers. The guidelines for visual impacts were intended to provide a framework of principles for future work.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** welcomed the exceptionally well written report and noted that an advantage of North America was the management of the World Heritage properties by the Park Services, which guaranteed a unified approach by one body. It asked whether there was an external review process of the reports. It also acknowledged the workload for the Committee: it had emerged from an informal European meeting on item 11B that France needed to revise about 50% and the UK about 75% of their statements of significance.

The Representative of **Canada** replied that external consultation took place through letters sent to the Advisory Bodies based in their countries as well as stakeholder consultation. Both Canada and the United States of America posted their draft reports for comments on their websites.

The Delegation of **Norway** welcomed the excellent, standard-setting report. It reported on the Norwegian experience in using external consultants from ICOMOS to review Norway's sites to prepare the basic reports. It shared the concerns raised about the statements of significance.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** thanked the States Parties for the interesting report and emphasized that the visual impact guidelines were extremely important. It suggested that a workshop with the Advisory Bodies could be envisaged.

The Delegation of **Argentina** welcomed the report and the clear presentation and requested more information about the implications of reporting as a continent. It also sought clarification of its links with the "List of the Americas" project by ICOMOS US.

The Representative of the **United States of America** replied that there was no connection and that the re-alignment of the western hemisphere might also be complicated. The Representative of **Canada** noted that the trilateral arrangements and collaboration with Mexico existed already in the field of parks and ecology.

**IUCN** welcomed the excellent report and noted that it would have liked to participate in the process as it had done for other regions, including the current European process, and not only to be consulted. IUCN was happy to involve State Parties in the preparation of the management guidelines; as to visual impact guidelines there was a WCPA group considering how to assess aesthetic values of protected areas, which could also try to address visual impact issues.

**ICCROM** congratulated both States Parties for the report, which contained many interesting points and lessons learnt. It noted that an ICCROM proposal to study the statements of significance was before the Committee. It agreed that developing guidelines for management planning would be useful, but questioned the narrowness of templates.

The Observer Delegation of **Hungary** welcomed the report, which provided a useful framework for the European region with its five sub-regions. Although Europe was not able to present its report on Section I at the current session on account of time constraints, it might be an advantage to present sections I and II together. In 2007 the issue of the divisions of sub-regions also needed to be addressed. On the issue of the visual impact study, good examples should be brought forward.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** was grateful for the report and asked how the Committee would deal with boundary changes.

The Representative of the **United States of America** noted that most changes were minor and the representative of **Canada** stated that Canada had had one boundary change for the City of Quebec which had been brought to the attention of the Committee in the past.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider draft Decision **29 COM 11A**.

The **Rapporteur** proposed a new paragraph after paragraph 6: *“Requests the Director of the Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties concerned to report at its 30th session in 2006 on the proposed structure and time schedule and resources needed for the implementation of paragraph 6”*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed replacing the term “guidelines” by “principles” in paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** proposed replacing “templates” by “guidelines” in that paragraph.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **Lithuania**, suggested adding a note that resources would be needed to follow up on the Periodic Reports.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 11A** adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.

## SIXTH DAY

### ELEVENTH MEETING

Friday 15 July 2005

03.05 pm - 11.00 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: After concluding the evaluation of the nominations to the World Heritage List and to the List of World Heritage in Danger, and examining the progress report on the protection of the Palestinian cultural heritage, the Committee at its eleventh session resumed the examination of the reports on the state of conservation of properties included in the World Heritage List.

Note du Rapporteur : Après avoir achevé l'examen des propositions d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et examiner le rapport d'avancement sur la protection du patrimoine culturel palestinien, le Comité, à sa 11e réunion, a poursuivi l'examen des rapports sur l'état de conservation de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

#### ITEM 8 B NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER (continued)

Property	The Biblical Tells and Ancient Water Systems – Megiddo, Hazor and Beer Sheba
Id. N°	1108
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.40*

ICOMOS presented the site. It drew the attention of the Committee to the change in the name of the site to incorporate the request from the State Party that the nomination be should be considered for its biblical associations and not for both biblical associations and water systems.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que les trois tells bibliques constituent des formes certainement remarquables de communautés urbaines qui, dans leur ensemble, possèdent une valeur universelle exceptionnelle indéniable. Toutefois, elle estime que l'analyse comparative présentée par l'Etat partie s'est concentrée sur certains tells bibliques au détriment d'autres. Elle remarque en outre une contradiction entre la

formulation du critère (iii) et celle du critère (vi) et propose de modifier cette dernière. Elle propose aussi d'ajouter un paragraphe qui fasse référence à la nécessité de réviser les limites de la zone tampon afin de mieux protéger le bien. Elle déclare enfin son soutien à l'inscription du bien.

**ICOMOS** informed the Committee that the State Party had recently enlarged the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked whether ICOMOS considered the revised buffer zone adequate.

**ICOMOS** said that the enlargement of the buffer zone was satisfactory.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that the property was extremely important in the history of humankind and strongly supported its inscription in the World Heritage List. It agreed with the suggestions made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the dates for the Bronze Age in the ICOMOS evaluation were erroneous and should have been the nineteenth to fifteenth centuries BC. It also stated that the title of the nomination was misleading and should be changed in order not to imply biblical associations. Furthermore, the conservation plan seemed to have too broad an orientation and its implementation status was not clear. It proposed the inscription of the site with conditions.

The **Chairperson** asked Egypt to submit the proposed conditions in writing.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it supported the inscription of the property with enthusiasm. It endorsed the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon and said that it was important to complete the management plan. Furthermore, it wished to underline for the sake of the record the importance of placing archaeological sites in a wider context both vertically and horizontally.

The Delegation of **India** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon and said that the errors identified in the ICOMOS evaluation should be corrected. It asked ICOMOS why the State Party had asked for the nomination to be considered for its biblical associations and not for both biblical associations and water systems.

The Delegation of **China** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

Having apologised for the error identified by the Delegation of Egypt, **ICOMOS** acknowledged the importance of placing archaeological sites in a broader context. In reply to the Delegation of India, it explained that inscribing the site under two sets of criteria was not tenable and any future extension of the site, for example, would have to qualify under both sets of criteria.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon and said that the Committee should adopt the revised buffer zone in order to clarify what was being inscribed.

The **Rapporteur** said that paragraph 1 of the draft Decision would remain unchanged, but that the descriptions of criteria ii) and vi) in paragraph 2 would include, respectively, the phrases “that of the Cananean cities of the Bronze Age and the biblical cities of the Iron Age” and “constitute a religious testimony of outstanding universal value”. He asked the Delegation of Egypt to submit a proposal in writing as regarded the completion of a management plan and asked the Delegation of Saint Lucia whether a written proposal could be prepared concerning the revised definition of the boundary.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that other members of the Committee should consider the issue before an amendment could be proposed.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that the revision by ICOMOS of the evaluation to correct dates could note the revised buffer zone. It suggested adding spiritual value to the amended description of criterion vi) in paragraph 2.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended to read “...religious and spiritual testimony of outstanding universal value”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that the nominated site covered only a limited chronological period and that therefore it should not be associated with the biblical tradition.

The Delegation of **Colombia** sought clarification from the State Party.

**ICOMOS** told the Committee that changing the name of the site to dissociate it from the biblical association would not affect its outstanding universal value.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** fully agreed with the statement made by ICOMOS and said that the nominated site represented 1,500 years of history including the Bronze and Iron Ages.

The **Rapporteur** sought clarification as to whether the Committee wished to retain paragraph 3 of the original draft Decision.

Referring to the long history of the site, the Delegation of **Portugal** proposed retaining paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.40** provisionally adopted, as amended, by acclamation.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** said that the site joined the country’s three other sites on the World Heritage List to provide a mosaic of culture as well as to promote open dialogue. It cited a passage from the Book of the Prophet, Isaiah (Chapter 2, Verse 4).

Property	<b>Syracuse and the Rocky Necropolis of Pantalica</b>
Id. N°	<b>1200</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.41*

**ICOMOS** présente les résultats de son évaluation à l'issue de l'étude du dossier présenté par l'Italie.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose une modification du paragraphe 3 du projet de décision **29 COM 8B.41**. Afin de mieux exprimer le souhait du Comité de ne pas voir surgir des problèmes qui naîtraient suite à l'inscription du bien, elle suggère de remplacer l'expression « redoubler de vigilance » par « adopter les mesures nécessaires ».

La Délégation du **Bénin** appuie la proposition de la Délégation du Liban. Elle souhaite tout de même entendre les motivations de l'ICOMOS sur cette recommandation. Plus spécifiquement, elle se demande si du point de vue de l'ICOMOS il s'agit de sensibiliser les autorités italiennes sur la nécessité d'éviter que ces problèmes apparaissent. Elle suggère d'écouter l'Etat partie sur les dispositions qui sont actuellement mises en place sur le site.

**ICOMOS** explique les raisons ayant motivé la terminologie remise en question par la Délégation du Liban, en confirmant l'avis donné par la Délégation du Bénin. Plus spécifiquement, l'organisme consultatif explique que ce paragraphe a été motivé par le souhait d'amener l'Etat partie à redoubler de vigilance sur les risques liés à l'insertion du processus de conservation. Il trouve sa proposition plus adaptée que celle de la Délégation du Liban.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond to the questions raised.

La Délégation du **Liban** insiste sur la nécessité d'être plus précis dans la rédaction du paragraphe 3. Elle propose d'inclure l'expression « s'assurer de l'application des mesures nécessaires ... ».

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) trouve la proposition de la Délégation du Liban satisfaisante. Elle informe le Comité qu'il existe pour le site un plan de restauration, qui est actuellement mis en œuvre, et qui a déjà permis la restauration satisfaisante de quelques maisons d'habitation.

La Délégation du **Bénin**, suite à la réponse de la Délégation observatrice de l'Italie, propose une modification au paragraphe du projet de décision **29 COM 8B.41**. Elle propose d'insérer « mettre en œuvre son plan de restauration sur les lots de maisons actuellement vacantes » en lieu et place de « accorder une attention particulière aux maisons actuellement vacantes ».



The Delegation of **Colombia** fully agreed with the recommendation to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. It congratulated the State Party on the quality of the management plan presented, which could be considered as a model.

The **Rapporteur** suggested amending paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft Decision. In paragraph 3, the words “to increase their vigilance” should be replaced by the words “to ensure application of the necessary measures”, and paragraph 4 should read: “Encourages the State Party to implement the plan it adopted in relation to the houses that are currently unoccupied in Ortygia ...”

**ICOMOS** informe le Comité qu’une erreur de frappe s’est glissé au paragraphe 5 du projet de décision **29 COM 8B.41** concernant la fréquence de présentation d’un rapport circonstancié. Elle suggère au Comité de remplacer la fréquence de 5 ans par 3 ans.

The **Chairperson** accepted the suggestion made by ICOMOS and declared Decision **29 COM 8B.41** provisionally adopted as amended.

La Délégation de l’**Italie** (Observateur) exprime sa grande satisfaction et ses remerciements à l’ICOMOS, au Rapporteur et au Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle remercie le peuple italien d’avoir accepté de confier la gestion de ce bien qu’elle considère comme une perle au Comité du patrimoine mondial.

Property	<b>Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl</b>
Id. N°	<b>1170</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.43*

L’**ICOMOS** présente les résultats de son évaluation à l’issue de l’étude du dossier présenté par la Fédération de Russie.

La Délégation du **Liban** partage les inquiétudes formulées par l’ICOMOS sur la gestion de la ville. Elle propose de rajouter un troisième paragraphe à la fin, visant à demander à l’Etat partie de prêter une attention particulière à la gestion du tissu urbain. Elle informe le Comité qu’un amendement écrit, préparé en consultation avec la Délégation des Pays-Bas, sera soumis au Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** fully supported the nomination. It did have a question regarding the protection of the property within the buffer zone, but was sure that it would be taken care of in the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property, and said that it found the ICOMOS recommendations convincing. It recognized the outstanding universal value of the site, with its many outstanding examples of seventeenth-century churches.

The **Rapporteur** suggested, following the proposed amendment of the Delegations of Lebanon and the Netherlands, adding a third paragraph to the draft Decision that would read as follows:

“3. Requests the State Party to pay particular attention to monitoring and management trends and eventual changes in the built fabric, as well as to the functions of the nominated area and its buffer zone, in order not to affect the outstanding universal values of the site.”

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.43** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its sincere gratitude on behalf of the Vice-Governor and Mayor of the city and the Government to the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The inscription of the Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl was of great importance, the site was a pearl in a gold ring. All present were invited to the annual festival celebrated in Yaroslavl.

*Decision : 29 COM 8B.44*

**Withdrawn to the request of the State Party**

**Retiree à la demande de l'Etat partie**

### **Extensions of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>The Belfries of Flanders, Artois, Hainaut and Picardy The Belfry in Gembloux (Minor modification) (Extension to Belfries of Flanders and Wallonia)</b>
Id. N°	<b>943 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>France / Belgium</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.45*

**ICOMOS** présente les résultats de son évaluation à l'issue de l'étude du dossier d'extension présenté conjointement par la France et la Belgique.

The Delegation of **Nigeria**, supported by the Delegation of **India**, wholeheartedly supported the extension of the property and the new name proposed for the whole property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.45** provisionally adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) remercie le Comité et la Belgique, et se félicite que ces 23 nouveaux beffrois s'ajoutent à ceux déjà inscrits en Belgique.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) se félicite de l'inclusion des beffrois de la France qui, avec les 30 beffrois de la Belgique, apportent un témoignage hautement significatif de la conquête des libertés communales.

Property	<b>Frontiers of the Roman Empire – Upper German-Raetian Limes (Extension to Hadrian's Wall)</b>
Id. N°	<b>430 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Germany / United Kingdom</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.46*

**ICOMOS** présente les résultats de son évaluation à l'issue de l'étude du dossier d'extension présenté par l'Allemagne et le Royaume-Uni.

The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the extension of the property and said that the draft Decision could be adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the Advisory Body to make a one-minute presentation, containing additional information, as the inscription was ultimately the core job of the Committee. It would appreciate hearing the reasoning behind the recommendation.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that the proposed extension had been well prepared, but it did have one concern regarding parts of the site that had been reconstructed. At its request, the States Parties had agreed to exclude certain parts of the nomination from the core zone and to treat them as a buffer zone. **ICOMOS** had asked for new maps showing the agreed new boundaries of the core and buffer zones. The States Parties had brought the maps with them, but as the deadline for submitting information had passed, they had not been considered. It said that the maps requested would be available for the Committee at its 30th session.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested some clarification as to the extent of the modification of the boundaries. It suggested adding the date of 1 February 2006 in the draft Decision for reception of the requested documentation.

**ICOMOS** said that the modifications to the boundary were minor. It had, for example, suggested that a wall around a fort be excluded from the core zone.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether **ICOMOS** then proposed to inscribe only half a monument.

**ICOMOS** explained that the fort which had been used as an example was a large one and that the total protected monument covered a very large area, over approximately 500 kilometres. It had suggested excluding the reconstructed parts from the core zone, and including them in the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that it had the impression that a satisfactory agreement had already been reached between ICOMOS and the States Parties concerned. If that was the case, the sentence requesting additional documentation could be deleted from the draft Decision.

**ICOMOS** said that it had indeed reached agreement with the States Parties, and that the present solution was significant for the philosophy of conservation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** confirmed that ICOMOS had proposed a series of exclusions and that it had agreed to them.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it too had agreed to the suggestions made by ICOMOS. It had been possible to supply the information requested fairly rapidly, which demonstrated the enthusiasm of everyone involved.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of Portugal that the sentence requesting additional documentation should be deleted.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.45** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it must be stressed that the documentation requested had been submitted.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany**, speaking also on behalf of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, thanked ICOMOS for its cooperation in preparing the nomination. It hoped that in the future the property could be extended to include, amongst others, sites in Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Croatia.

Property	<b>Works of Antoni Gaudí (Extension of Parque Güell, Palacio Güell and Casa Mila in Barcelona)</b>
Id. N°	<b>320 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (i)(ii)(iii)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.47*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it had two questions. First, it wanted to know why had the buildings in the extension of the property not been included in the original nomination and second, whether the best of Gaudi had now been covered, or whether more nominations would follow.

**ICOMOS** said that with the buildings already included in the World Heritage List and the proposed extension of the property under consideration, the best of Gaudi's work would feature on the List. The State Party was in the best position to answer the first question.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Saint-Lucia. It asked the State Party to say whether it would consider extending the property beyond Catalonia.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the draft Decision, and said that it had appreciated the advice given by the Advisory Body.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.47** provisionally adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** thanked all the persons and institutions involved in the preparation of the extension file. It said that with the extension the entire work of Gaudi was fully represented and no future extensions to the serial property were to be expected.

Property	<b>City-Museum of Gjirokastra</b>
Id. N°	<b>569 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Albania</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.48*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the name of site in English should be Museum-City, and not City-Museum.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that the prepared management plan for 2002-2010, including training aspects, was a commendable initiative.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed the immediate inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, supported by the Delegation of **Benin**, proposed an additional paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported inscription with certain conditions.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the preceding propositions.

The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.48** provisionally adopted, as amended, by acclamation.

La Délégation de l'**Albanie** (Observateur), au nom de son gouvernement, remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour cette inscription, ainsi que l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, nommément M. Bandarin et Mme Rossler ainsi que son équipe pour l'aide apportée dans la préparation du dossier d'inscription. La Délégation confirme l'engagement très fort de son gouvernement pour la préservation

de ce bien, et rappelle que, notamment, un tiers du budget destiné à la préservation du patrimoine a été alloué, deux ans auparavant, à ce site et qu'une stratégie de développement du tourisme a été élaborée. La Délégation de l'Albanie souligne que cette inscription représente un signal très fort et un encouragement pour les intellectuels et les habitants, et elle termine son intervention par une citation du poète albanais Ismaël Kadaré, célébrant les beautés de la ville de Gjirokastra.

Property	<b>Old City of Mostar</b>
Id. N°	<b>946 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iv)(v)(vi)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.49*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to keep its statement to three minutes.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the case was a complicated one, with a long history of deferral and referral. Consequently, it would be helpful if time-keeping was relaxed, both for ICOMOS and for Committee members.

The **Chairperson** agreed that it was necessary to be flexible in that respect and he was sure that the Committee would be of the same opinion.

**ICOMOS** said that repeated recommendations made by the Committee and various missions had been addressed gradually and the new nomination had finally been confined to a much smaller boundary than the initial nomination. The structure of the bridge, which had been destroyed during the war in the 1990s, was not authentic, but the methods and material used in the reconstruction had been thoroughly researched and that research had been applied. The renaissance of the bridge represented the memory of reconciliation of the different local groups and symbolized destruction, reconciliation and international cooperation.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the last ICOMOS visit had been in 2003 and it wondered whether a deferred nomination could be evaluated without a field mission, especially for a site involving heavy reconstruction.

**ICOMOS** said that the nomination file had been submitted in January 2005 which had allowed the property to be recommended for inscription. As locally-based ICOMOS experts had been closely involved in the production of the progress report submitted by the State Party, ICOMOS had considered that there was no need for another mission to the site.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the outstanding achievements of the Committee and the State Party over so many years.

The Delegation of **Portugal** cited a poem on the significance of bridges. Bridges were the most emblematic and symbolic of all human constructions. With the new name of the site being “The Old Bridge area of the Old City of Mostar”, the nomination had become even more symbolic. There were many other properties on the World Heritage List which were reconstructed structures. Inscriptions had to be made for peoples and for the future, and it therefore supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that in spite of the great damage caused to the site, archaeological and scientific research had made it possible for the reconstruction to be undertaken using an authentic methodology. The bridge between different religious groups in the region having been reconstructed, the bridge bore the memory of recent events.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** seconded the statements of the Delegations of Portugal and the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the inscription and observed that there seemed to be a consensus among the Committee members.

The Delegation of **Japan**, quoting the Nara Document on Authenticity, said that “All cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage and these should be respected.” It supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party on the preparation of the nomination and ICOMOS on its excellent evaluation. It said that the site was quite clearly the symbol of reconciliation and hope.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated the State Party and experts involved in the nomination process.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the draft Decision should not be adopted on the basis of emotions, but on objective grounds. It read out cultural criteria (iv) and (vi). It doubted the value of the site in terms of criterion (iv), since the bridge and the surrounding buildings of Mostar had been totally restored after destruction and were replicas dating from 2003-2004. It stressed that the main value attributed to the site was more symbolic, it was the emblem of reconstruction and peace. It proposed inscription of the site under criterion (vi) only, on an exceptional basis.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the inscription of the site and stressed that the process undertaken by the State Party should be acknowledged as extremely important and unforgettable.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient vivement l’inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ainsi que l’application du critère (vi). Néanmoins, en réponse aux délégations qui ont établi un parallèle avec l’inscription de la vieille ville de Varsovie, elle fait remarquer que la reconstruction du pont de Mostar est certes un symbole de

nouveau départ, mais que sur le plan scientifique les deux démarches ne sont pas comparables puisque la reconstruction de la vieille ville de Varsovie était une re-création complète à partir d'une mémoire sélective qui ne s'appuyait pas de façon rigoureuse sur les documents et les archives historiques. La Délégation considère par ailleurs que le critère (iv) est également applicable à la reconstruction de l'ancien pont de Mostar, de la même manière qu'il a été appliqué pour la reconstruction du Pavillon d'or incendié à Kyoto.

The Delegation of **China** supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that this site should be on the World heritage List and proposed that only criterion (vi) be applied.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** seconded the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom for inscription under criterion (vi) only. The Delegation stated that after consultation of several reports, evaluations and documents, it was clear that apart from the Bridge itself, there has been a lot of bad reconstruction, not based on any documentation and with inadequate material. The Delegation mentioned a letter by an Architect found in the nomination file of Mostar, addressed to the Mayor and copied to the President of the International Scientific Committee and to the President of the World Heritage Committee, expressing great concern about the inappropriate reconstruction of the old city monuments. Therefore, the Delegation did not agree with the Delegation of Lebanon and had serious doubts about the authenticity of the site. Moreover, the Delegation argued that ICOMOS justified both authenticity and outstanding value by focusing only on the Bridge and the remarkable work of the International Community! The Delegation wished to remind everybody that it was not only the Bridge and certainly not the International Community that were being inscribed, but the old town of Mostar. The Delegation therefore insisted it could only agree with the exceptional symbolic and intangible value of the site, and accept inscription under criterion (vi) only.

The Delegation of **Norway** did not agree with the Delegation of Saint Lucia and recommended that all the Committee members should read the Nara Document on Authenticity. It considered that the site had value under criterion (iv) as well.

The Delegations of **South Africa** and **New Zealand** said that there seemed to be a consensus for inscription and asked ICOMOS whether the site should be inscribed under both criteria (iv) and (vi) or under criterion (vi) only.

La Délégation du **Bénin** souligne que la seule question qui se pose véritablement est celle des critères, et considère que le critère (vi) ne devrait pas être utilisé seul, bien que le cas se soit déjà produit.

**ICOMOS** said that it could not comment on the letter referred to by the Delegation of Saint Lucia since it had not seen it.



The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that, in the light of the discussion, it could propose an amendment to the draft Decision, by which the site would be inscribed under criterion (vi) only and a paragraph would be added encouraging the State Party to undertake further research that might acknowledge the outstanding universal value of the site. It also proposed inserting in the draft Decision an acknowledgement of the great achievement of international cooperation in the reconstruction of the site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** seconded the proposal of the Netherlands, as it would indeed be great pity if the potential value under criterion (iv) was not mentioned and if no reference was made to international reconstruction efforts. It sought clarification from ICOMOS as to whether any major construction problems existed within the core area of the nominated site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** pointed out that the Delegation of Saint Lucia had mentioned a negative letter from an expert, whereas ICOMOS considers that the chapter devoted to the restorations is positive, which implies that that criterion (iv) is acceptable. The Delegation therefore supported the application of criteria (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Argentina** wondered what the judgment of the Committee members would have been if there had been no war. It recalled the discussions held in Kazan concerning criterion (vi) and considered that this criterion was neither weak nor minor.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que l'utilisation du critère (vi) seul est une preuve de mépris pour tous les architectes, archéologues, historiens, etc. qui ont travaillé avec acharnement et compétence, non seulement sur le pont, mais aussi sur d'autres quartiers de la ville, et estime que le Comité devrait reconnaître la qualité de leur travail.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Historic Centre of Warsaw in Poland had been inscribed under criteria (ii) and (vi), and Robben Island of South Africa had been inscribed under criteria (iii) and (vi). It stated that there were some exceptional cases, such as Auschwitz Concentration Camp, the Island of Goree and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial, that had been inscribed under criterion (vi) only. Those exceptions were all symbols of human suffering; therefore an inscription under criterion (vi) only would be a very strong message, as well as being the only acceptable criterion. It reiterated its concern that a 2003-2004 reconstruction was not acceptable in terms of criterion (iv).

The Delegation of **India**, invoking Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure, moved closure of the debate for the sake of time management.

The **Rapporteur** concluded that there were three options before the Committee. First, it could inscribe the site under criteria (iv) and (vi); second, it could inscribe it under criterion (vi) only, and third, it could adopt the proposal made by the Delegation of the Netherlands and inscribe the site under criterion (vi) only but acknowledge other potential values as well as the efforts made by the international community. The Committee chose to follow the third option proposed by the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.49** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** expressed its deep gratitude to the Committee, the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO, the Government of Italy, as well as the Governments of the Netherlands, France, Turkey and Croatia, and the World Bank and the international community. It recalled with emotion the moment when the Old Bridge of Mostar had been destroyed during the war in the 1990s. It again thanked UNESCO for the safeguarding and restoration work, which figured among UNESCO's greatest achievements.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la culture** rappelle sa première visite à Mostar en 1994 pour l'évaluation de l'état des monuments et précise que l'UNESCO n'a cessé depuis d'envoyer les meilleurs spécialistes à Mostar, tant Croates, Bosniaques et Serbes qu'Italiens ou Français tels les responsables de Pise ou de Notre-Dame de Paris. Il souligne que l'UNESCO s'est véritablement engagée pour préserver les qualités intrinsèques de la vieille ville de Mostar, notamment le petit pont, et évoque la foule de jeunes venus célébrer l'inauguration du pont reconstruit, en 2004.

The meeting was suspended at 6. 30 p.m. and resumed at 7.30 p.m.

Property	<b>Incense Route and Desert Cities in the Negev</b>
Id. N°	<b>1107</b>
State Party	<b>Israel</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (iii)(v)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.50*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the Committee had referred the nomination back to the State Party at its 28th session. It particularly welcomed the comparative analysis. The site's specificity should be made clearer in its name, since other parts of the Incense Route would be in different countries. It proposed adding two paragraphs, paragraphs 4 and 5, to the draft Decision to change the name and to recommend that the State Party implement the existing management plan.

**ICOMOS** said that the Incense Route was the key to the nomination. It proposed the name "Incense Route/ Desert Cities in the Negev" as a solution so that other related sites in other countries could be included in the future. Further submissions from the State Party were pending but ICOMOS could stand for the content of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that there was no proof that incense was the main item of trade. It considered that the Nabatean history, cultural landscape aspect and

agricultural value should have been added and enhanced, and that the site should have been called the “Nabatean City”.

La Délégation du **Bénin** précise que le site est très différent du tronçon de la Route de l’encens déjà inscrit et qu’il n’est pas possible de modifier le nom maintenant. Il propose que cette question soit traitée ultérieurement entre l’Etat partie et l’organisation consultative.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** endorsed the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the inscription as well as the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon to add a paragraph requesting the State Party to implement the management plan.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the site, as the conditions set in 2004 had been met. It proposed amending the draft Decision to encourage the State Party to implement its archaeological strategy and amplify the existing management plan.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.50** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** welcomed other States Parties to join those travelling along the Incense Route.

## LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

### New nominations

Property	<b>Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works</b>
Id. N°	<b>1178</b>
State Party	<b>Chile</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decisions: 29 COM 8B.51 and 29 COM 8B.52*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated Chile for this unique property which contributes towards a more balanced World Heritage List. This property shows that the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not negative, and considered that Chile gives a lesson of sincerity.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** doubted whether the site represented real wealth to Chile or not, and expressed its concern at the fragility of the building, where conservation work had not yet been completed. Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger might assist the process and efforts for the safeguarding of the site

in the future, but benchmarks should be set. It sought clarification as to how the site's values and authenticity would be protected.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it was convinced of the outstanding universal value of the site as well as of the threats facing it, and it therefore considered that simultaneous inscription on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger might result in corrective measures. It sought clarification as to how the authenticity of the rest of the site, other than the two factories, could be ensured.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** acknowledged the outstanding universal value of the site which enhanced industrialization and social transformation in modern history. It said that the whole site was of outstanding universal value but extensive safeguarding was necessary, and it therefore supported inscription on both the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS**, replying to the Delegations of the Netherlands and Saint Lucia, said that the two buildings that were the subject of the nomination were of a type that was often built with poor materials and regularly repaired by replacing elements as the need arose, because of wear and tear due to evolving needs related to their function. The fact that they had survived was partly down to the particularly dry climate of the northern Pampa of Chile, which had prevented them from rusting away. As for how to ensure their conservation and maintenance of authenticity, similar cases of industrial buildings had shown that a policy of successive replacement of single and limited sections of the building constituted an acceptable practice. ICOMOS had indeed suggested that such an approach should be integrated in the conservation plan for the site, provided of course that the main structure of the buildings was stabilized.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party on the nomination and supported inscription of the site on both the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recalled that much has been said about these remains and congratulated Chile for finally breaking the "anathema" linked to the List of World Heritage in Danger, recalling that the States Parties until now were afraid of seeing their sites inscribed on this List. It considered that Chile is facing up to this problem very honestly.

The Delegations of **Japan** and **Nigeria** enthusiastically supported the nomination for inscription on both the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que cette inscription pose un problème méthodologique car on voudrait à la fois garder le site tel qu'il est sans le réparer, et surtout sans en faire une usine neuve, tout en évitant une dégradation irréversible. Mais quels pourraient être les repères en vue de le retirer de la Liste du patrimoine en péril ?

La Délégation du **Bénin** n'a pas d'objection à l'inscription mais interroge l'ICOMOS sur les *Orientations* en soulignant qu'un programme de mesures correctives doit être entrepris.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the inscription of the site but proposed adding to the draft Decision a paragraph to ensure the safeguarding of the authenticity of the site by setting benchmarks within the conservation plan.

**ICOMOS** said that industrial structures were vulnerable to collapse and needed to be stabilized. A tourism plan had been produced with a view to endowing the site with a theatre function, but access to the industrial structures was limited for the time being due to their fragility.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.51** provisionally adopted and Decision **29 COM 8B.52** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the Committee, the staff of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, recalling that this was its fourth site inscribed and the only one in the world on the production of saltpeter. It pointed out that it was the community linked to the production of saltpeter that wished to save these works, by collecting 20,000 signatures, that the work was done by the population, thus allowing the conservation work to be reactivated. The Delegation considered that the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger is important, that it is a means of preserving the authenticity of the site. It thanked the South African people for their hospitality and warmth, not forgetting the international community and concluded its intervention with a quotation from the Chilean poet Pablo Neruda on saltpeter.

Property	<b>Urban Historic Centre of Cienfuegos</b>
Id. N°	<b>1202</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)(v)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.53*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the inscription of this site, which allows a gap to be filled, that of the 19th century, as an example of modernism in America. It pointed out that the site has a management plan and that it firmly supports the inscription.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** strongly supported inscription of the site, and mentioned the influence of West African culture among other cultural interchanges that had taken place there.

The Delegation of **Chile** declared that it is an extraordinary site and that it firmly supports its inscription.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.53** provisionally adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Cuba** thanked all those who had taken part in the process and recalled that this was the eighth Cuban site inscribed on the List. It said that it was

very pleased with the criteria taken into account and considered that it was a tribute paid to the people who had contributed to the development of this town, both the French settlers who came from Philadelphia and the African workers who built it. The Delegation confirmed the State Party's commitment to maintain the values of the site, not only for the local community, but also for all those who will appreciate it.

Property	<b>Route of the First Colonial Sugar Mills of America</b>
Id. N°	<b>1132</b>
State Party	<b>Dominican Republic</b>
Criteria proposed by State Party	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 8B.54*

**ICOMOS** presented the site.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that it was of the opinion that the site was of outstanding universal value, pending further action to be taken with regard to the nomination. It suggested referring the nomination back to the State Party rather than deferring it, as had been recommended.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that it endorsed the draft Decision as it stood. It considered that the name of the site could be improved.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the referral of nominations back to States Parties allowed them to address the Committee's recommendations over a period of three years before resubmitting the necessary documents for examination by the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the deferral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out a discrepancy between the name of the nomination in English and in French.

The Delegation of **India** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the colonial sugar industry had involved the transportation of a great many people to foreign lands to work as slaves. It strongly objected to any commemoration of the history of colonialism as human heritage.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.54** provisionally adopted.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee would turn to Section III of the working document concerning nominations received for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session in 2006.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that two nominations, Baltic Klint (Estonia) and Le Toubkal (Morocco), had been received by the World Heritage Centre on 2 February 2005, that was, after the 1 February deadline for the submission of nominations, and it

sought the Committee's approval to include them in the list of nominations received for review by the Committee at its 30th session (2006).

The Delegation of **India**, supported by the Delegation of **Japan**, said that it had been informed of the delay in the submission of the two nominations due to the delay of courier delivery within UNESCO before reaching the Office of the Director of the World Heritage Centre. It was clearly not the responsibility of the State Parties, and appealed to the World Heritage Centre to be flexible in its treatment of the nominations.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked why the issue had to be brought to the attention of the Committee - surely the Centre could have dealt the issue internally.

La Délégation du **Bénin** rappelle que le cachet de la poste fait foi et indique la date d'envoi.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 8B.55**, Option 1, provisionally adopted.

The **Chairperson** recalled the discussions suspended earlier that day on two nominations, namely, the **Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon)** and **Ecosystem and Cultural Landscape of the Minkébé Massif (Gabon)** and invited the Committee to take a decision on them.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to the draft Decisions, which, if adopted would lead to their referral back to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 8B.17** and **29 COM 8B.18** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 11D PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

*Document:* WHC-05/29.COM/11D

*Draft Decision:* **29 COM 11D**

The **Chairperson** invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture to present the working Document *WHC-05/29.COM/11D*.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la culture** rappelle les efforts déployés par l'UNESCO en faveur du patrimoine culturel et naturel palestinien, en particulier en assistant l'Autorité palestinienne à dresser l'inventaire de ce patrimoine culturel et naturel exceptionnel, à faire l'évaluation de son état de conservation et rappelle les nombreuses activités visant à renforcer les capacités des institutions palestiniennes responsables de la mise en œuvre de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Il rappelle

les contributions du Comité du patrimoine mondial et du Gouvernement italien grâce auxquelles un plan de travail a pu être élaboré et par la suite adopté par le Comité conjoint UNESCO/Autorité palestinienne en permettant la mise en œuvre de nombreuses activités. Il remercie enfin les deux parties pour leurs efforts conjoints et se félicite de la médiation offerte une fois de plus par l'Ambassadeur d'Italie, M. Francesco Caruso, ce qui a permis de résoudre d'une façon consensuelle la discussion de ce point.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture and the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Italy to UNESCO, Mr Francesco Caruso, for their efforts and suggested that the Committee adopt the draft Decision without discussion.

He declared Decision **29 COM 11D** provisionally adopted and gave the floor to the States Parties concerned for a brief statement.

La Délégation d'**Israël** (Observateur) souligne les importants résultats figurant dans la décision que le Comité vient d'adopter, obtenus grâce au dialogue entre les deux parties et avec son homologue M. l'Ambassadeur M. Abdelrazek et remercie l'Ambassadeur d'Italie, M. Francesco Caruso pour ses efforts continus. Il annonce enfin que l'Etat d'Israël a décidé d'allouer la somme de 10.000 dollars EU pour contribuer à la sauvegarde du patrimoine palestinien.

La Mission d'Observation de la **Palestine** (Observateur) rappelle la décision du Comité du patrimoine mondial prise à sa 26e session à Budapest qui avait reconnu la valeur exceptionnelle du patrimoine palestinien et l'engagement de l'UNESCO à aider l'Autorité palestinienne dans la préparation d'un inventaire de ce patrimoine. Il remercie donc l'UNESCO, le Comité du patrimoine mondial, le Sous-Directeur général pour la culture, M. Mounir Bouchenaki, le Directeur du Centre, M. Francesco Bandarin et son équipe pour tous les efforts qui ont été déployés. Il rappelle que l'inventaire contient 20 biens culturels et naturels et qu'il constitue une étape importante pour la rédaction de politiques de conservation du patrimoine palestinien. Il souligne avec préoccupation que ces efforts ne reflètent pas la situation qui se vérifie jour après jour sur le terrain et rappelle les pertes et les graves dommages subis par des centaines de bâtiments suite aux opérations militaires. Se référant au geste symbolique que constitue la contribution de 10.00 dollars, il rappelle néanmoins que les destructions représentent une perte de plusieurs millions de dollars. En exprimant sa vive inquiétude pour la situation présente, il espère que l'esprit de coopération qui oriente la politique du Comité du patrimoine mondial et qui se concrétise aujourd'hui avec l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial d'un site d'une valeur fondamentale comme la ville de Mostar puisse amener à la compréhension et à la paix entre les deux peuples concernés.

La Délégation d'**Israël** (Observateur) affirme que le Comité du patrimoine mondial est un organisme qui doit discuter de patrimoine et non pas de politique et quitte la salle.

L'Ambassadeur d'Italie, M. **Francesco Caruso**, félicite le Comité du patrimoine mondial qui, lors de la présente session du Comité comme déjà l'an passé lors de sa 28e session, a su comprendre la dimension de la question proposée à son attention. En faisant référence au projet de décision qui vient d'être adopté par le Comité, et en particulier au Comité technique conjoint israélo-palestinien pour l'archéologie, il



rappelle qu'aucune autre organisation internationale ne va si loin dans la construction du dialogue et de la coopération entre les deux parties.

The **President of the General Conference of UNESCO** congratulated the Members of the Committee for their exemplary efforts in implementing the *World Heritage Convention*. He emphasized that the present Committee session was the first to be held in sub-Saharan Africa, and remarked that the *World Heritage Convention* touched all regions of the world. Furthermore, he observed that there had been fewer inscriptions than at previous sessions. He thanked the Chairperson, the Members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre for their dedication in safeguarding the heritage of humanity.

**ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED)**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/7.B.Rev  
WHC-05/29.COM/7.B.Add

*Draft Decisions:* **29 COM 7B.a, 29 COM 7B.b, 29 COM 7B.c**  
*and from 29 COM 7.B1 to 29 COM 7B.10*

The **Chairperson** proposed starting the discussion with the properties of Aksum (Ethiopia) and Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran), as otherwise the delegations sent by the State Parties concerned to follow the discussions would be unable to participate due to their travel arrangements.

**Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that the working document presented information on the multidisciplinary UNESCO scientific mission undertaken in the context of the agreed return of the Obelisk of Aksum. The Centre would continue the site survey as well as a full Environmental Impact Assessment, which would also assist in developing a non-destructive methodology for re-erecting the Obelisk. It had completed a draft project document for phase 1, which was currently being studied by Italy with a view to further support.

**ICOMOS** noted that a careful study was necessary to decide where and how to erect the Obelisk. It considered that the Obelisk had to be erected *in situ* and noted that excavation should be avoided unless it was absolutely necessary.

La Délégation du **Liban** demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de ne lire que les éventuelles informations supplémentaires qui ne figurent pas dans le document de travail.

The **Chairperson** reiterated the request made by the Delegation of Lebanon that the World Heritage Centre should be brief and read out only new information.

La Délégation du **Bénin** approuve le projet de décision **29 COM 7B.34 Rev**. Elle met l'accent sur l'importance du retour de l'obélisque, se félicite de la coopération des parties prenantes et encourage l'UNESCO et l'Etat partie à prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires pour assurer la réédification de l'obélisque.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.34 Rev** provisionally adopted.

### **Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)**

The **World Heritage Centre** referred to the revised draft Decision, reporting new information obtained from the UNESCO Office in Teheran that construction of the high-rise building in the vicinity of the property was continuing as of early July 2005, pending the final decision of the Esfahan Justice Department on whether to reduce its height.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked the Chairperson to invite the State Party to comment on the revised draft Decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** expressed its general agreement with the revised draft Decision, but suggested that two minor amendments be considered for the sake of clarity, in paragraphs 3 and 6. "Commercial complex" should be replaced by "multi-functional complex", and "section of the building closer to the property" and "rest of the complex" should be replaced by "for the eastern side of the complex" and "for the western side".

The Delegation of **Portugal** endorsed the proposal by the Observer Delegation of Iran.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision with the two minor amendments proposed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.54 Rev** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **MIXED SITES**

### **Kakadu National Park (Australia) (C/N 147 bis)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.30** provisionally adopted.

### **Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France/Spain) (C/N 773bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the French authorities had not replied until July 2005. A letter dated 11 July 2005 from the Permanent Delegate and Ambassador of France to UNESCO stated that the Festival de Gavarnie had not taken place in 2005 and that alternative venues were being sought for it in the framework of the property's management programme.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that it had proposed an amendment to the draft Decision that had been circulated in the room.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.31** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)**

La Délégation du **Liban** indique qu'elle a souhaité que ce site soit examiné car le rapport indique que l'Union européenne a financé la construction de routes et des rénovations, sans le moindre respect des valeurs du patrimoine mondial, ni des normes de conservation traditionnelles. Elle propose qu'un paragraphe soit ajouté au projet de décision, priant la Commission européenne de prendre les mesures nécessaires.

**ICOMOS** said that in view of the situation at the site, it would be useful if the State Party could be requested to invite a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS/IUCN mission.

La Délégation du **Liban** confirme que si effectivement l'ICOMOS n'est pas sûr de ce qui se passe réellement sur le site, alors une mission est nécessaire.

The Delegation of **India** said that the amendment should refer to the European Union and not the European Commission.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.32** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that it had received additional information on the new master plan, which had been submitted in draft form to the Centre on 19 April 2005. The draft plan was the result of cooperation between the authorities in charge of the cultural and natural resources of the property. It noted that planning and management arrangements, which were fundamental requirements for effective site conservation, had been improved only partially. The draft plan needed to be developed in greater depth in terms of urban planning and zoning. The daily work of the management unit remained inadequate. No studies on transportation alternatives to the Sanctuary had been undertaken. Control of the urban development of Aguas Calientes

was not properly dealt with in the proposed guidelines for the master plan. An overall plan for Aguas Calientes had to be prepared as a matter of urgency in accordance with the master plan of the Machu Picchu Sanctuary. All the stakeholders had to work together to ensure that the plan included detailed ordinances for constructions. The management authorities had produced a final draft document that would be open to public revision until 30 September 2005.

The Centre had also met World Bank officers in Washington on 1 June 2005 and had expressed its concern with regard to the resettlement of 60 families in the buffer zone of the Sanctuary, in close proximity to the core of the property. The area had the same problems of mudslides and was considered in the new master plan as an area requiring strict protection. The Vilcanota project, which had started on 9 May 2005, did not seem to have taken the new master plan for the Sanctuary into account. An environmental impact assessment study of the pilot project should be conducted as a matter of urgency.

La Délégation du **Liban** insiste sur le fait que ces informations se trouvent dans le document de travail et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de ne présenter que les nouvelles informations.

The Delegation of **Chile** wondered whether the Committee had been fully informed. It also said that it had submitted a draft Decision to the Rapporteur which should be brought to the attention of the Committee members.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.33** provisionally adopted.

#### **Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C1055)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.35** provisionally adopted.

#### **Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.36** provisionally adopted.

#### **Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)**

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that on reading the report it appeared that the property was rapidly moving towards being added to the List of World Heritage in Danger, with buildings seriously threatened with collapse. The submission of a report by the State Party in 2007, as requested in the draft Decision, would not be advisable.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that a report should be submitted in 2006.

La Délégation du **Bénin** approuve la suggestion de la Délégation de Sainte-Lucie, et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial si une date limite a été définie pour la soumission du rapport.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had already been requested to provide a report in 2005.

La Délégation du **Bénin** pense que, dans ce cas, il n'est pas souhaitable d'attendre 2007 pour la soumission du rapport.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The **Chairperson** observed that there was a consensus in the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** proposed that paragraph 5 of the draft Decision should be amended so that the report would be requested for 2006.

La Délégation du **Liban** suggère de changer également la fin du paragraphe 5 comme suit : « pour examen par le Comité à sa 30e session en 2006 ».

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.37** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had received a considerable amount of additional information concerning Robben Island in the previous few days. The Centre commended the State Party and Robben Island Museum for their continued work to address the Island's problems as identified during the 2004 IUCN/ICCROM/ICOMOS mission. The Centre and the Advisory Bodies would review the information in due course and were prepared to continue to provide assistance to the State Party in setting priorities for the implementation of the Advisory Bodies mission recommendations.

The **Rapporteur** had received a proposed amendment to paragraph 6 of the draft Decision from the Advisory Bodies, so that it would read as follows: "Urges the State Party and the Robben Island Museum, *with the assistance of the Advisory Bodies*, to set priorities for the implementation of all the recommendations made by the ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission".

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.39** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)**

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of **India**, said that as the Committee had inadvertently omitted to examine the state of conservation of the Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal), it should do so at the first opportunity on the following day.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11 pm



## SIXTH DAY

### SUBSIDIARY BODY ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ISSUES

Friday 15 July 2005

11.00 am - 01.00 pm

**Chairperson: Mr Voorneveld (Netherlands)**

**Rapporteur: Mr Bignall (New Zealand)**

#### **ITEM 10 GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY: BUDGETARY PROVISIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR CAPACITY BUILDING ON NATURAL HERITAGE**

*Documents: WHC-05/29.COM/10*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 10*

At the request of the **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, the **Legal Adviser** clarified the procedures for the election of the Chairperson of the subsidiary body. He noted that candidates had to be proposed and that the Chairperson was elected from among the candidates.

After discussion, the Committee decided that the meeting would be chaired by the Delegate of the Netherlands, apart from items 16 and 15, which would be chaired by the Delegate of Norway.

The **Chairperson** invited IUCN to introduce item 10.

IUCN reminded the Committee that it had presented its draft Natural Heritage Framework Programme for the Implementation of the Global Training Strategy at the Seventh Extraordinary Session of the Committee in 2004. The Committee had taken note of the programme and had requested a proposal on budgetary provisions for its implementation. The working document included the indicative budget that had been presented at the seventh Extraordinary Session, amounting to a total budget of US\$ 688,000 over a five-year period of which it was proposed that US\$ 200,000 would be funded from the World Heritage Fund. After consultation with the Centre, it had been recognized that those resources were currently not available, so more work would be needed to mobilize the extrabudgetary resources needed. However, IUCN noted that the resources it was currently receiving for training activities, amounting to US\$ 32,000 per year, allowed only for a limited and specific input such as completing the



various resource manuals under preparation and its participation in various training workshops. It therefore proposed to increase the budget for the biennium by US\$ 40,000 in order to allow for the development and implementation of an action plan focusing on raising funds for the Framework Programme.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked if IUCN had already a planned programme and a detailed plan on how the money would be spent.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked if the Framework Programme addressed only natural sites.

**IUCN** clarified that the Framework Programme had been presented in detail at the Seventh Extraordinary Session and had been developed in close consultation with an expert group.

The **Delegation of Egypt** said that that did not answer its question and inquired if the additional budget was needed to organize an expert workshop to raise extrabudgetary funds.

**IUCN** recalled that the current budget did not allow for full implementation of the programme and that the additional funds would be used to develop an action plan, clarify priorities and mobilize extra budgetary funds. It also reminded the Committee that each biennium, US\$ 130,000 was allocated to ICCROM for cultural heritage training and that with the current proposal the budget for natural heritage training would be increased to approximately US\$ 100,000.

**ICCROM** noted that the Global Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage had been developed before the natural heritage part and had been discussed by the Committee in Cairns in 2000. The strategy was currently under implementation.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked for further clarification from IUCN on how the money was to be spent.

**IUCN** agreed to provide some more detailed wording on the budget.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the draft decision was acceptable subject to the approval of the overall budget.

He declared Decision **29 COM 10** provisionally adopted.

## **ITEM 12 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/12*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 12*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that the item had already been presented at previous sessions, but that major improvements had been made, as the Centre had started using a new methodology, called Results Based Management. In applying the new methodology, it had defined outcomes, based on a six-year cycle and outputs based on a two-year cycle for the strategic framework. That information was included in a table contained in the working document. The same methodology would later be applied to the thematic programmes.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated efforts made by the Centre but drew attention to paragraph 10 of the working document, which demonstrated the tension between process-oriented objectives and heritage objectives. Countries were more attracted by inscriptions but the principal aim of the Convention was to conserve heritage. The question was if the proposed indicators were sufficient to measure efforts by the States Parties to conserve the sites.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** welcomed the development of indicators, but agreed that the proposed table should be regarded as a first draft. It suggested organizing a working group at the next session that could study the table in detail. It also stressed the importance of establishing baselines for each indicator and proposed to replace outcome with long-term objective and output with short-term objective, to avoid confusion.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the comments by the Delegations of Japan and United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Norway** proposed to change indicator 2.1.1.1 to “Percentage of early-detected threats where rapid response removes the threats”.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that developing nations had limited capacity to prepare nominations and conserve sites already inscribed and asked how that issue would be addressed. It also had further detailed comments on some indicators and would provide those to the secretariat in writing.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed that sites would always face some threats, but the objective was to lower the number and gravity of the threats.

The **Chairperson**, in summing up, said that the working paper was excellent but clearly needed further development.

**ICCROM** congratulated the Centre for what was an important step forward and pointed out that indicators had to be measurable, and had to measure what needed to be measured. Some indicators were difficult to measure. ICCROM also noted that it would be happy to further assist with the development of the document.

**IUCN** stressed the need to add a time frame as well as lead responsibilities to the table and that priorities needed to be set. It thought that there were too many indicators and suggested focusing on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the development of tentative lists and addressing underrepresented heritage categories. A clear link should be established with the work already done on this issue

by the Advisory Bodies on the analysis of the List. IUCN was ready to assist in those efforts.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed that the document needed further work. Indicators needed to be defined not only in quantitative but also in qualitative terms.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** also congratulated the Centre for the step forward and emphasized that priorities had to be set bearing in mind the limited resources available. It also insisted on the measurability of the results and on the fact that the indicators were not sufficient to measure impact.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** félicite aussi le Centre, mais demande à ce que les indicateurs régionaux et globaux soient mis en relation. Elle se réfère à l'indicateur 3.1.3 comme exemple d'indicateur qu'il faudrait encore affiner.

The **Chairperson**, in summing up, noted that many ideas and comments had been put forward and that the proposed table would have to be considered a first step. He was confident that the Centre would take account of the remarks made.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed that more work was needed and proposed that a working group could be established as of now to work by email and present comments to the Centre by 1 February 2006.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** pointed out that the proposed table was extremely useful for the States Parties. If States Parties were to develop conservation plans as requested in 2.3.2, there would be a need to increase the budget for International Assistance.

The **Chairperson** repeated the suggestion of the Delegation of Egypt to establish a working group and proposed to include in the decision an invitation to States Parties to provide comments on the document by 1 December 2005. A working group could then be established at the next session.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the suggestion by the Chairperson and proposed to amend the Draft Decision, deleting "precise" from paragraph 3 and "completely integrated" from paragraph 5, as those did not seem very realistic targets given the amount of work to be done.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the proposal by the Chairperson.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** sought clarification from the Centre on what work it was still proposing to do.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Committee for the comments already made and hoped to receive further comments. He proposed that, as a next step, the indicators given in the table would be refined and that at a later stage indicators for the thematic programmes would also have to be developed. It would also be important to link the exercise with periodic reporting as that was the way in which the Centre received information on all properties in a systematic way. That would have to be reviewed as part of the reflection on periodic reporting, planned in 2007.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested information on the time frame.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** proposed that the results should be published on the website.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed to publish the revised table, based on the comments, on the website by 1 March 2006.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 12** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 13 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES PROGRESS REPORT ON WORLD HERITAGE PACT**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/13*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 13*

The **Chairperson** introduced the item, referring to the discussions that had taken place on the same subject at previous sessions.

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the contents of the working document, explaining that it was divided into three main parts: a proposed Regulatory Framework for the World Heritage PACT, as requested by the Committee; an assessment of the performance of the initiative; and tables listing all partnership agreements established by the World Heritage Centre. Concerning the Regulatory Framework, the World Heritage Centre explained that it was the first of its kind within UNESCO. It both contained principles, mirroring those of the United Nations Global Compact, and proposed procedures. The section on the performance of the PACT initiative clearly reflected an ongoing process, which would in the future have to align its indicators on those established by the Committee for the implementation of the *Convention* in general. Significant achievements had been accomplished so far, as shown by the attached tables. However, more time would be needed for the initiative to come fully to fruition and for that reason the Centre requested the Committee's permission to postpone examination of the evaluation of the initiative until its 31st session in 2007. New developments could include consideration of a possible World Heritage Prize.

The Delegation of **Norway** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the excellent document it had prepared, which provided the Committee with a complete overview on the issue of partnerships. Developing partnerships took a long time and it was essential to have a solid policy to make them sustainable. The document took that into account while addressing the ethical challenges of interacting with the private sector. The Delegation expressed its satisfaction, while acknowledging that there was scope for further development. It stressed that, in mobilizing resources and partnerships, the focus should be on Africa, for the protection of its heritage as well as for assistance to its States Parties in submitting new nominations. In that context, Norway would be willing to contribute financially to the proposed African World Heritage Fund.

Concerning the final paragraph of the Draft Decision, it was content with the proposed time frame of 2007 for the submission of a full evaluation of the programme, but nevertheless wished to receive an update on developments in 2006.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the document and requested clarification on two points. In paragraph 13 of the proposed Regulatory Framework, what entities were referred to? Would that provision apply to tobacco and brewing companies? With reference to paragraph 4, the proposed method of seeking funds appeared too passive. The Delegation suggested more proactive approaches, including the possibility of writing personal letters to chief executive officers of large companies and banks signed by the Director-General of UNESCO or the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, stressing that the real issue with the document was the relationship with the private sector, emphasized the need for clarity and transparency. Egypt, since ancient times a very centralized and state-oriented society, had not yet developed significant experience in that regard, and the document might have provided useful indications for future developments in that country. With reference to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation stated that the Regulatory Framework had to be discussed before it could be approved by the Committee. It also proposed some amendments to the wording of paragraphs 3 and 7 of the Draft Decisions. With respect to the proposed objectives of the PACT initiative, mentioned in paragraph 7 of the Regulatory Framework, raising awareness did not seem to be enough. Implementation of the Global Strategy and the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee (the 4 Cs) should be indicated in the objectives. The mere agreement of the proposed beneficiary countries, as suggested by paragraph 13 of the Regulatory Framework, would not be enough. Full consultation and a tripartite agreement between the World Heritage Centre, the beneficiary country and the partner were preferable. Finally, the Delegation of Egypt asked for clarification as to how the World Heritage Centre intended to manage contributions from donors who might not be prepared to make their donations to the World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **Japan** seconded the proposal by the Delegation of Norway on the need to have an updating report at the 30th session in 2006, considering the ongoing nature of the process.

The **Chairperson** drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 8 of the Regulatory Framework, requesting the World Heritage Centre to report annually on new partnership agreements.

The Observer for the **United Nations Foundation** (UNF) expressed UNF's strong appreciation of the initiative and of the staff working on it at the World Heritage Centre. PACT was a very important tool for promoting the *Convention* to the United States public. The possibility of developing an initiative called "Friends of World Heritage" was also being explored.

On the issue raised by the Delegation of Egypt and referred to in paragraph 17 of the Regulatory Framework, the Delegation of **Norway** assumed that normal UNESCO procedures would apply for dealing with the private sector.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that its authorities would impose the recommendations adopted by the Committee on the private sector wishing to establish partnerships for World Heritage.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that UNESCO had very specific regulations for dealing with extrabudgetary sources and the private sector in particular. Agreements with breweries, tobacco companies and arms manufacturers were explicitly prohibited. On the question of proactiveness, a special Unit had been established within the Centre to pursue possible partnership agreements in many different ways. The PACT initiative was not simply about fund-raising, but more appropriately a programme to promote partnership agreements, not necessarily with financial implications. It agreed to provide a progress report for information at the 30th session in 2006, but suggested that the issue should not be included in the items for discussion, in the interests of time.

The **Chairperson** suggested that such information might be presented as part of the Secretariat's Report.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested two further clarifications. If a private company in Egypt approached the competent national authorities proposing a partnership agreement focused on World Heritage, should the authorities refer the company to the World Heritage Centre, or would they be free to engage into such a partnership? Furthermore, would it be possible to include the 4 Cs within the objectives of PACT in the context of paragraph 7 (a) of the Regulatory Framework?

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked whether the World Heritage emblem could be used by partners in the context of agreements established at the national level between the authorities in charge and private companies. It also asked if private partners could make earmarked donations to the World Heritage Fund.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the use of the World Heritage emblem was regulated by the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. National Commissions were responsible for authorizing use of the emblem for activities at national level, which therefore did not require endorsement from the World Heritage Centre. Such endorsement, however, was necessary for international initiatives. In reply to the Delegation of South Africa, the World Heritage Centre confirmed that it was possible to make earmarked donations directly to the World Heritage Fund, although it preferred to limit that kind of arrangement.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the discussion and read out the revised decision and Regulatory Framework, including all the proposed amendments.

Following some further minor modifications proposed by the Delegations of the **United Kingdom** and **South Africa**, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 13** provisionally adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.



## SIXTH DAY

### SUBSIDIARY BODY ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ISSUES

Friday 15 July 2005

03.00 pm - 06.00 pm

**Chairperson: Mr Voorneveld (Netherlands)**

**Rapporteur: Mr Gillespie (New Zealand)**

#### ITEM 14A EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/14A*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 14A*

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the Committee was asked to take a decision on one request for International Assistance by the State Party of Bangladesh and briefly recalled the content of the request as set out in the working document.

In response to a question by the **Delegation of Egypt**, the **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the State Party had now paid the outstanding amount of its dues and that the Decision under discussion was draft Decision **29 COM 14A (option A)**.

The Delegation of **South Africa** considered the request to be reasonable but sought clarification about what would happen if the study concluded that major works were needed.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it might be the case that the issue of drainage could be dealt with as part of long-term maintenance rather than through major interventions. Otherwise, work could be undertaken to identify the costs and sources of funding.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that it was the third request for International Assistance for the property and requested information about previous awards.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the previous amounts had been used to deal with training in the conservation of terracotta plaques at the site and confirmed that the Assistance had resulted in good progress in terms of the plaques' conservation and skills enhancement for the staff. It was confident that the current request, if approved, would be well used.



The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification that it was permissible to move funds from the Emergency Assistance budget to meet the request.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it was and that the proposal to do so resulted from the fact that only around 25% of the Emergency Assistance chapter had been used to date and that it was unlikely to be used up within the biennium.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested prioritizing the equipment to be purchased as part of the request. The hydrological instrument and moisture measuring instrument should take higher priority over the computer and laptop.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to take note of that request.

**ICCROM** noted that paragraph 8 of the draft Decision required the study to integrate a day-to-day maintenance policy. It considered that the remuneration for consultants outlined in the budget was possibly too high and suggested that the World Heritage Centre conduct some further negotiation on that point.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support for the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that the draft Decision should include reference to the need to identify remedial actions. Subject to that, it supported the Draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that it had been asked to invert the order of equipment to be purchased and commented that the objective of the study was to identify remedial actions, referring to paragraph 3 of the working document.

The Delegation of **China** requested that paragraph 5 of the draft Decision be amended to make it clear that the transfer of funds between budgetary lines was permitted under the financial regulations of the World Heritage Fund.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked that the request of the Delegation of Colombia be reflected in paragraph 6 of the Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 14A (option A)** provisionally adopted as amended.

**ITEM 15      REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET 2004-2005  
AND FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL  
ISSUES OF THE AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE  
CENTRE UNDERTAKEN IN 1997**

*Documents:*      *WHC-05/29.COM/15*  
                         *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.15*

*Draft Decisions:* **29 COM 15.1**  
                         **29 COM 15.2**

The **Chairperson** suggested structuring the discussion of the documents so that consideration was given first to the report on the execution of the Budget 2004-2005, then to follow up on the recommendations concerning the administrative and financial issues of the 1997 Audit and finally to the draft Decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew attention to the content of document *WHC-05/29.COM/15*, noting that the table showing extrabudgetary projects by other divisions or sectors of UNESCO was somewhat incomplete, as not all the requested information had been provided on time.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the World Heritage Centre for producing a clear and instructive document. Annex 1 showed that as at 31 March 2005 the World Heritage Centre had implemented extrabudgetary projects to the value of US \$22 million. That was significant and suggested that the Director-General of UNESCO should consider allocating more Funds in Trust Operating Cost Account (FITOCA) funds to the World Heritage Centre. It sought clarification of the “earmarked” activities of US \$1.2 million outlined in the Financial Statement in Annex 2 and asked for estimates as to the rate of implementation of the budget at the end of the biennium, noting that total expenditure as at 31 March 2005 was around US \$4 million. It had sought confirmation that UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) would be instructing the Bureau of the Budget not to permit projects to begin until all the necessary monies had been received. It was therefore important that States Parties be urged to pay their contributions early in the year; otherwise they would be hindering the work of the World Heritage Centre. It further noted the forthcoming transfer of some members of staff from the Division of Cultural Heritage to the World Heritage Centre and sought clarification as to the amount of extrabudgetary projects that would be transferred with them and whether those projects fell within the remit of the *Convention*.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the US \$22 million of extrabudgetary projects highlighted in the table did generate FITOCA funds for the World Heritage Centre. While overheads were usually charged at 13%, a rate of 5% was applied to UNF projects. The majority of the projects captured in the report were UNF funded. He further explained that FITOCA funds were usually allocated at the end of a project. While the Centre did benefit from some FITOCA funded posts, it would welcome an increase in the allocation in order to give it a small margin of flexibility. He estimated that the budget would be 93% implemented by the end of the biennium and confirmed that IOS would henceforth insist that expenditure could not be made until anticipated funds had been received. As the majority of States Parties did not pay early in the year, that would be problematic. Turning to the proposed transfer of staff from the Tangible Heritage Section of the Division of Cultural Heritage, he explained that that reform allowed all World Heritage related activities to be dealt with in one place and that an assessment of the status of projects to be finalized, transferred to the Centre or decentralized was under way; and that the extrabudgetary amounts coming should represent around US \$6 million per year.

En réponse à la question de la Délégation des **Pays-Bas** concernant 1,2 million de dollars EU de recettes affectées, le Secrétariat explique qu’il s’agit de crédits alloués au Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour une affectation précise.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for producing such a high-quality and comprehensible document. It sought clarification of the low rate of implementation of the Special Account mentioned on page 9 of the document and of the varying rates of implementation of International Assistance (IA) by region, noting on page 7 a very low rate of implementation for the Asian region (2%).

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Special Account in question was the account set up to receive the funds arising from the UNESCO dues of the United States of America on its return to the Organization in the final quarter of 2003. Unlike other elements of the budget, it had a four-year lifespan and that was reflected in the implementation rate. In reply to the Delegation of Japan, he explained that the 2% implementation rate was related to extrabudgetary funds which had no limited time span and for which payments had been received very recently.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, referring to page 7, noted significant variations in the amounts budgeted for Africa in relation to other regions.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that that reflected the requests for International Assistance that had been received.

Commenting on variations in how the different funds were spent, the Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** referred back to the Committee's discussion of Performance Indicators for World Heritage Programmes (item 12) and sought clarification as to why the World Heritage Centre was seeking extrabudgetary funds for the purpose in question; it was surely a core activity and therefore eligible for funding under the regular programme or from a special account.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that, while extrabudgetary funds were usually allocated to specific projects, the only extrabudgetary funds non-earmarked were the royalties the World Heritage Centre received from a number of media partnerships which were used for promotional activities. The work on results-based management (RBM) could not be included in the regular programme budget because of constraints imposed by the C5 document.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to turn to the follow-up to the recommendations concerning the administrative and financial issues of the Audit of the World Heritage Centre undertaken in 1997.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** briefly presented document *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.15*, explaining the three "slow progress" statements of the report and stating that the audit was a useful management tool.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed satisfaction with the report and with the fact that most of the recommendations made eight years previously had already been dealt with. Concerning the IOS audit, it highlighted two points that it considered particularly interesting. They were recommendations 16 and 20 dealing with potential conflicts of interest on the part of the Advisory Bodies in dealing with IA and the need to justify in writing decisions taken against the advice of the Advisory Bodies. It urged caution on the part of the Committee when it came to consider the proposed budget for 2006-2007, as the table on page 5 of document *WHC-05/29.COM/INF.15*

showed a linear decrease in the reserves since 1999. While the Committee might consider that the protection of heritage outweighed other considerations, it would be imprudent to adopt a budget where expenditure was not covered by income.

**ICCROM** observed that it took the issue of conflict of interests very seriously and had adopted a policy of challenging any requests involving a possible conflict when commenting on international assistance requests.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft Decisions.

He declared Decision **29 COM 15.1** provisionally adopted.

Referring to paragraph 2 of draft Decision **29 COM 15.2**, the Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the Director-General of UNESCO might invite other organs, in addition to States Parties, to make voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund. There was a strong link there to the World Heritage PACT initiative

Replying to an inquiry from the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** as to whether there were technical reasons for separating States Parties from partners, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that as the Head of an international intergovernmental organization it was the Director-General's prerogative to invite States Parties to do so. He had no such prerogative in relation to others.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested the inclusion of a paragraph urging States Parties to pay their dues promptly at the beginning of each year.

The **Rapporteur** suggested a formulation to accommodate the concerns of the Delegation of Egypt and the **Chairperson** some reordering of the paragraphs of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 15.2** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 16 PRESENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET 2006-2007**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/16  
WHC-05/29.COM/16 Corr.

*Draft Decision:* **29 COM 16**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the document comprised three main tables and a series of appendices presenting the proposed budget for the World Heritage Fund for the biennium 2006-2007. The structure of the budget included three Main Lines of Action (MLAs) in order to be consistent with the C/5 document, while retaining the 4Cs. Noting that the Committee had adopted a number of decisions which carried financial implications, he sought the Committee's advice on how to incorporate those elements and suggested that a paragraph be added in the

draft Decision, requesting the Centre to integrate all the budgetary elements contained in other draft Decisions in the 2006-2007 budget. He also informed the Committee that, while the tables had been prepared as requested by Decision **28 COM.11**, the central financial services of UNESCO had identified some inconsistencies in the tables, especially in table 1. The Centre would make proposals in the future to improve that table.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested amending paragraph 3 of the draft Decision by removing the word “charge” and inserting an appropriate alternative word or phrase such as “allow”. It commented on the gross disparities between the assessed contributions to the World Heritage Fund of certain States Parties. Returning to that point later in the discussion, it asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre tactfully to encourage States Parties having the relevant capacity to make voluntary contributions to the Fund.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that mandatory contributions were set at 1% of the States Parties’ assessed contribution to UNESCO, the dues to UNESCO being calculated on the basis of the United Nations system.

The **Chairperson** commented that the current meeting was not a forum to debate the justice or otherwise of that system.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** urged caution with respect to the depleting reserves of the World Heritage Fund. It would be imprudent to spend in excess of anticipated income, as both the text and tables indicated to be the case. While it was not proposing to reduce the budget, it suggested including in the draft Decision a reference to the continuing depletion of the reserves. While understanding the World Heritage Centre’s position, it nonetheless asked the Centre to retain the format of table 1 in Annex 1 for the future, as it provided a user-friendly overview of the funds managed by the Centre, which had not been the case three years earlier. But the World Heritage Centre could add any table that it would find useful. Referring to the proposed decentralization of US \$1,269,200 under the Regular Programme, it further proposed introducing a new paragraph into the Draft Decision requesting the Director-General of UNESCO and the Director of the World Heritage Centre to ensure that any funds that were decentralized to field offices should be spent, so far as possible, in line with Main Lines of Action (MLAs) 2 and 3. It sought clarification as to whether the proposed funds for the Advisory Bodies were all captured under MLA 1 and why almost the same amount of money was proposed for both ICOMOS and IUCN, given the different number of sites that each body was required to monitor and evaluate. At first it appeared that IUCN’s services were three times more expensive than those of ICOMOS. It fully appreciated that the Committee was requesting more and more work from the Advisory Bodies but noted that, as the resources of the World Heritage Fund were limited and decreasing, it was somewhat concerned that such a large increase over the previous biennium was proposed. Finally, it questioned providing for the overheads of the Advisory Bodies for the services provided, knowing that the Internal Oversight Service was not in favour of paying overheads to contractual partners. It seemed strange that the Advisory Bodies’ staff should be paid out of the World Heritage Fund.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that, because almost all Member States had now acceded to the *Convention*, and that compulsory contributions to the Fund were capped at 1%, it was unrealistic to expect the Fund to be augmented from those sources. The Fund faced pressures from rising costs and a weak dollar, so the trend in the budget was to focus on *Convention* services. He confirmed that the budget did try to capture all Advisory Bodies in MLA 1 although there were some WHF- funded activities under other MLAs, such as AFRICA 2009, in which they were involved. Finally, he noted that the staff support costs identified in the Advisory Bodies' budgets were not overheads as such and suggested finding a different term to make that clear. He clarified that expenditure did not in fact exceed income. Because the Centre could not predict exactly how much it would receive from States Parties, it provided an estimate based on actual income received in the previous biennium.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated that the World Heritage Fund should be used for services, not to pay for staff for the Advisory Bodies, and that there was an undeniable gap between the expenditure and the income foreseen.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Advisory Bodies played a critical role in the implementation of the *Convention* and it was important that the Committee should provide adequate funding to enable them to continue to fulfil their functions and provide high-quality advice. Given the limits of the Fund, the Committee should reflect on and set priorities for what it expected of the Advisory Bodies. It noted that, while Annex 3 provided details about what the Advisory Bodies expected to achieve over the biennium, it had not provided a corresponding report on how the money already received had been spent. It would be helpful to have such a report in the future.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested clarification as to why the World Heritage Centre wished to see flexibility within the proposed budget and in particular whether there was a precedent. It shared the concerns expressed in relation to the Advisory Bodies and the depletion of the reserves, commenting that, from the perspective of a national government, the figure of 20% of the budget coming from the reserves (as was the case in the proposed budget of the WHF) was too large.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the comments raised thus far and in particular supported the comments of the Delegation of the United Kingdom in relation to the Advisory Bodies. The Committee continued to ask more and more of them and it needed tools to enable it to set priorities among the services they were asked to provide.

The Delegation of **South Africa** concurred with the Delegation of Colombia, noting that, as the Committee in plenary regularly requested the Centre and Advisory Bodies to provide assistance to States Parties, it might be useful for the future to annex a table to the proposed budget indicating the number of missions requested by the Committee. It sought clarification on the discrepancies in staffing between the forthcoming and the current biennium.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that that was a result of a move towards fewer consultants and supernumerary posts and more temporary posts

and appointments of limited duration – which provided more stability for staff but was necessarily more expensive. Replying to the remark of the Delegation of South Africa, he explained that a table of the missions required by the Committee was drawn up after each session, but that it was difficult to infer some costs from that. Replying to the question raised by the Delegation of Japan, he explained that it was a matter of practicality given that the Committee in plenary had adopted a number of decisions with financial implications that had not been reflected in the budget currently under discussion. Replying to a subsequent question from the Delegation of the Netherlands, he confirmed that the overall amount would not change but that there might be a need to reallocate items.

**IUCN** assured the Committee that, as for previous years, it was committed to providing the highest level of technical advice and to deliver the maximum value for every dollar it received, including making extensive use of its volunteer network. The proposed budget fell short of what was really needed. During its current session, the Committee had requested numerous missions involving IUCN. If the Committee wished to reduce the proposed allocation further, then it would need to define priorities and tell IUCN what not to do.

**ICOMOS** explained that its budget had been submitted on the basis of both experience and trends but that the proposal under discussion fell significantly short of what had been requested. It currently undertook a range of activities for which it was not paid, covering State of Conservation and International Assistance. Its evaluators were paid for a maximum of three days – beyond which they had to cover their own costs. While everyone involved was passionate about conservation, ICOMOS noted that even missionaries had to eat and that it could not go on along those lines if the requested funds were not found.

**ICCROM** concurred with IUCN and ICOMOS. It further commented that, as the Committee moved the implementation of the *Convention* to a more strategic level, with the application of valuable tools such as periodic reporting, that incurred ever greater costs to cover attendance at regional and subregional meetings.

The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre for a short explanation on the carryover mechanism, since it was something new.

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** confirme que ce mécanisme n'existe pas. Comme l'assistance internationale peut être approuvée à n'importe quel moment de l'année, les requêtes approuvées en fin d'exercice biennal risquent de ne pas être mises en œuvre pendant l'exercice biennal en question, mais dans le suivant, ce qui pénalise le budget. Le mécanisme proposé ne concerne que l'assistance internationale ; il serait possible de demander dans le projet de décision non pas d'examiner, mais de mettre en place ce mécanisme.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commented that if that were permissible within the financial regulations, the proposal should be encouraged as a means of easing pressure on scarce resources.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed reservations about the proposal, recording that such a mechanism had been proposed at the Executive Board in April and had been

rejected by Japan, among others. Commenting that it did not want to encourage the Centre not to implement activities in the relevant biennium, it therefore proposed deleting paragraph 3 from the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** sought clarification as to whether the proposal related exclusively to the World Heritage Fund or whether the other types of resources were concerned; whether there was a requirement to return any unspent balance to States Parties at the end of the biennium as was the case under the Regular Programme; and whether such a mechanism was really necessary, since the World Heritage Fund was already based on a carryover system through its reserves. If so, it suggested amending paragraph 3 to specify that the proposal related only to the World Heritage Fund.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that there was a clear differentiation between the rules applying to carryover in relation to the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund. There was no requirement to return any unspent balance of the World Heritage Fund to States Parties and it was therefore already carried over. The proposal related to an administrative problem whereby contracts that had not been fully implemented by the end of the biennium were automatically cancelled and had to be re-established in the next.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) demande si l'article 4.3 du Règlement financier du Fonds du patrimoine mondial s'applique ici. Elle souhaite savoir s'il s'agit d'une ligne budgétaire en tant que telle, ou de crédits non utilisés dans le Fonds du patrimoine mondial.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** answered that Article 4.3 applied there and proved that the World Heritage Fund was based on a carryover.

The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **South Africa** suggested modifying the draft Decision to clarify matters and to adopt that carryover mechanism.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the discussion and the amendments proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands which were incorporated into the Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered the compromise position on the carryover mechanism to be acceptable.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested an amendment recognizing the volume of work demanded of the Advisory Bodies and requesting an annual report on their activities that might assist the Committee in prioritizing its demands.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed but preferred to ask for a report for the 30th session of the Committee, in order not to overload the World Heritage Centre.

**ICCROM** explained that the Advisory Bodies already provided such reports to the Centre and recalled that in previous sessions in the late nineties they had been presented to the Committee as an information document.



The Delegation of **Egypt** welcomed the proposal regarding a report on the activities of the Advisory Bodies but suggested drafting changes in order to avoid a situation whereby the Committee was obliged to set priorities.

The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and of the **United Kingdom** said they wished to retain the possibility of prioritization, but amended the paragraph introduced by the United Kingdom by including the notion of “possibility” of prioritization, on which the Delegation of **Egypt** agreed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 16** provisionally adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that it had found the discussions of the subsidiary body extremely helpful but requested that, in order to enable greater participation, future sessions should not be scheduled in parallel with the plenary.

## **ITEM 17      REPORT ON THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/17*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 17*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that by Decision **7 EXT.COM 14**, the Committee had requested that steps be taken and measures applied by WIPO as a matter of urgency to ensure the protection of the World Heritage Emblem with or without text and request that the protection offered through the *Paris Convention* be extended to the words “World Heritage” when situated around the emblem in any language. Such steps had been taken and WIPO had confirmed by letters dated 20 May 2005 that the World Heritage Emblem was now protected in those terms.

Working Document *WHC-05/29.COM/17* also presented a table reporting on requests to use the World Heritage Emblem received between August 2004 and April 2005 and granted by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in conformity with paragraph 278 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. He noted that other requests made directly to the World Heritage Centre were redirected, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, to the States Parties concerned. As a result relatively few requests were reported in the table.

The **Chairperson** commented that the World Heritage Centre appeared to have done what the Committee had asked it to do in relation to the protection of the World Heritage Emblem. He declared Decision **29 COM 17** provisionally adopted.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m

## SEVENTH DAY

### TWELFTH MEETING

Saturday 16 July 2005

09.50 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: The Committee, at its twelfth meeting, resumed and concluded the examination of the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed in the World Heritage List. It then confirmed, with minor changes, the draft decisions proposed by its Working Group on Working Methods.

Note du Rapporteur : Le Comité, à sa 12e réunion, a poursuivi l'examen des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Il a ensuite confirmé, avec des modifications mineures, les projets de décisions proposés par son groupe de travail sur les méthodes de travail.

#### ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (CONTINUED)

*Documents: WHC-05/29.COM/7.B.Rev  
WHC-05/29.COM/7.B.Add*

*Draft Decisions: 29 COM 7B.a, 29 COM 7B.b, 29 COM 7B.c  
and from 29 COM 7B.1 to 29 COM 7B.103*

The **Chairperson** reminded the World Heritage Centre that it should only present information received since the preparation of the corresponding working document. He then invited the Committee to resume its work with the examination of the report on the state of conservation of the Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal), as decided on the previous day.

#### **Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the working Document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

The **Rapporteur** had received a written amendment from the Delegation of Lebanon that would insert a new paragraph after paragraph 6, reading as follows: ‘Considère que, en fonction des résultats de cette mission, le Comité pourrait décider d’inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril’

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.38** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Matobo Hills (Zimbabwe) (C 306rev)**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.40** provisionally adopted.

## **ARAB STATES**

### **Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente le document de travail tout en mentionnant qu’aucune nouvelle information n’a été reçue depuis sa rédaction.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.41 Rev** provisionally adopted.

### **Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)**

La Délégation de **Colombie** se dit préoccupée par l’état de conservation du site, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien semble menacée. Elle souligne également le fait que l’Etat partie a déjà été invité à prendre des mesures appropriées lors des sessions précédentes du Comité, mais bien peu a été fait.

La Délégation du **Chili** demande à ce que la parole soit donnée à l’Etat partie, tout en rappelant la longue expérience de l’Egypte dans le domaine de la conservation.

The Delegation of **Egypt** acknowledged the report produced after an ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission undertaken in March 2005. It thanked the World Heritage Centre for the organization of an International Symposium on the Conservation and Restoration of Islamic Cairo in 2002 which had had positive results and received considerable media attention. The rehabilitation projects, some of which were referred to in the ICOMOS mission report, were ongoing. Greater Cairo was a city with 10 million inhabitants, of which ‘Historic Cairo’ was only a small part where all kinds of activities took place, and it was an important commercial centre. Many problems had been identified, but work was continuing, slowly but surely. Therefore, in acknowledgement of the efforts made and the various projects underway, it would

have been preferable to refer in the working document to ‘the slowness of implementation’ of relevant recommendations rather than ‘the absence of implementation’. It did not agree that the problems had a serious impact on the overall outstanding universal value of the property, as implied by the last part of paragraph 5 of the draft Decision, which, it suggested, should be deleted. So indeed should the first part of the paragraph, urging “the State Party to take immediate necessary steps to elaborate the Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City”, as that had already been done.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** concurred with the state of conservation report as presented in the working document and expressed its agreement with the draft Decision. It supported the Delegation of Colombia’s statement that the property was in danger, and it should possibly be considered for future inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the debate and concluded that the draft Decision should remain unchanged.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.42** provisionally adopted.

#### **Ksar of Aït-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente le document de travail tout en mentionnant qu’aucune nouvelle information n’a été reçue depuis sa rédaction. Il attire l’attention sur le fait que le projet de décision comprend deux options mais, l’Etat partie n’étant pas présent, il semble difficile de prendre une décision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** was of the opinion that a precedent should not be set. The Committee's decision-making process cannot be paralysed because the State Party is not present. It proposed including a provision in the draft Decision to the effect that a mission should be dispatched to the property, as it had been endangered since its inscription on the World Heritage List. The mission should not only assess the property’s state of conservation, but also whether it was still of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thought that it had understood that a mission had in fact been carried out at the site, and that it had clearly shown that the outstanding universal value of the property is in fact in danger. It asked the World Heritage Centre for confirmation.

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** répond à la Délégation de Colombie qu’il n’y a pas eu de mission spécifiquement envoyée sur place, qu’il s’agit seulement de la visite de membres du Bureau de Rabat.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that its understanding was that no expert mission had taken place and it endorsed the proposal of sending an ICOMOS/UNESCO mission to assess the outstanding universal value of the property. It suggested that the report of the mission, to be presented to the Committee at its 30th

session, should advise on the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, or the delisting of the property.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the debate and suggested that a paragraph should be added to the draft Decision requesting the State Party to invite a WHC/ICOMOS mission to evaluate the outstanding universal value of the property. A further paragraph should be added stating that the Committee ‘will consider at its 30th session the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger or the delisting of the property’.

**ICOMOS** stressed that a mission should be undertaken to evaluate the state of conservation, not its outstanding universal value.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.43** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** rappelle que le bien a été retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril l’année dernière. Bien que le Comité, lors de sa 28e session (Suzhou, 2004), ait demandé à l’Etat partie de revoir le plan de gestion conformément aux recommandations du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l’ICOMOS, le Centre a reçu (après la rédaction finale du document de travail) un plan de gestion pratiquement identique au précédent. C’est pourquoi le Centre a soumis un projet de décision révisée.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it supported the revised draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.46 Rev** provisionally adopted.

### **Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** précise que ce point n’était pas prévu pour examen par le Comité. Cependant, peu avant la session, l’Etat partie a demandé à ce qu’une mission soit envoyée sur place pour examiner un nouveau projet d’aménagement en bordure du site. Un fax du Ministère de la Culture a été reçu deux jours auparavant par le Centre du patrimoine mondial dans lequel les autorités marocaines s’engagent à tenir compte des recommandations de cette mission.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that it was the second property to be discussed where major visitor facilities were foreseen, but where a holistic view of the management of the site seemed to be lacking.

The **Rapporteur** drew attention to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision in which ‘a management programme for the new installations in accordance with the management plan for the entire property’ had been requested of the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested amending the draft Decision to include a request for the preparation of a management plan.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.100** provisionally adopted.

### **Tyre, Lebanon (C299)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** précise que ce point n'apparaît pas dans le document de travail, mais que le projet de décision **29 COM 7B.102** a été distribué en séance plénière.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.102** provisionally adopted.

### **Medina of Essaouira (former Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 rev)**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** informe le Comité qu'aucune information nouvelle n'a été reçue depuis la rédaction du document de travail.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that once more a problem with a high-rise building demanded the attention of the Committee. It was of the opinion that the draft Decision might not be clear enough, as the property seemed to be heading towards inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it was the third property in Morocco to be facing serious problems. It proposed that a mission should be dispatched to the site.

The **Rapporteur** suggested adding to the draft Decision a recommendation that a joint WHC / ICOMOS mission should be undertaken to the property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.47** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **ASIA AND PACIFIC**

### **Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that it had approved a request for international assistance amounting to US\$ 45,000, as described in the working document, on the previous day in the parallel session.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.48** provisionally adopted.

## **Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing and Shengyang (China) (C439bis)**

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the working document and said that no new information had been received since its preparation.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it was not in favour of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft Decision, which concerned restoration projects initiated at the property, and requested the State Party to provide information to the Committee about them. It recalled paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which stipulated that the Committee should be informed of the States Parties “intention to undertake or to authorize [...] major restorations or new constructions which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property”, emphasizing the word “major”. In the case in point, ordinary maintenance work had taken place. Accordingly, paragraphs 4 and 5 should be deleted and replaced by an alternative text that it would pass on to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Japan** endorsed the comments made by the Delegation of Norway and said that there was a proper scientific approach for that kind of conservation and maintenance work. It suggested deleting the last sentence of paragraph 4 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **China** informed the Committee that some days earlier supplementary information on the extended buffer zone of the Imperial Palace in Beijing together with information on legislation procedures at both municipal and national levels had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre. In regard to the ongoing restoration work taking place within the Imperial Palace, the work had been regarded as routine repair without structural intervention, which was being carried out all year around in agreement with the ‘Outline of the Conservation Master Plan’ of the Palace. The situation of the Summer Palace and Temple of Heaven had been similar to the case of the Imperial Palaces. It said that in China a clear distinction was made between repair/conservation of wooden buildings and restoration, and that as the term ‘major restoration works’ was thus inappropriate in paragraph four of the draft Decision, it should be amended or deleted. The Delegation welcomed a reactive monitoring mission and said that China would be happy to submit detailed information concerning the maintenance work as requested.

The **Rapporteur** proposed deleting the sentence under discussion from paragraph 4. He read out revised paragraph 5 as proposed by Norway, requesting the State Party to provide information on the construction of a one-storey building in the courtyard of the Imperial Palace.

The Delegation of **China** explained that the first floor of the exhibition building had been in existence since the 1950s. The third and fourth floors of that building, which had been added later, would be torn down, after which only the first floor would remain. The decision to that effect had not yet been approved by the relevant authorities.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.49 Rev** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707ter)**

The Delegation of **China** thanked the international community and the experts who had undertaken a mission for their efforts to protect and conserve the property. It endorsed the draft Decision, and explained that some of the recommendations had already been implemented, such as the evaluation and redefinition of the buffer zones. A city development master plan, conservation plan and public promotion plan of heritage conservation were being revised. A Steering Committee for institutional coordination would soon be set up, and the revised 'Guidelines for the Conservation and Rehabilitation of Traditional Buildings' implemented.

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the working document and referred to the pertinent information contained therein.

La Délégation du **Liban** informe le Comité qu'elle a maintenant pris note du document amendé.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.50 Rev** provisionally adopted.

### **Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)**

The Delegation of **India** informed the Committee that a task force had been set up consisting of the Chief Secretary of Gujarat, the Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India, the Heritage Trust, a local NGO actively associated with the property and other concerned departments, to coordinate and oversee the preparation of a management plan. The Gujarat State Government had also proposed special legislation for the management of the property which was due to be finalized before the Committee's 30th session. It suggested that the words 'continuing lack' might be deleted from paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, or indeed the paragraph as a whole could be deleted as action had been undertaken to put in place legislation for the management of the property.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that, if the amendment proposed by India met no objection by the Committee, paragraph 4 could be deleted from the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.51** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodhgaya (India) (C 1056 rev)**



The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested clarification, considering that, on the one hand, the working document stated that ICOMOS recommended suspending work on the management plan of the site prepared by HUDCO, whilst on the other hand the draft Decision, in its paragraph 4(b), provided for the adoption of the provisions of such management plan.

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a joint ICOMOS/UNESCO mission had taken place. A management plan had been presented to it containing useful proposals, but it had not yet become operational. It therefore suggested that the Committee explicitly request the State Party to officially endorse and implement the plan and to address its weaknesses.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said it understood that ICOMOS had proposed the suspension of the management plan. In its view, that idea could be removed or modified in the working document, as at present it seemed to be inconsistent. It said that it had sought clarification as to whether or not a mistake had been made.

**ICOMOS** explained that the working document expressed its views correctly, namely that management mechanisms should be created at the property, and implemented by a site manager.

The **Chairperson** said that the Delegation of Lebanon was correct to state that the text was somewhat ambiguous.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it understood from the draft Decision that a management plan existed, without the means being in place to implement it. It suggested that the State Party should be requested to adopt the current management plan, to improve it, and to appoint a site manager. It believed that ICOMOS had recommended that the management plan should be implemented.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that the draft Decision had been drafted in cooperation with ICOMOS, after consultations during its mission. It agreed that the site management plan should be put in place, after which the shortcomings could be corrected.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed changing the order of paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, so that subparagraph (b) became subparagraph (a), subparagraph (c) became subparagraph (b), and subparagraph (a) became subparagraph (c).

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.52** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C592)**

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed that a mission should be sent to ascertain the state of conservation of the property and the draft Decision amended accordingly.

**ICOMOS** said that information had been received recently from the State Party focusing on stone conservation, and it expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.53** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C115)**

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the property had been already discussed.

### **Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)**

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime sa déception quant à l'état de conservation du bien, indiquant qu'il n'y a pas de mot pour décrire combien le bien s'est détérioré, et qu'il est en effet défiguré à un point tel que le Comité ne sait pas ce qui peut être entrepris pour remédier à la situation. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS et au Centre du patrimoine mondial de prendre toutes les mesures possibles pour contribuer à améliorer cette situation.

Supporting the points raised by the Delegation of Lebanon, the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed great concern at the state of conservation of the property and its state of management, especially since the property had benefited from a considerable amount of money and architects' assistance. In the master plan presented in the nomination file, it had been clearly stated that there would be no construction on the sacred area, and yet this temple was constructed. Moreover the report of, or the recent mission states that even the sacred environment and the religious symbols have been lost! This clearly means that there is a loss of Outstanding Universal Value because of the built structure. Therefore, unless alterations were made to the Temple, the Property should be delisted.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** said that it fully supported the statement made by Saint Lucia, and added that the property had been problematic since its inscription. It had similar problems to the Katmandu property and the Committee could not delay action while the property's problems got worse.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that even though it had not followed the previous information on the property, by reading the working document it was possible to get some feel for the situation that was having a severe impact on the property's authenticity and integrity. It proposed that the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** asked for the views of ICOMOS in that regard.

**ICOMOS** said that it was a regrettable situation, but that the property still had outstanding universal value. The state of deterioration of the property was still reversible, to a certain degree, and the Committee had to take that into consideration.

The Delegation of **India**, supported by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, said that the property was an important one but clearly in difficulty. Paragraph 3 of the draft Decision reflected the gravity of the situation. If the property continued in its current state of deterioration, it should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Bénin**, en parfait accord avec la Délégation de l'Inde, propose de modifier le paragraphe 6 du projet de décision, au sujet du rapport que l'Etat partie doit soumettre au Comité, afin que celui-ci puisse faire référence à la mission conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial/ ICOMOS entreprise en 2004.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.55** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka)(C451)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that it had no new information on the property, but that it wished to draw to the Committee's attention to the fact that the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications was the only World Cultural Heritage site affected by the 2004 tsunami.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.56** provisionally adopted.

### **Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that it had no new information on the property, but that a mission was required to ascertain its state of conservation.

La Délégation du **Liban**, soutenant la Délégation de **Lituanie**, indique qu'il y a de sérieux problèmes au sujet de ce bien, voire des menaces. Elle se propose de faire des propositions par écrit à ce sujet et de les soumettre au Rapporteur. Elle suggère qu'une mission de suivi réactif conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS soit entreprise pour vérifier l'état de conservation du bien ; si la situation ne semble pas s'améliorer, le bien devra alors être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril à la 30e session du Comité.

The **World Heritage Centre** expressed its support for the views of the Committee and the proposal to amend the draft Decision so as to raise the possibility of the site being included on the List of World Heritage in Danger if no improvements were made.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.57** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Complex of Huē Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)**

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended the State Party for protecting the property and for having complied with all the requests of the Committee. It was indeed a success story.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.58** provisionally adopted.

### **City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the recommendations of the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission were reflected in the draft Decision, and reported that the State Party had confirmed by letter of 5 July 2005 the appointment of an official urban coordinator responsible for the property.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by the Delegation of the **Netherlands**, asked what was meant by “in due course” in paragraph 5 of the draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Bénin** approuve la remarque faite par la délégation de Sainte-Lucie et souligne également l'importance de mettre en oeuvre les recommandations de la mission conjointe UNESCO/ICOMOS.

The **World Heritage Centre** told the Committee that the mission had found the situation serious and had wondered whether the State Party would be able to prepare a comprehensive urban master plan for the property and its buffer zone before the 30th session of the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** sought clarification from the Committee as to whether the recommendations of the mission should be implemented before the 30th session of the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** said that the joint reactive monitoring mission by UNESCO and ICOMOS had evaluated the construction of a modern exhibition hall, a modern vertical addition to a 1950s theatre and the demolition of a historic dwelling in the historic centre. Having underlined the positive effect of the mission in raising awareness of the *World Heritage Convention* in Austria, the State Party indicated that the immediate outcome of the mission had included the decision to halt the construction of a modern vertical addition to the theatre and the appointment of an officer responsible for World Heritage. The new exhibition hall was an excellent example of contemporary architecture in a historic centre, and had served as a case study during the conference “World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture” (12-14 May 2005, Vienna, Austria). Furthermore, the State Party assured the Committee that the recommendations of the mission would be carefully considered and the conservation status would be reported on a voluntary basis through the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise in 2005.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed that the timing of the implementation of the mission's recommendation should not be specified in paragraph 5 of the draft Decision. It further suggested that the deadline for the submission of a progress report by the State Party should be 1 February 2006 and not 2007.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.63** provisionally adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee of a request from the State Party concerned to change the order of the agenda in order to examine the state of conservation of the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) as its next item.

### **Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C786)**

**ICOMOS** expressed its concern that the projected high-rise building in the east of the Gardens might have a serious visual impact on the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** stressed that the high-rise project had not received planning permission and that the authorities were revising the volume and height of the building. It undertook to report on the situation so that the Committee could examine it at its 30th session.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it appreciated the statement made by the Observer Delegation of Austria. It suggested amending the draft Decision so that it urged the State Party to reconsider the height of the building project and to submit alternative solutions “with no direct impact” on the visual integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed including a new paragraph in the draft Decision in order to recall the importance of taking into account the recommendations of the “Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture-Managing the Historic Urban Landscape”.

The **Rapporteur** clarified that the draft Decision would be amended as proposed by the Delegations of the Netherlands and Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.73** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported to the Committee that by letter of 6 July 2005 the Georgian National Commission for UNESCO had provided a detailed response to the ICOMOS comments on the state of conservation report submitted on 13 February 2005, stating that (a) the State Party was working to establish special projects on the monitoring, documentation, conservation and restoration of several monuments and the project for Javari Monastery was being jointly developed with ICCROM, (b) the

World Heritage Division of the Georgian Ministry of Culture had launched a programme to define and legalise the boundaries of all World Heritage properties in the country, and (c) the UNESCO-UNDP Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta had been translated into Georgian and the Ministry of Culture was examining the document for approval.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that a proposed amendment had been submitted to the Rapporteur in writing, requesting the State Party to solve the problem of the illegal and inappropriate additions to the old Catholicos Palace that strongly affected Mtskheta's outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its satisfaction with the new information provided by the World Heritage Centre, as it had been concerned at the situation.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the problem of coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities concerned both the City Museum Reserve of Mtskheta and Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery. It proposed amending the draft Decision in order to recall the importance of cooperation between the State Party and stakeholders for the conservation of the site.

**ICCROM** confirmed its joint project on monitoring, documentation, conservation and restoration for the Jvari Monastery.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the name of the property, "City-Museum", was an appropriate description of it.

The **World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that the requested name change had been approved by the present session of the Committee (Decision **29 COM 8B.1**) and that the name of the property had become Historical Monuments of Mtskheta.

The **Rapporteur** presented an amendment to the draft Decision based on the proposals by the Delegations of Lithuania and the United Kingdom.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.64** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.65** provisionally adopted.

### **City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported on the new information provided by ICOMOS on 7 June 2005 stating that the Veneto Regional Administrative Court, by decision 2234 of 12 May 2005, had sustained all the appeals presented against the construction

of the A31 Valdastico Sud motorway. The decision of the Veneto Regional Administrative Court annulled all acts relating to the environmental impact report procedure and the project might be re-submitted for a state environmental impact assessment but the new evaluation would have to follow the ruling of the Veneto Administrative Judge on the appropriateness of the work and on a necessary reconsideration of the decision to build the motorway section in question in the context of a district plan which did not yet exist. It also informed the Committee of a letter dated 4 July 2005 from the State Party which stated that the general management plan for the property was under preparation and that the construction of the highways was on hold following the afore-mentioned decision of the Veneto Regional Administrative Court.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its concern as to the situation and proposed amending the draft Decision to request the State Party to submit a progress report by 1 February 2006 rather than 2007.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (observateur) réaffirme son engagement concernant la protection du bien. Elle confirme également que la construction d'une partie de l'autoroute a été suspendue et que la route a été modifiée afin de garantir l'intégrité visuelle du bien.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended as proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B. 66** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Curonian Spit (Lithuania and Russian Federation) (C 944)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported to the Committee that a state of conservation report had been received from the Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO by fax dated 6 July 2005 and two letters had been received from Lithuania, both dated 11 July 2005. According to the communications, the States Parties had held (1) a meeting of experts from 17 to 18 February 2005 in Kaliningrad to discuss the modalities of the post-project assessment, risk assessment and compilation of background documents, (2) a meeting of the Working Group established by the Joint Commission from 18 to 19 May 2005 which had developed a draft plan on cooperation in combating sea pollution, and (3) a third meeting of the Joint Lithuanian-Russian Commission on cooperation in the field of environmental protection had been held in Vilnius from 17 to 18 February 2005 which had discussed the plan of action for the post-project analysis of the D-6 project, among other issues. The World Heritage Centre placed particular emphasis on the fact that the way in which the States Parties had come to cooperate was a real World Heritage success story which had prevented the property from being automatically inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Recalling the meeting he had attended with the representatives of both States Parties, the **Chairperson** expressed his satisfaction with the positive effect the *World Heritage Convention* had had on the safeguarding of the transboundary property.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment proposed jointly by Lithuania and the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** stressed that the amendment was proposed jointly with the Russian Federation and requested further minor amendments, namely the removal of the word “strongly” from paragraph 4 and changing the words “State Party” to “States Parties”, since both countries should report to the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.67** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.68** provisionally adopted

### **Old Town of Avila and its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain)**

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked for the photographs of the construction on the square to be shown on the screen. Having referred to paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it emphasized that the State Party should have informed the Committee before undertaking the construction of the building in the square. The Delegation also expressed its concern that the delineation of the core zone was not apparent. It suggested amending the draft Decision in order to request the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a progress report on the legal status and implementation of the protection zones by 1 February 2006 and not 2007.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** considered that the site was under considerable threat and asked ICOMOS what was left to justify the outstanding universal value for which the property had been originally inscribed.

**ICOMOS** informed the Committee that the property was referred to in the ICOMOS publication “Heritage at Risk” and stated that the situation was serious.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** repeated its earlier question to ICOMOS.

The **World Heritage Centre** referred to the mission report of March 2005 which concluded that the redesign of the Plaza Santa Teresa, located between the town walls and the extra-muros Church of San Pedro did not affect the outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **India** said that if the redesign of the Plaza negatively impacted on the property it would certainly affect its outstanding universal value. It asked



ICOMOS for more information and suggested considering the possible removal of the property from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that all too often the Committee was informed about major developments after they had taken place. It considered that more information on visual impact studies would be desirable.

The **Chairperson** said that he was sure that ICOMOS would follow up on the suggestion concerning visual impact studies.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed amending the draft Decision to provide for consideration as to whether the redesign of the Plaza Santa Teresa had affected the outstanding universal value of the property.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether the new construction was a complex of apartments or a multi-story garage, because if it were the latter, exhaust fumes would be an additional conservation problem.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** assured the Committee that the revision of the management plan and the definition of a buffer zone were underway. It further remarked that the new building in the square had replaced buildings which had not been legally protected or had no historical value. The newly-constructed buildings had value as modern architecture and the square had also become pedestrian, thereby enhancing civic enjoyment of it.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the draft Decision that would (a) recall the importance of fully respecting paragraph 173 (c) of the *Operational Guidelines*, (b) request ICOMOS to submit to the Committee at its 30th session a detailed report on the visual impact of the building on the outstanding universal value of the property and (c) request the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report designating the buffer zone in the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.69** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)**

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft Decision appeared to duplicate each other.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended to take into account the point raised by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.70** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160)**

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party on its efforts to safeguard the property.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.71** provisionally adopted.

### **Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a mission had taken place in April 2005, within the framework of France-UNESCO cooperation, which had stressed the importance of closer cooperation between the City authorities and the State Inspectorate for Heritage Preservation.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** strongly expressed its concern as to the negative impact that high-rise construction would have on the visual integrity of the property, and suggested amending paragraph 5 so that it read "... ensure that new and recently constructed buildings will fully respect the visual integrity ..." and including a reference to the Vienna Memorandum on "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape".

While fully acknowledging that high-rise construction was a potential threat to many World Heritage sites, the Delegation of **Portugal** said that urban development sometimes brought social or economic benefit to the local community.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended to include the points raised by the Delegation of the Netherlands in paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.78** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Old Town of Vilnius (Lithuania) (C 541)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that a World Heritage Centre mission to Vilnius in May 2005 had met with the major stakeholders to discuss the protection of the urban landscape. It also informed the Committee that the material submitted by the local communities and NGOs warned against the probable negative visual impact of the proposed high-rise buildings and further development proposals in the buffer zone.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose d'inclure un nouveau paragraphe dans le projet de décision afin d'encourager l'Etat partie à améliorer la législation assurant une protection juridique appropriée du tissu urbain et de la structure historique du bien, y compris son intégrité visuelle.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.79** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)**

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of the additional information received on 6 July 2005 on the specific amendments to the Special Plan of the protection of the Old City of Salamanca and the interior reform of the university area and the artistic quarter. The World Heritage Centre remarked that there had been at least 27 amendments to the Special Plan, which included the *Huertos de las Adoratrices* plot, dated 5 October 2000 which seemed not to have been implemented.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS soumettent un rapport détaillé suite à cette lettre lors de la 30e session du Comité.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that it agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon. Citing the recommendation of the Bureau on the inscription of the site it expressed strong concern that the Special Plan had been amended as frequently as 27 times, 12 of them affecting the area within the inscribed site. The Delegation proposed to not merely encourage but rather request the State Party to improve and implement specific legislation so as to ensure appropriate legal protection of the historic urban fabric and structure on a national level. It further suggested adding a paragraph to the draft Decision requesting the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to submit an updated detailed report on the legal protection and management of the property for examination by the Committee at its 30th session.

The **Rapporteur** presented the draft Decision which reflected the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.86** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)**

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the World Heritage Centre had received a letter dated 27 May 2005 from the State Party stating that a meeting of the stakeholders and planning authorities had been planned for 8 June 2005 to explore the issues of tall buildings.

**ICOMOS** said that, as far as it understood, planning permission had been given for construction of a high-rise building within the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que le problème de la Tour de Londres est tout à fait comparable à celui des biens du patrimoine mondial du Centre historique de Vienne en Autriche et de la Cathédrale de Cologne en Allemagne, en ce sens qu'il porte sur l'impact visuel généré par des constructions élevées. Se référant à un

courrier daté du 18 octobre 1988 du département de l'Environnement adressé au Centre du patrimoine mondial, et à la décision adoptée par le Comité lors de l'inscription du bien, la Délégation propose d'amender le projet de décision afin de rappeler l'engagement de l'Etat partie, au moment de l'inscription du bien, à mettre en œuvre les réglementations visant à la protection de l'environnement de la Tour, et à appliquer les engagements restrictifs sur tout nouveau développement.

The Delegation of **India** sought comments from the State Party. It suggested amending the draft Decision to reflect the possible need of the World Heritage Committee to examine the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should the requested in-depth study not be completed.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Government took its commitment to safeguard the property very seriously. It undertook to consider the issues concerning tall buildings and to report to the Committee thereafter.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the draft Decision based on the proposals made by the Delegations of Lebanon and India.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.89** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Maya Site of Copán (Honduras) (C 129)**

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that the State Party had submitted two official letters on 11 July 2005 to confirm that the Government of Honduras will proceed with the cancellation of the national operations of the airstrip of *La Estanzuela* from 29th September 2005. The Government of Honduras also informed of its intention to establish regulations concerning flights' altitude over the main archaeological group of buildings in Copan.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that it was important to conduct an environmental impact study on the archaeological remains prior to the construction of the airport facility in Rio Amarillo.

The **Rapporteur** proposed amending paragraph 5 of the draft Decision to respond to the concerns raised by the Delegation of Colombia.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.90** provisionally adopted as amended.

### **Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.91** provisionally adopted.

### **Coro and its Port (Venezuela) (C 658)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.92** provisionally adopted.

He said that this concluded the Committee's discussion of Item 7B.

### **Draft Decision 29 COM 7C**

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to introduce a new draft Decision **29 COM 7C** on general state of conservation issues submitted by the Delegation of the Netherlands and supported by the Delegations of Benin, Lebanon, Lithuania, Saint Lucia, South Africa and the United Kingdom.

The **Rapporteur** presented the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** explained that the main purpose for submitting the draft Decision was to open up discussion on how the Committee should examine the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and, more particularly, whether the Committee wished to defer the decision to inscribe new sites on the World Heritage List of a State Party that did not submit full reports requested by the Committee for two consecutive ordinary sessions of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked whether it had understood correctly that paragraph 10 of the draft Decision generally did not concern properties that were already on the List of World Heritage in Danger but properties that would be inscribed henceforth. It also considered that paragraph 9, regarding deferral of inscription, might contradict the provisions of the *World Heritage Convention* and should therefore be deleted.

The Delegation of **India** supported the general spirit of the draft Decision but was concerned that some countries would be unable to comply with the decisions of the Committee for internal reasons. It therefore proposed amending paragraph 9 to specify that the decision to inscribe new sites on the World Heritage List of a State Party that did not submit full reports as requested by the Committee "could" be deferred.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the working group established by the Committee at its 7th extraordinary session was considering the issues rose in paragraph 9, and that those issues would also be discussed by the Committee at its 30th session in 2006. It supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India. It also said that at future sessions the Committee should have adequate time to discuss the state of conservation of properties and the Committee should consider not inscribing sites on the World Heritage List if no management plan existed.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the intention of paragraph 9 was to defer the decision to inscribe new sites on the World Heritage List and that it did, therefore, fall within the mandate of the Committee. Those States Parties that could not respond to the request to submit state of conservation reports over a two-year period were unlikely to have the ability to prepare nomination dossiers.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose d'amender le paragraphe 9 en ajoutant "à moins qu'il n'existe des raisons valables"

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Lebanon to submit its proposal in writing.

The Delegation of **Colombia** disagreed with the last part of the statement by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, as certain parts of a country might be governed by public order which made intervention by the central government difficult.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the concerns expressed by the Delegations of India and Colombia and proposed amending paragraph 9 of the draft Decision to take into account exceptional circumstances that might prevent States Parties from submitting state of conservation reports as requested.

The Delegation of **Norway** endorsed the general spirit of the draft Decision and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether its proposal was acceptable to the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **India** said that the issue raised in paragraph 9 had been considered by the working group established at the 7th extraordinary session of the Committee and it could not accept the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands, as more substantive discussion by the Committee would be necessary at its 30th session.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, seconded by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, called for a vote on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **India** said that a vote should be unnecessary, as the Committee usually worked on the principle of consensus. Furthermore, the Delegation of the Netherlands had called for a vote on the amendment without consulting the Delegation of India. Invoking Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure, it moved adjournment of the debate.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reminded the Committee that it had called for a vote on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

The **Chairperson** said that there was not enough time to discuss the matter and recalled the reference made by the Delegation of Japan to the possibility of returning to the issue at the 30th session of the Committee, which seemed to him to be the best way to proceed.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that voting was a legitimate way to take a decision on a draft Decision on which many delegations had worked for a long time.

The Delegation of **Portugal**, supported by the Delegation of **Japan**, said that there was no consensus on the issue and that it therefore proposed amending paragraph 9 so that it stipulated that the Committee would consider the issue at its 30th session.

The Delegation of **Chile** reminded the members that the Committee had always worked in a spirit of consensus.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that when a member of the Committee called for a vote, a ruling should be made on that call. However, it would agree to the deletion of paragraph 9 from the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** said that the draft Decision would be amended to delete paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Colombia** reminded the Committee that the proposal by the Delegation of Portugal was to decide to discuss further at its 30th session in 2006 the possibility of deferring the decision to inscribe new sites on the World Heritage List of a State Party that did not submit full reports that had been requested by the Committee for two consecutive ordinary sessions.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that it maintained its proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Egypt** sought clarification as to whether the Committee could take a decision which would prevent States Parties from nominating sites for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee would discuss all the issues concerned at its 30th session. He declared Decision **29 COM 7C** provisionally adopted as amended by the proposal of the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that, at its 30th session, the Committee should examine the state of conservation of the following World Heritage properties inscribed in the World Monuments Watch List of 100 Most Endangered Sites: Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania), Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico), Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain), and Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan).

## **ITEM 18 WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Document:* **WHC-05/29.COM/18**

*Draft Decisions:* **29 COM 18A, 18B and 18C**

*submitted by the Working Group on Working Methods*

The **Chairperson** invited the Chairperson of the Working Group on Working Methods to introduce the item.

Ambassador Marčiulionytė, from the Delegation of **Lithuania**, proposed to move forward with the draft Decisions before the Committee which were based on consensus in the Working Group.

The **Rapporteur** presented the three draft Decisions submitted by the Working Group. Draft Decision **29 COM 18A** concerned ways and means of interpreting the Cairns-Suzhou decision, including transboundary properties. He pointed out that with regard to under-represented and non-represented categories the Working Group had proposed that the Advisory Bodies provide an update of their studies as well as additional information to the 30th session of the Committee. He informed the Committee that draft Decision **29 COM 18B** concerned the sensitive issue of the perception of conflicts of interest, which was to be discussed at the 30th session in 2007. Finally, draft Decision **29 COM 18C** was based on Document *WHC-05/29.COM/18*, and specifically on the management of time and workload at Committee sessions.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to paragraph 6 of draft Decision **29 COM 18C**, stated that it was not satisfied that the Subsidiary Body on administrative and financial issues was not required to report back to the plenary Committee session. Further, the plenary and the subsidiary body could not meet at the same time and that needed to be reflected in the decision.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that the working group needed to report to the plenary as the plenary had to review and discuss those items; failure to report to the plenary would be contrary to UNESCO policy. It proposed to add "...which would report back to the plenary" to the draft Decision. Parallel sessions raised difficulties for some delegations as not all members would have the in-depth knowledge about certain issues.

The Delegation of **Egypt** wondered why there was a paragraph on subsidiary bodies as they did not make decisions, and noted that decisions were taken by the Committee. It suggested that there was no need for paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** underlined that subsidiary bodies prepared draft decisions which would have to come back to the plenary.

The **Rapporteur**, summarizing the debate, noted that the only changes proposed had been to draft Decision **29 COM 18C**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 18A** and **29 COM 18B** provisionally adopted, and further declared Decision **29 COM 18C** provisionally adopted as amended



The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that, in view of the 87th birthday of Nelson Mandela on 18 July 2005, a paper would be distributed to the delegates for birthday wishes to be transmitted to him. A candle would be lit at Robben Island World Heritage site.

The **Chairperson** said that the Committee had completed most of its agenda, with the exception of a few items which remained to be considered on Sunday 17 July before the adoption of the report.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, speaking on a point of order, stated that delegates must be heard in full. He had been told at the Subsidiary Body meeting that the Decisions would not be approved by the Committee except at the final session when the report was adopted.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** congratulated Lithuania for hosting the 30th session of the Committee. It informed the Committee that the New Zealand authorities would be pleased to host the 31st session in 2007.

The **Chairperson** thanked New Zealand on behalf of the Committee for the kind invitation and announced that Africa Day would start at 2 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

## EIGHTH DAY

### THIRTEENTH MEETING

Sunday 17 July 2005

03.30 p.m. – 07.55 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Wakashe

Note of the Rapporteur: After hearing a presentation from the Delegation of Lithuania, the Host country of its 30th session, and examining some suspended items of its agenda, the Committee at its thirteenth –and final- meeting elected its new Bureau (Chairperson, Rapporteur and Vice-Chairpersons) and discussed the provisional agenda for its next session. It subsequently adopted the Decisions of the 29th session, concluding its work.

Note of the Rapporteur : Après avoir écouté une présentation par la Délégation de la Lituanie, pays-hôte de la 30e session, et avoir examiné quelques points de l'ordre du jour précédemment suspendus, le Comité, à sa 13e - et dernière – réunion a élu son nouveau Bureau (Président, Rapporteur et vice-présidents), et a discuté de l'ordre du jour provisoire de la prochaine session. Il a ensuite adopté les décisions de la 29e session, concluant ainsi ses travaux.

In opening the discussion, the **Chairperson** explained that short presentations would be made by the Delegation of Lithuania, to provide the Committee with information on the next session that would take place in Vilnius, and by the Observer Delegation of Italy, followed by a musical and artistic performance by a group of young people from the region of Durban. Subsequently, the Committee would discuss items 6, 9, 19 and 20. Before the adoption of the final report containing the decisions of the 29th session, the outgoing members of the Committee would address a salute to the plenary.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** took the floor to provide an overview of the three World Heritage properties of Lithuania (Vilnius Historic Centre, Curonian Spit, Kernavé archaeological Site) as well as of other places of great interest in the country. It also gave information on the venue of the next session of the Committee and wholeheartedly invited all States Parties to participate in it.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) remercie le Président de lui avoir permis de distribuer une brochure illustrant l'idée qui sera soumise au Comité de créer un musée du patrimoine mondial. Il s'agit, à la manière d'André Malraux, de créer un « musée des musées ». Une des résidences des rois d'Italie, plus précisément la Maison de Savoie, la Veneria Reale à Turin, serait mise à la disposition des pays souhaitant donner de la documentation, des objets, des reproductions, etc. De plus, un parc de

chasse de 16.000 ha, la Mandria, serait également mis à disposition de ce musée et pourrait abriter des exemples du patrimoine mondial. En outre, les installations pourraient abriter des activités de recherche (banque de données, réseau scientifique), de conservation et de restauration, d'éducation (cours, conférences, séminaires), de communication, etc. Le patrimoine immatériel serait également représenté, avec des laboratoires de langues notamment.

Pour l'instant, il ne s'agit que d'un projet, soutenu par le gouvernement italien et la ville de Turin. La Délégation de l'Italie espère que ce projet intéressera le Comité, ainsi que l'ICOM (Conseil international des musées).

A short musical and artistic performance was given by a group of young people from Durban, focusing on the heritage and intercultural dialogue.

The **Chairperson** offered thanks for the rhythmic drum performance of the youth group and the results of the painting workshops held during the World Heritage Committee meeting, which had demonstrated the vision and perception of young people concerning world heritage in South Africa.

## **ITEM 6        REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE FOR THE 15th GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (continued)**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/9*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 6*

The **Chairperson** drew attention to the Report of the World Heritage Committee for the 15th General Assembly of States Parties, and requested the Rapporteur to recall the proposed decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the six-page document presented to the Committee, drafted according to the standards required by the General Conference of UNESCO, was to be finalized by incorporating the main outcomes of the present session of the Committee, before submission to the General Assembly in October.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed appreciation for the document prepared by the World Heritage Centre, which showed that a great deal could be said in only six pages.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, supported by the Delegation of **Nigeria**, requested that mention be made of the Africa Position Paper as one of the main outcomes of the work of the Committee during the current biennium.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its support for the document, and stressed that the priority of the *Convention* should be conservation, rather than nominations. That

should have been reflected in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly of the States Parties to the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** welcomed the document prepared by the World Heritage Centre, and requested that a letter be sent to all States Parties to remind them the relevant decisions taken by the Committee and the General Assembly on the issue of the elections of the new Committee members, namely about refraining to seek immediate re-election and reducing the mandate to four years instead of six years.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that such a letter would be sent to all States Parties, and recalled that paragraph 21 of the revised *Operational Guidelines* contained reference to all the relevant decisions taken by the Committee and the General Assembly in that regard.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the Decision, referring to the proposed amendments to the document.

In the absence of any further comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 6** provisionally adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 9 ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF EXPERTS (KAZAN, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 6-9 APRIL 2005) ESTABLISHED BY DECISION 28 COM 13.1 (continued)**

*Documents:* WHC-05/29.COM/9, WHC-05/29.COM/INF.9A,  
WHC05/29.COM/INF.9B

*Draft Decision:* **29 COM 9**

The **Rapporteur** reported to the Committee that the draft Decision remained as it was, up to paragraph 6 and, taking account of all the points discussed in the debate, particularly the suggestions from the Delegation of the United Kingdom, referred to the formulation of paragraph 6 requesting the Director of the World Heritage Centre to start implementing paragraphs 11 to 25 of the *Convention*, by making best use of resources. He read out paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft Decision as set out in the reformulation presented to the Committee. He explained that the text of paragraph 7 included the term *guide* so as not to restrict directions for analysis of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** acknowledged the Rapporteur's effort toward the inclusion of all the comments made during the intense debate, emphasizing the need to open and deepen the debate on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, and to continue working on that point as a Committee priority.

In the absence of any further comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 9** provisionally adopted as amended.

**ITEM 19 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR FOR THE 30TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Document: WHC-05/29.COM/19*

*Draft Decision: 29 COM 19*

The **Rapporteur** submitted to the Committee the draft Decision in the working document.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, seconded by the Delegations of **South Africa** and **Nigeria**, nominated Ms. Ina Marčiulionytė (Lithuania) as Chairperson of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee. It outlined some of the most significant features of a professional background worthy of the honour of the Committee's Chair, and emphasized her outstanding human values, strength of character and personality. Furthermore, it would be delighted to see a woman once again take the Committee's reins.

The **Chairperson** declared Ms Marčiulionytė (Lithuania) elected as Chairperson of the 30th session of the Committee.

The newly elected **Chairperson** of the 30th session thanked all those countries that had backed her nomination and assured them that a warm welcome awaited all Committee members at Vilnius in Lithuania in July 2006.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, seconded by the Delegations of **Norway**, **Portugal** and **Lithuania**, nominated Mr Alexander Gillespie (New Zealand) as Rapporteur, highlighting his professional profile, which included experience in legislation applied to heritage and particularly the conservation of natural heritage.

The **Chairperson** of the 29th session declared Mr Alexander Gillespie (New Zealand) elected as Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** thanked Committee members for the confidence it had shown in the newly elected Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Japan** proposed India as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed Chile as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed Kuwait as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed the Netherlands as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed Benin as Vice-Chairperson.

In the absence of any objections, the **Chairperson** declared India, Chile, Kuwait, the Netherlands and Benin elected as Vice-Chairpersons. He expressed his wish to continue to contribute to the Committee's efforts and work with all those just elected to prepare for the forthcoming World Heritage Committee meeting.

He declared Decision **29 COM 19** provisionally adopted, as adjusted with the results of the elections.

## **ITEM 20 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 30TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE 2006**

*Document:* WHC-05/29.COM/20

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the corresponding working Document, stating that it was structured classically, as in previous meetings of the Committee. Three reports would be presented during the opening session: the report of the Rapporteur of the Committee at its 29th session, the report of the Rapporteur of the General Assembly of State Parties at its 15th session (UNESCO 2005), and the World Heritage Centre report.

The reports would be followed by the examination of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and the evaluation of nominations to both referred Lists. This would be followed by a presentation of the progress in the implementation of the Global Strategy programme, particularly the debate on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and on the "Filling the Gaps" Plan of Action.

Because it had not been possible to debate the Periodic Report for Europe at the 29th session of the Committee, the entire European report, both Parts 1 and 2, would be presented at the 30th session. Concerning the preparation of the next cycle of periodic reporting, forecasts had clearly shown that a longer period of reflection would be needed to define the final format and that a further year would therefore be necessary for those entrusted with the reflection on the new categories. This would enable them to submit a final outline for consideration of the Committee at its 31st session (2007). Later, the session would continue with a review of the Committee's working methods, and the examination of the items dealing with administrative and financial issues.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed including an item on a review of the *Africa Position Paper*, since there was to be a special summit on the report in the coming months.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed concern about the time schedule, and asked the Committee to take the appropriate steps to avoid subjecting the World Heritage Committee again to the strain under which it had worked in Durban. The Delegation did not desire an extraordinary session, but expressly requested the new Chairperson to extend the duration of the forthcoming session, which might take place between 9 and 16 July 2006. Holding working sessions in parallel should be avoided, and that might require extending the meeting two additional working days. It asked for the agenda of the meeting to focus on substantive items.

The Delegation of **South Africa** likewise stressed the need to include the Africa Position Paper, and expressed agreement with the suggestions made by the Delegation of Norway, in order to avoid an extraordinary session.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the statements of Norway and South Africa, on the understanding that two further working days would be conducive to clearer and more efficient decision-making by the Committee.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Egypt** agreed that two more working days were needed for the next Committee session.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** confirmed that an extra day had already been proposed, and that it was willing for discussions to be held with the Lithuanian authorities on the possibility of implementing the Committee's suggestions and extending the planned programme by two days.

The Delegation of **Norway** proposed that the Committee session should take place between 8 and 16 July 2006, one day more than at Durban. Should this extension not be feasible, no new items should under any circumstances be added to the agenda established in advance.

The **Rapporteur** asked for clarification from the Director of the World Heritage Centre about the possibility of including the Nigerian Delegation's suggestion.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that he was convinced that it would be perfectly possible to include the point mentioned by Nigeria in the agenda. The addition of a further day to the Committee session would mean a total of 11 days, in order to have a free day in the middle, since the present session had already stretched the capacity of the Centre to the maximum.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the opening meeting could take place on 10 July in the afternoon, with a half-day free in the middle of the session. Committee members would like to learn more about World Heritage sites in Lithuania, as they had done in South Africa, and a day following the Committee's session could be used for the excursions.

On another issue, the Delegation asked about the aims and procedure for the questionnaire sent by a consultancy agency conducting a study for the World Heritage Centre on improved management and planning of its work, and wondered whether the results would be debated at the Vilnius meeting. It wished to know whether it represented an official opinion of States Parties to the *Convention*, and wished to see the matter included in the agenda of the 30th session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the aim of the study for improving the Centre's management system and encouraged Member States to respond to the questionnaire. The exercise would draw on official Member States' views and opinions of experts and non-governmental organizations and other users of data produced by the World Heritage Centre.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that Document *WHC-05/29.COM/20* and the relevant draft Decision stood as presented, with the addition of a new item 11G on the presentation of the *Africa Position Paper*, in line with the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Norway**, the **Chairperson** said that the matter of adding another day to the session should be dealt with between the Lithuanian authorities and the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 20** provisionally adopted as amended.

## STATEMENTS BY OUTGOING MEMBERS

The **Chairperson** said that the 29th session of the Committee in Durban was the farewell session for some members who had contributed enormously to the enrichment of working methods and ways and means of implementing the *Convention*. He thanked the outgoing members for their dedication and support and opened the floor to those wishing to speak.

The Delegation of **Argentina** explained that Argentina had been elected to the Committee in 2001, after an absence of more than 16 years. It was voluntarily leaving the Committee four years later, showing thus the way towards a much needed higher rotation of the Members of this executive organ of the *Convention*. Despite the very difficult political and economic situation of Argentina, the Delegation had continued to work actively and constructively in the Committee, participating decisively in some of its most important events, such as the celebration in 2002 of the thirtieth anniversary of the *Convention*, the collaboration between the Centre and the European Space Agency for the implementation of the “Open Initiative” on the application of satellite technologies to the conservation of World Heritage properties, the preparation of the transboundary nomination of the “Qhapaq-Ñan / Main Andean Route”, and the preparation of the periodic report of Latin America. It reiterated its thanks to South Africa for the organization of the current session, and the hospitality with which participants had been welcomed in Durban. It expressed also its thanks to the World Heritage Centre and its staff, particularly Dr. Nuria Sanz.

The Delegation of **China** thanked Committee members for the collaboration and good understanding established in six years of work, and expressed its wish to continue to contribute efficiently to the World Heritage Committee’s work. The necessary practice of handover, giving other countries a chance to work effectively in the promotion of the *World Heritage Convention*, had led the Delegation to take its leave, and it wished new Committee members the best of luck in their mission. It thanked the Chairperson and members, as well as observers, for the support received throughout its term of office.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its pride at having formed part of the Committee and having made its modest contribution in the framework of a *Convention*, working in the conviction of the importance of the living heritage, which must reinforce peoples’ development capacity. The Committee would surely continue



its good work. It thanked the World Heritage Centre and especially Nuria Sanz and the Advisory Bodies for the quality of their work, expressing gratitude to Spain for its cooperation and support in sustaining Latin American and Caribbean regional projects, particularly in regard to the transboundary nomination of the Main Andean Route, and the Spanish translations of the documents of the Committee's ordinary and extraordinary sessions. It thanked South Africa for its hospitality, which had demonstrated the outstanding universal value of its people.

The Delegation of **Egypt** drew attention to the need for regional experts in UNESCO's regional offices familiar with the administrative and official procedures for nominations, international assistance and drafting of tentative lists, in order to reduce costs and improve conservation efforts. It also emphasized the need for initiatives to guarantee implementation of the results of periodic reports. It would be desirable to reinforce operations with national UNESCO Commissions, to make the World Heritage Centre's work more visible. It reiterated its thanks for the years it had spent on the Committee, when there had been times of extremely difficult decision-making, but also memorable moments of unalloyed pleasure.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its thanks for the fulfilling years of work with other Committee members, and its gratitude to those who had organized the Durban meeting for what was undoubtedly a demonstration of "outstanding universal value".

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that it had been a real pleasure and honour to serve for six years on the Committee and stressed that leaving the Committee would not diminish Portugal's commitment towards the *Convention*. It thanked Committee Members, as well as the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, for the interesting learning experience. It was convinced that the Committee was a place for building cooperation and learning about diversity. In concluding, the Delegation called upon all people present to pay tribute to the men and women everywhere in the world who served as the guardians of humankind's common heritage, sometimes at the cost of their lives, as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stressed that, although it was now leaving the Committee after a term of four years, it would continue to work for the implementation of the *Convention*. It thanked everybody that had worked with the Committee and its Members during the previous four years towards safeguarding the world's common heritage.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Committee for the honour it had done South Africa and the confidence it had placed in it by choosing it as host for the 29th session. It also thanked the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It had observed with sadness that, once again, only very few nominations from the African continent had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, but welcomed the broad and warm support by the Committee for the Africa Position Paper and the proposal to establish the African World Heritage Fund. It expressed hope that all participants had enjoyed and would continue to enjoy over the coming days the hospitality of the South African people and its rich and diverse tangible and intangible heritage.

The Head of the Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that she had arrived on the Committee four years previously at the Helsinki session, with only little knowledge of

the *Convention* terminology and the Committee's ways of working. During her term as Committee Member she had learned a great deal about the *Convention* and heritage conservation and management, without claiming to have become a technical expert in the matter. But above all she had become passionate about the importance of the *Convention* as a tool for heritage conservation. She would like to take the opportunity to leave two important recommendations for current and future Members, namely the importance of avoiding transforming the Committee into a political arena and the need to deal with the issue of conflict of interests that had been raised in the Working Group, as she felt strongly that it was not only about perception, but reality. She also expressed thanks on behalf of the Delegation of Lebanon, which had had to leave before the end of the meeting on account of other commitments. Finally, she thanked Ron Van Oers for his dedicated commitment, Anne Lemaistre, Lodovico Folin Calabi, Richard Veillon and Bénédicte Selfslagh for their valuable help with the new *Operational Guidelines* and Alessandro Balsamo for his tremendous cooperation during the past month that she has spent in archives.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that it had greatly enjoyed the previous four years of working with colleagues from the Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The United Kingdom, too, was able to learn a great deal from such international exchange and cooperation. It wished to take the opportunity to reflect upon the key achievements of the past years as well as trends for the future. It suggested that the greatest achievement of the previous four years had been the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*, which had resulted in a more user-friendly document but was also in its opinion a major step towards effective conservation of the world's most outstanding places. According to the new *Operational Guidelines*, criterion (vi) could now be used in its own right. While it agreed that the application of that criterion remained challenging, it believed that it was important to use it to distinguish places that had marked human history. It was therefore extremely pleased that the Committee at its current session had inscribed Mostar under that criterion. The Kazan meeting had enabled progress to be made in the further exploration and definition of the concept of outstanding universal value. The Europe periodic reporting exercise had contributed in a major way to improving cooperation between States Parties in the region. The Delegation finally expressed satisfaction with the growing interest in transnational nominations, which it regarded as a symbol of international cooperation and the true spirit of the *Convention*.

## **ITEM 22      ADOPTION OF DECISIONS**

*Document:*      *WHC-05/29.COM/22*

The **Rapporteur** announced that the document containing the decisions, which would be available shortly, included more than 250 decisions, many of which had been adopted over the previous two days, and noted that the production of the report had been hampered by certain technical problems.

The meeting was suspended at 17.15 p.m. and resumed at 18.15 p.m.

The **Chairperson** opened the discussion under item 22, Adoption of decisions.

The **Rapporteur** referred to Document *WHC-05/29.COM/22* which had been distributed in the room and proposed that the Committee should start with draft Decisions **29 COM 1** to **29 COM 4**, move on to draft Decision **29 COM 16** and then return to draft Decision **29 COM 5**. Accordingly, he submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 1** to **29 COM 4** to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 1, 2, 3A, 3B** and **4** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** thanked the Rapporteur from New Zealand for covering the subsidiary body established to consider item 16, and submitted Decision **29 COM 16** to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 16** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** noted that there were four draft Decisions under item 5, from which the brackets would be removed, and he submitted them to the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested inserting the word “programme” after the word “marine” in paragraph 2 of draft Decision **29 COM 5A**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 5.A** adopted as amended, and Decisions **29 COM 5B, 5C** and **6** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** suggested addressing the draft Decisions under items 7A and 7B by region, starting with Africa. Accordingly, he submitted to the Committee draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.1** to **7A.7**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7A.1, 2** and **3** adopted.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, comparing paragraph 11 on page 13 with paragraph 7 on page 11, said that the language of draft Decision **29 COM 7A.4** needed to be reviewed for consistency.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed to the proposal about the consistency of language.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM7A.4** adopted as amended, and declared Decisions **29 COM 7A.5, 6 and 7** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.8 to 12** to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7A.8, 9, 10, 11 and 12** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.13 to 15** to the Committee.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, supported by the Delegation of **Nigeria**, proposed two amendments to draft Decision **29 COM 7A.14**: “Invites international partners to support the development project for the rehabilitation of the architecture of Timbuktu” and a rephrasing of paragraph 9 to read: “... if there is no substantial progress towards the implementation of the conditions set out in paragraph 8 ...”.

The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee members that no changes could be made to substance when adopting the decisions.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7A.13 to 15** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.16 to 19** to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said with reference to paragraph 7 of draft Decision **29 COM 7A.17** that originally the date of 1 April 2006 had been proposed, but that that had been questioned by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, recalling the statutory date of 1 February and the time needed by ICOMOS to evaluate the report.

The Delegation of **Argentina** noted that the situation was an exceptional one. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed and proposed, as a compromise, “a progress report by 1 February”.

The **Chairperson**, noting the agreement of the Delegation of the **Netherlands** to the United Kingdom proposal, said that he took it that there was consensus on the compromise of a progress report to be submitted by 1 February.

He declared Decision **29 COM 7A.17** adopted as amended and Decisions **29 COM 7A.16, 18 and 19** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.20 to 31** to the Committee. He noted that draft Decisions **29 COM 7A.30 to 33** had been omitted from the English version of the working document and were being distributed separately.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7A.20 to 31** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7B.1 to 28** to the Committee.

The Delegation of **South Africa** pointed out a minor spelling mistake in the English version of draft Decision **29 COM 7B.1**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.1** adopted as amended and Decisions **29 COM 7B.1 to 28** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decision **29 COM 7B.29** to the Committee.

Concerning the draft Decision in question, on the Galapagos, the Delegation of **Colombia** recalled that the Committee had agreed to change the text in paragraph 7, in order to recommend a long-term vision focusing on conservation and sustainable development.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed this view and, in response to a request by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, read out the proposed final text. Paragraphs 1 to 3, 5 and 6 remained unchanged; in paragraph 4 the report was to be due by 1 February 2007; paragraph 9 was merged with paragraph 7; the rephrased parts of paragraph 8 now read: "... in the context of the above meeting ... in the development of a long-term international ... and on conditions of whether or not to include ..."; and in paragraph 9 "illegal fishing" was to replace of "sports fishing".

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.29** adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7B.30 to 32** to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7B.30 to 32** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7B.34 to 47** to the Committee.

Concerning draft Decision **29 COM 7B.39**, paragraph 7, the Delegation of **South Africa** suggested replacing "provide" by "submit".

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggesting deleting: "otherwise facing the loss of the outstanding universal value of the property" from draft Decision **29 COM 7B.42**, paragraph 5.

In response to requests from the Delegations of the **United Kingdom** and the **Netherlands** for different wording, the **Rapporteur** proposed "in order to ensure...".

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that strong words were needed to avoid the loss of outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed, proposing “to sustain”, rather than “to ensure”.

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom**, the **Netherlands** and **Portugal** agreed with that proposal.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7B.39** and **42** adopted as amended. He further declared Decisions **29 COM 7B.34, 38, 40, 41** and **43** to **47** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7B.48** to **89** to the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** informed the Committee that the text of draft Decision **29 COM 7B.75** had erroneously been copied into draft Decision **29 COM 7B.74**.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that the version of draft Decision **29 COM 7B.74** as presented in *WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Rev* (15 June 2005, page 99) be used.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.74** adopted as amended. He further declared Decisions **29 COM 7B.48** to **73** and Decisions **29 COM 7B.75** to **89** adopted.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decisions **29 COM 7B.90** to **102** to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **29 COM 7B.90** to **102** adopted, subject to a repositioning of Decisions **100** to **102**.

The **Rapporteur** submitted draft Decision **29 COM 7B.103**, a general decision on state of conservation, to the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **29 COM 7B.103** adopted.

## **ITEM 23: CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to take the floor.

In his closing remarks the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** observed that the Committee had been together for long hours, and that the Committee session had been a rich and fruitful one and that important decisions had been taken that would make a difference to the implementation of the *Convention* and to the conservation and

protection of World Heritage sites. The Committee had now an Africa Position Paper, the meeting had produced a regulatory framework for activities and more sites had been inscribed. He thanked the outgoing Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr. Wakashe, commending his hard work and drive, and the “African wisdom, this grace that makes things happen”. He expressed gratitude to the World Heritage Committee for its support in making the meeting a success. He paid tribute to the outgoing Rapporteur, Mr. Ariel Gonzalez, and looked forward to his guidance in the future. He thanked the staff of the World Heritage Centre, with whom it was a pleasure to work, and addressed a special thank to Mrs. Anne Lemaistre, “the Angel of World Heritage”, for her ability to deliver a very good work even when it seems impossible. Finally, he expressed thanks to the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, for his invaluable and continued support. With reference to the session’s decisions, the Committee had a set of strategic objectives which had become a common language among all members. Important new developments included the decisions concerning the timing of Committee meetings, the improvements to the statutory meetings and the work of the Bureau, the completion of the *Operational Guidelines*, the cycle of reform, the holding of recent events and the initiatives to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the *Convention*. Extrabudgetary resources had increased. The Centre had strengthened its PACT, POL and Information Units, the Centre’s documentation and website had improved and would continue to improve, and the Centre was now in a much better position to service the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed great pleasure at having been asked to make a closing intervention on behalf of all delegations. The Delegation reminded that, since Africa was a common root of all humanity, the Committee and all observers had, in fact, returned to Africa. It thanked the host country, South Africa, on behalf of the Committee and the South African Ministry of Arts and Culture for the smooth organization of the Committee session and wonderful hospitality. It further expressed thanks to the outgoing Rapporteur for his assistance and guidance; the African Union; the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture; the World Heritage Centre for its assistance and efficiency; the Advisory Bodies for their support and help; the delegations that had also served as Vice-Chairpersons of the 29th session, particularly the Delegation of Colombia; the interpreters and translators; and, finally, its colleagues on the Committee as well as the observers. In conclusion, the Delegation commended the exceptionally high quality and professionalism of the Committee’s debates.

In his closing remarks the **Chairperson** expressed thanks for the unremitting and concerted efforts of all delegates and participants in the meeting, enabling it to accomplish the major tasks set out in the agenda. Complying strictly with the *World Heritage Convention*, the *Rules of Procedure* and the *Operational Guidelines*, the Committee had carefully examined the 45 nominations before it and had inscribed 24 properties on the World Heritage List, three of them from countries that had been unrepresented on the List, namely Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova and Bahrain. The addition of their wonderful sites to the List made the World Heritage List much richer and more diverse.

Inscription on the List was only the beginning of a long process of ensuring that those sites retained the outstanding universal value for which they had been inscribed. As could be seen in the State of Conservation reports, this was a heavy responsibility for

the Committee as well as the relevant States Parties. The hours spent by the Committee on reviewing those reports showed how important the Committee considered that part of its work. The Committee was pleased to see that the outstanding universal value of Sangay National Park, Timbuktu and Butrint was no longer threatened, their having been withdrawn from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and they were real success stories for the *Convention*.

The success of the 29th session had been due to the Committee's hard work, cooperation, spirit of mutual understanding and consultation and, above all, the Committee's commitment to safeguarding the *World Heritage Convention*. He thanked in particular the members of the Committee for the positive and outstanding contributions made to debates and to the decisions; the Rapporteur, Mr. Ariel Gonzalez, for his efforts and the exemplary support he had given to the Chairperson and the Committee; and the five Vice-Chairpersons who had provided invaluable advice at several Bureau meetings held during the session, and particularly Ambassador Maria Zulema Velez Jara of Colombia who had presided over several segments of the sessions in his absence. He expressed gratitude to UNESCO and the Director-General for their support for the 29th session in particular, and the cause of World Heritage in general; and further thanked the representatives of the States Parties, the three Advisory Bodies, the various international governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations attending the session as observers, and the staff of the World Heritage Centre and the interpreters and translators behind the scene for preparing and facilitating the work. On a personal note, he thanked Professor Omolewa, President of the General Conference of UNESCO, and Dr Gawanas of the African Union. He was grateful to the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, and to Mr. Francesco Bandarin, Director of World Heritage Centre, for their cooperation and support.

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the newly elected Chairperson, Ambassador Ina Marčiulionytė from Lithuania, took a seat on the podium.

The outgoing **Chairperson** shared with the World Heritage Committee extracts from a poem written for the Committee by His Excellency, Ambassador Jallali of Iran, who had had to leave the Committee session earlier.

Handing over the Chair to the newly elected Chairperson, he said that she could count on his full support over the coming years. Turning to the delegates and observers, he said that they would be returning to their homes ever more convinced that World Heritage protection was a noble and worthy cause, and he wished them all a safe journey.

He declared the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.