

Distribution limited

WHC-03/27.COM/INF.24
Paris, 25 June/ 2004
Original: English/Français

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-seventh session

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room XII
30 June – 5 July 2003**

SUMMARY RECORD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Opening session	149
2.	Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable	149
3.	Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur	150
4.	Report of the Rapporteur on the 6th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee	152
5.	Report of the Secretariat	153
11.	Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the World Heritage Fund budget for 2004-2005 – (Opening of the Agenda item)	154
14	Evaluation of the Cairns Decision - (Opening of the Agenda item)	155
6A	Periodic Reporting: State of the World Heritage in Asia and the Pacific, 2003	158
6B	Periodic Reporting: Follow up to periodic reporting in Arab States and Africa and preparations in Latin America and the Caribbean and in Europe and North America	165
20B	Tools for the implementation of the 2002 World Heritage Strategic Objectives: World Heritage Programmes	165
7A	State of Conservation: Properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger	167
2.	Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable (continued)	185
7A	State of Conservation: Properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (continued)	186
8A	Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger: Tentative Lists	189
8B	Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger: Nominations of properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger	190
8C	Establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger: Nominations of properties to the World Heritage List	190
7B	State of conservation: Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	216
11.	Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the World Heritage Fund budget for 2004-2005 (continued)	243

14.	Evaluation of the Cairns Decision (continued)	244
18A	Preparations of the 14th General Assembly of States Parties to the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> : New voting mechanism and revision to the procedures for the election of the members of the World Heritage Committee	250
18B	Report of the activities of the World Heritage Committee to be presented to the 32nd General Conference of UNESCO (29 September - 17 October 2003)	251
12.	International Assistance	251
10.	Revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	253
22.	Provisional Agenda of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee	254
13	Implementation of the Global Strategy	256
23.	Other business	258
24.	Adoption of Decisions	258
25.	Closure of the session	258

1 OPENING SESSION

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/1
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.1
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.2 Rev 1*

1. The 27th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by Mr Tamás Fejérdy (Hungary) Chairperson, on 30 June 2003 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France. The Chairperson welcomed Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, the Director-General of UNESCO, Committee members, States Parties and all observers. The 21 members of the Committee: Argentina, Belgium, China, Colombia, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Oman, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zimbabwe participated in the session.

2. Eighty-seven States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Germany, Grenada, Guatemala, Holy See, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Morocco, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam and Yemen.

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

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

5. The Secretariat presented working document *WHC-03/27.COM/1* containing the names of all those organizations and individuals having requested Observer participation and all those who were invited by the Director-General of UNESCO in accordance with Rule 8.4 of the *Rules of Procedure*.

6. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 1** without any discussion. The List of Participants is included as

Annex I to the List of Decisions, document *WHC-03/27.COM/24*.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/2 Prov. 2
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.2 Rev*

1. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the Provisional Agenda to the Committee and highlighted the heavy workload facing the Committee. He stated that the proposed working hours would be from 9:00 to 13:00 and from 15:00 to 20:00. In order to achieve a better time-management during the session, the following changes to the timetable were suggested:

- (i) The agenda items on the budget of the World Heritage Fund (Agenda item 11) and on the evaluation of the Cairns Decision (Agenda item 14) would be briefly opened during the discussion on the Secretariat's report so as to allow for the creation of working groups, if so desired by the Committee;
- (ii) Three working days (Tuesday through Thursday) would be left for the main issues to be examined by the Committee, i.e. nominations and state of conservation reports.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** stated that a process of reform of the Committee's work was already being implemented and therefore the Committee's workload (in particular the number of documents to be reviewed) should be decreasing with time. This session was of course a particular one as the *Operational Guidelines* and the Periodic Report for Asia and the Pacific had to be adopted. It was proposed to the Committee that it consider following the practice of the Executive Board where some agenda items are presented for information and noting only and are therefore not open to discussion.

3. The **Chairperson** commented that this system could possibly be applied on a trial basis, but that it would be up to the new Bureau to decide this. He recalled that Agenda item 22 (Provisional Agenda of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee) would be opened at the beginning of the session to decide on the venue and date of the next Committee session. This would facilitate the process of electing the new Bureau for this session.

4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Thailand and suggested that the Committee carry out its work without coffee breaks. Working days starting at 9:00 and finishing at 19:00 would be counterproductive and unrealistic for members of the Delegations and the Secretariat. It was also questioned when working groups would be meeting with such a schedule.

5. On a different point, it was recommended that when a property appeared in two different agenda items (e.g. reactive monitoring and request for extension) the Committee should take a holistic approach and discuss all issues pertaining to the property only once. Moreover, all interventions made by Delegations should be relevant to the discussion and of limited duration. The Committee should rely on the Chairperson for this.

6. The Delegation of **China** recalled that originally the 27th session of the Committee was to take place in Suzhou, China, for a duration of 5.5 working days and not 4.5 as was now the case. Concerning the working hours of the Committee a compromise solution was proposed: that working days start at 9:30 and that the session should end at 19:00 or 19:30. However this should be left flexible for the Committee to decide on as its work progresses. It also supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Thailand that certain items of the Agenda be categorised as exclusively for the information of the Committee. If this system was applied, perhaps a deadline should be introduced so that Delegations provide their written comments on the documents several days in advance.

7. The **Chairperson** stated that this system might be adopted by this session. For this he invited the Secretariat to assist the Committee in identifying those Agenda items which would only be for the information of the Committee.

8. The Delegation of **India** stated that it was unrealistic to work without coffee breaks as it was necessary to have informal consultations between Delegations. It also disagreed with the establishment of time limitations for interventions.

9. The **Chairperson** pointed out to the Committee that unless there were official coffee breaks the Rapporteur and Chairperson could not easily leave the room. The Committee should simply take shorter coffee breaks.

10. He then proposed that the Committee accept the proposal made by the Delegation of Thailand on the classification of Agenda items depending if they are for the discussion or for the information of the Committee.

11. The Agenda was adopted by the Committee with the structure proposed in working document *WHC-03/27.COM/2 Prov. 2*. The timetable was approved with changes concerning coffee breaks, daily working hours and classification of Agenda items according to whether they are for the discussion or for the information of the Committee.

12. The discussion on this item was reopened later in the week.

3. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/3
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.3*

1. The **Chairperson** recalled that Rule 13.1 of the revised *Rules of Procedure* stipulates that the elections of the Bureau are to be conducted at the end of ordinary sessions of the Committee. However, the Committee at its 6th extraordinary session had decided (see Decision **6 EXT.COM 3**) that this Rule would only enter into force from the 29th session of the Committee and thus transition provisions would apply. As China would be hosting the 28th session of the Committee (and not the 27th session as originally planned, see Decision **27 COM 22.1**), the Chairperson asked the Committee to consider the following proposal to revise these transition provisions.

2. He suggested that the Committee elect, on an exceptional basis, a Bureau with two Chairpersons. The mandate of the first Chairperson would start at the beginning of the 27th session of the Committee and last until the end of the 27th session. At the end of the 27th session of the Committee this Chairperson would become a Vice-Chairperson.

3. The mandate of the second Chairperson would begin at the end of the 27th session and last until the end of the 28th session in 2004. During the 27th session, this second Chairperson would be a Vice-Chairperson.

4. The rest of the Bureau (i.e. a Rapporteur and the other 4 Vice-Chairpersons) would be elected for the duration of both the 27th and 28th sessions of the World Heritage Committee. At the end of the 28th session of the Committee, a new Bureau would be elected with a mandate starting at the end of the 28th session and finishing at the end of the 29th session of the Committee (June 2005) in accordance with Rule 13.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee.

5. The Chairperson then explained that if the Committee agreed to this proposal, it would be a good occasion to allow a State Party who would not normally have the opportunity to host the Committee session, to act as Chairperson for the duration of the 27th session of the Committee.

6. The Delegations of **Zimbabwe, Thailand, Finland, Nigeria, Russia** and **Oman** supported this proposal.

7. The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Committee's agreement on this issue and invited the Committee to nominate a Chairperson for the 27th session of the Committee.

8. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Chairperson, Mr Tamás Fejérdy, for his sense of judgment and professionalism shown throughout the duration of his

mandate. It also thanked Mr Fejérdy for being the first Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to visit the Sub-Saharan region during his mandate.

9. The Delegation of Zimbabwe continued by recalling the Decision of the 13th General Assembly to grant States Parties without properties inscribed on the World Heritage List the possibility of having a 'reserved seat' in the World Heritage Committee. Following this decision Saint Lucia was elected to the Committee (November 2001). The Delegation of Zimbabwe proposed Ms Vera Lacoueilhe (Saint Lucia) as Chairperson of the 27th session of the Committee. Her experience at UNESCO, in particular in the Executive Board and her grasp of the *Rules of Procedure* would ensure that the Committee would accomplish its tasks.

10. The Delegations of **Argentina, South Africa, Finland, Belgium, Greece, Thailand, Oman, Lebanon, Egypt, Colombia, Nigeria, China, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Hungary** and **Observer Delegations** expressed their support for the nomination of Ms Vera Lacoueilhe as Chairperson of the 27th session of the Committee.

11. All the above-mentioned Delegations and Observer Delegations commended Mr Tamás Fejérdy for the spirit of consensus and leadership with which he had conducted the work of the Committee.

12. The **Chairperson** declared Ms Vera Lacoueilhe (Saint Lucia) elected as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for the duration of the 27th session of the Committee. He then asked the Committee to nominate the Chairperson for the period between the end of the 27th session and the end of the 28th session of the Committee.

13. The Delegation of **Hungary** recalled the customary practice by which the Chairperson of the Committee usually came from the host country. It proposed Mr Zhang Xinsheng (China) as the next Chairperson.

14. This was accepted by the Committee and the Chairperson declared elected Mr Zhang Xinsheng (China) as Chairperson of the 28th session of the Committee.

15. The Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude to the Committee for the election of Mr Zhang Xinsheng as Chairperson.

16. The **Chairperson** proceeded to request nominations for the Rapporteur from the Committee.

17. The Delegation of **Argentina** nominated Ms Louise Graham (South Africa) as Rapporteur and thanked Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh for her work as outgoing Rapporteur. This proposal was supported by Lebanon, Saint Lucia, Thailand, Greece, China and Hungary, who also expressed their gratitude to Ms Selfslagh for her dedication in her role as Rapporteur.

18. The **Committee** approved the nomination and the Chairperson announced the election of Ms Louise Graham (South Africa) as Rapporteur. He then asked the Committee to propose candidates for Vice-Chairpersons.

19. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed Oman as Vice-Chairperson, this was seconded by the Delegation of Egypt.

20. The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed Nigeria as Vice-Chairperson.

21. The Delegation of **Greece** proposed the United Kingdom as Vice-Chairperson.

22. The Committee approved these nominations and the Chairperson declared Nigeria, Oman and the United Kingdom elected as Vice-Chairpersons.

23. As a fourth Vice-Chairperson still remained to be elected, the Chairperson suggested that the Committee briefly break in order to allow for consultations.

24. Following the break, the Delegation of **Mexico** proposed Argentina as Vice-Chairperson.

25. This nomination was also welcomed by the Committee and the Chairperson declared Argentina elected as Vice-Chairperson.

26. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the outgoing Chairperson, Mr Tamás Fejérdy, for his dedication and commitment both during the sessions of the Committee as well as on a number of important missions. He also expressed his gratitude to the Rapporteur, Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh, for her contributions to the work of the World Heritage Committee, in particular in the reform of its reporting methods.

27. The **Chairperson** invited the two newly elected Chairpersons and the Rapporteur to the podium. He presented both Ms Vera Lacoueilhe and Mr Zhang Xinsheng with a gift (a booklet with advice for future Chairpersons of the Committee, prepared by his team).

28. Ms **Vera Lacoueilhe** assumed her role as Chairperson of the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee. She thanked the Committee for having given its trust to Saint Lucia, the smallest country currently member of the Committee. She informed the Committee that she might be invoking Rule 22.2 of the *Rules of Procedure* "to limit the time allowed to each speaker if the circumstances make this desirable".

29. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 3**.

4. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR ON THE 6TH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/4

1. Ms **Bénédicte Selfslagh**, in her capacity as Rapporteur of the 6th Extraordinary Session of the Committee (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, March 2003) and of the 26th ordinary session (Budapest, Hungary, June/July 2002) shared her experiences with the Committee.

2. Concerning the Decisions, she observed that there was a great disparity between the draft decisions, according to the regions or themes; that the decisions were often too general, with no precise indications of the deadlines; and that there was not yet a tool to ensure the institutional memory of the *Convention*.

3. She thus put forward the three following proposals : (i) To ensure that *Decisions* are coherent, precise and operational, with clear deadlines; (ii) To create a schedule of *Decisions* by deadline, in order to better manage the workload and check their implementation; and (iii) To ensure the memory of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies by creating a General Index of *Decisions*, by theme and by site.

4. Concerning the Summary Record, **Ms Selfslagh** recalled that this was intended to present the context in which the decisions were taken and to provide a written record of the oral debate. She pointed out that the new format was applied in progressive stages allowing the debates of the session to be presented in chronological order. She underlined that the Rapporteur needed to be given more time to check the quality of the text.

5. Concerning the Summary Record of the 6th Extraordinary session of the Committee, she indicated that it had not been possible to finalize it as priority had been given to the preparation of the working documents for the 27th session. In this context she underlined that the work and the role of the Secretariat was the very basis of the quality of the Committee's work, and that it was necessary to reinforce the human resources both in terms of numbers and of specific professional qualifications, which currently are lacking. She quoted the speech of Mr Koichiro Matsuura at the 12th General Assembly of States Parties in 1999, in his capacity as Chairperson of the Committee " ... the ability of the Committee in fulfilling its tasks depends on the efficiency and energy of the Secretariat".

6. Referring to the conditions in which the Secretariat has to work and the long working days, Mr Matsuura stated: "This situation cannot continue. (...) The World Heritage Centre needs to be strengthened with more staff and financial resources".

7. Finally, Ms Selfslagh, as a witness to the scale of the work required of the Secretariat and referring to Article

43.4 of the *Rules of Procedure*, suggested that the Director General appoint, in consultation with Director of the Centre, a Secretary of the Committee, who would be in charge of the statutory meetings and the preparation of the Committee's documents. This would facilitate the contacts between the Secretariat and the Committee on the one hand, and would allow better coordination within the Centre itself and between the Centre and the other units of UNESCO, on the other hand.

8. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to prove its comments on this presentation.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that Ms Selfslagh's report included many interesting and constructive comments. It suggested that it would be very useful if the newly-elected Rapporteur could take these comments into consideration.

10. The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its wish to further discuss the comment made on Rule 43.4 of the *Rules of Procedure*, maybe on a later occasion.

11. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the proposal that the Summary Record be distributed after the session hoping that this would allow for a more faithful text. It stated that it would be very beneficial if the World Heritage Centre could provide information on the execution of the Decisions of the Committee. It invited the World Heritage Centre to prepare a document containing this information for the next session of the Committee.

12. The Delegation of **South Africa** commended Ms Selfslagh for the proposals she had presented to the Committee. It supported the need for additional funds and staff for the World Heritage Centre. Most of the proposals put forward by Ms Selfslagh would have the support of the Committee.

13. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the new Chairperson and congratulated Ms Selfslagh for her work as Rapporteur of the Committee. It agreed with the call for a reinforcement of the human resources for the World Heritage Centre. The proposal for a Secretary of the Committee was a good one, but it was contingent on solving the human resources needs of the Centre. Geographical considerations should also be taken into account when reinforcing the staff of the World Heritage Centre.

14. The Delegation of **Thailand** stated that it would be useful for the Director of the World Heritage Centre to comment on the proposal made by Ms Selfslagh on the appointment of a Secretary of the Committee.

15. **Ms Selfslagh** indicated that her suggestion aimed to provide solutions and not to create problems. She clarified that at the present time the Director of the Centre was also Secretary of the Committee and that as a result of these double duties, the workload had become too heavy. By

appointing a Secretary of the Committee the documents would enjoy better coordination and the preparation and follow-up of the sessions of the Committee could be improved.

16. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that more than a year and half ago a special unit, the Policy and Statutory Implementation Unit, was created to co-ordinate all activities for the Committee and which carries out all functional and organizational tasks required for this purpose. However, the Committee should be aware that the preparation of documentation for the Committee sessions and the execution of the Committee's Decisions also involves the work of the different units of the World Heritage Centre and sectors of UNESCO.

17. The Delegation of **Thailand** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre if the creation of this position would duplicate the functions assigned to the Director of the Centre. Perhaps in view of the increasing amount of work of the Centre the amount of time available for the Director of the Centre for issues related to relations with the Committee had been reduced.

18. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that effectively it would be a duplication of functions. He underscored that the Secretariat not only prepared documents for the Committee, but had very important organisational and operational roles.

19. The **Chairperson** asked Ms Selfslagh to make a proposal to the Committee on how to continue with this issue.

20. **Ms Selfslagh** suggested that the Committee pronounce on the other proposals she had submitted.

21. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested that the Committee come back to this point later on.

22. **Ms Selfslagh** offered to prepare a Draft Decision in due form in order to submit it to the Committee so that the latter could decide.

23. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it could accept the other recommendations made by Ms Selfslagh.

24. The Delegation of **India** requested that these be presented in written form. It stated that the Committee was not yet ready to take a decision.

25. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined the importance of having a text on which the Committee could give its opinion.

26. The **Chairperson** closed the Agenda item and asked Ms Selfslagh to prepare the text of the Draft Decision.

27. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 4**.

28. As part of Decision **27 COM 4**, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre "in order to facilitate the implementation of its decisions and to better plan and manage its workload during future sessions, to prepare a 'Directory of Decisions by deadline' according to the model as proposed by the Rapporteur attached as **Annex I** to the Summary Record and in order to ensure an institutional memory of the World Heritage Committee decisions, to prepare 'A General index of decisions of the Committee', by theme and property according to the model as proposed by the Rapporteur attached as **Annex II** to the Summary Record.

5 REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/5
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.5A*

1. The **Secretariat** introduced Item 5 of the Agenda, noting that the Report of the Secretariat had taken a different form this year to those of previous years. As many of the activities undertaken by the Secretariat would be discussed under separate Agenda items in the course of the session, the Report of the Secretariat attempted to be more forward looking and draw the Committee's attention to a number of critical issues that might merit its particular attention over the coming year.

2. Continuing, the Secretariat explained that *WHC-03/27.COM/INF.5A* had been grouped with the Report of the Secretariat as it was important to give an overview of the implementation of the Decisions of the 26th session of the Committee concerning the protection of the cultural heritage in the Palestinian Territories.

3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat and invited questions.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Secretariat for its report to the Committee on the implementation of the decisions of the 26th session of the Committee concerning the protection of the cultural heritage in the Palestinian Territories. Within this framework, the Delegation mentioned that, by a letter dated 6 September 2002, the Observer Mission of Palestine had sent a letter to the Chairperson of the Committee informing him of its worries concerning the Tell Rumeida site (Hebron). The Delegation of Lebanon asked the Secretariat to inform it of the action taken following this letter.

5. The **Secretariat** explained that during its mission in Hebron of October 2002, it had not been possible to visit this particular property, and confirmed that this issue would be part of its future work, if conditions permit. The Secretariat further underlined that the letter referred to by the Delegation of Lebanon had been received with great delay.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested, in the name of its country, that the greatest interest be taken in this question rapidly and seriously; the establishment of colonies on this site was already well advanced.

7. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Secretariat and the Palestinian Authority for the work being undertaken in view of the establishment of an inventory of heritage properties, and welcomed the presence of Palestinian specialists in the room. It further recalled that the High Court of Israel had issued an injunction against a project to demolish old houses by the historic core of Hebron - a decision supported by the Israeli World Heritage Committee.

8. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the request made by the Delegation of Lebanon, and asked that the Secretariat give more consideration to the issue.

9. Referring to the intervention of the Observer Delegation of Israel, the Delegation of **Lebanon** pointed out that it was a question, in this particular case, of unauthorized constructions on an archaeological site, which were leading in part to its destruction. The Delegation pointed out that it should be prohibited to build on this site.

10. The Observer Mission of **Palestine** thanked the Secretariat for its report and progress achieved in the Decision taken at Budapest, and welcomed the remarks made by the Observer Delegation of Israel, notably the decision to stop demolitions in the old city of Hebron. It stressed, however, that the building of new constructions on the property of Tell Rumeida was contrary to an agreement made by the two concerned parties and needed to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its desire to see in the future a Report of the Secretariat centred on the implementation of the decisions of the Committee, as well as the other activities of the World Heritage Centre. It proposed that the title of this report be changed to "Report on the implementation of the decisions of the Committee".

12. The **Chairperson** noted that this proposal by the Delegation of Belgium was very constructive and merited further consideration.

13. The Delegation of **Hungary** also supported this proposal.

14. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 5.1** and **27 COM 5.2**.

11 EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND BUDGET FOR 2004-2005

Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/11

WHC-03/27.COM/11 ADD

1. The **Chairperson** opened the item and the Secretariat presented the budget shortfalls expected for 2004-2005 and made some suggestions to identify potential additional resources.

2. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** remarked that, unfortunately, resources for the *Convention's* core activities represented by Main Line Action 2 (*Promotion and implementation of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Heritage Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)*) were reduced, and observed that, at the same time, UNESCO's budget for 2004-2005 was being increased. It concluded that actions such as an exceptional contribution from UNESCO to the World Heritage Fund and the re-channeling of States Parties savings on their UNESCO contributions to the World Heritage Fund should be actively pursued.

3. The Delegation of **Nigeria** invited the Committee to seek new voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that certain States Parties were behind with their dues and that this was having a bigger and bigger impact on the budget.

5. The **Secretariat** suggested that a working group to examine the 2004-2005 budget shortfalls could: a) produce decisions on corrective actions for the consideration of the *Convention's* and UNESCO's Governing Bodies; b) examine the budget cuts that had been introduced in the 2004-2005 budget, and c) establish a set of priorities for the use of any additional funds that may be secured for World Heritage.

6. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** reminded the Committee that it had proposed, with the support of the Russian Federation, a draft Resolution at the last session of the Executive Board of UNESCO in order to reinforce UNESCO's contribution to the World Heritage Convention. This draft was accepted and included as a Decision in the 32 C/6.

7. The Delegation of **India** proposed that the 32 C/6 Decision be endorsed by the World Heritage Committee in order to give it more weight.

8. The **Chairperson** concurred.

9. The Chairperson asked Committee members to volunteer for the Budget Working Group which would be open-ended for delegations and observers to attend. The group was established as follows:

- Argentina
- Belgium
- China
- Oman
- United Kingdom
- Zimbabwe

10. The working group was asked to elaborate proposals and recommendations on how to strengthen the World Heritage budget for 2004-2005. These proposals and recommendations would be submitted by the Director-General to the next Executive Board and General Conference, for examination and approval.

11. The discussion of this Agenda item continued later in the week (Decisions 27 COM 11.1, 27 COM 11.2 and 7 COM 11.3)

14 EVALUATION OF THE CAIRNS DECISION

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/14

1. The **World Heritage Committee** decided to create a short term working group to define the terms of reference and time frame required to evaluate the Cairns Decision. This working group would report back to the Committee on Thursday, 3 July, with recommendations for adoption by the Committee at this session.

2. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** made a brief introduction to the Agenda item. He noted that the Cairns Decision had placed excessive trust in the study by the Advisory Bodies which it had hoped would be a tool to guide the pre-selection of properties above the global limit of 30 to be examined by the Committee. The critical factors in the Cairns Decision were two ceilings: the total number of new nominations to be accepted, set provisionally at 30; and 1 property per State Party per year. After having implemented this Decision for two years, the number of nominations examined by the Committee has declined. Nevertheless, he noted the failure to achieve greater geographic and thematic representation of properties proposed for inscription. The Director also stressed the importance of the need to look at the capacity of the system. Following discussions with the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies have indicated that their upper limit as regards the evaluation of new nominations, without additional resources, would be 20 natural evaluations by IUCN, and 40 cultural evaluations by ICOMOS. By retaining the one-property-per-country limit, the Committee would stay within this capacity, but he acknowledged that there might be other solutions.

3. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for discussion, recalling the need to keep the agenda item open for the remainder of the week, allowing time for the working group established, to further discuss the topic and make recommendations to the Committee.

4. The Delegation of **India** indicated that it found the document disappointing. Although the additional information provided by the Secretariat in its presentation was helpful in explaining the document, it did not address the core issues. Not all States Parties could take advantage of the nomination derogations proposed by the Cairns Decision (e.g., exemptions for deferred and referred properties, extensions, and trans-boundary nominations). Furthermore, the absence of a grace period in the nomination cycle was a handicap in presenting nominations. The new schedule made no provision for the submission of new information after the Advisory Body evaluation had been published. In general, different regions have different needs concerning the preparation of nominations. It was therefore essential to give further consideration to increasing training and other assistance notably to build capacity in under-represented countries. The working group should be provided with statistics on the results of the implementation of the Cairns Decision during the last two years.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that it had no difficulty with the Draft Decision as presented. Furthermore, it stressed the need to allow a sufficient length of time for the full implementation of the Cairns Decision. The Delegation proposed that the Committee review the Cairns Decision in 2006 before making a decision about changing it.

6. The Delegation of **Finland** agreed that this was a complex issue and that main problem to be addressed was the lack of representativity in the List. It asked what had been achieved as regards the analyses of the List and Tentative Lists by thematic categories. It acknowledged that while work was underway, the complete study was not yet available. There was a need to establish typologies in order for the study to be used as a strategic instrument that would contribute to improving the representativity of the List. It suggested that the creation of typologies could be a task of the working group.

7. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the analysis of the Cairns Decision was complicated and that the question of the ceiling was not the most important. On the other hand, the question of representivity and the balance of the List was essential. The Delegation would, like the Delegation of the United Kingdom, like more time to be given to the implementation of the decision before an evaluation of the situation can be done. The Delegation insisted on the fact that the Cairns Decision had contributed to slowing the imbalance on the List. Indeed, if this decision had not been adopted, the countries having nominated sites for inscription would no doubt not have been limited to a single nomination per country which would have increased the imbalance even more. The study of the typologies, in preparation by the Advisory Bodies, could help give some leads for the future. Other solutions deserve to be looked into, for example that of a sponsorship system. Concerning the global ceiling, this was not a major question since the Centre and the

Advisory Bodies seemed to be able to manage up to 60 nominations (20 natural sites and 40 cultural sites) without difficulty.

8. The Delegation of **Hungary** recalled that it was necessary to draw up the terms of reference and the mandate of the working group, if one were to be created. Concerning the question of balance on the List, it was important to accurately define the term "balance". Was it a question of re-balancing the List as regards nature and culture (by a comparison of the number of natural sites and cultural ones or by a comparison of the surface area that the sites occupy)? Or was it a question of examining the geographical or thematic balance? It would be useful, therefore, to be able to look at different statistics from the point of view of all the definitions of balance. The Delegation recalled that these figures could be contained in the reports of the Advisory Bodies which would be published in time for the next session of the Committee.

9. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted that the Cairns Decision was the culmination of a process, not an event in itself. It recalled the extensive meetings that had been held prior to the adoption of this decision, and noted that the Decision also provided for a review mechanism. However, there had not yet been enough time for such an evaluation to take place and thus agreed with the necessity of setting up a working group with clear Terms of Reference and a long term mandate. The Delegation observed that if the Committee adopted a fast-track method, the problems would not be solved and in its view, the Draft Decision presented in the document did not form the basis of a decision for the Committee at this time.

10. The Delegation of **Argentina**, indicated that it supported the Cairns Decision with regard to the limit of one property per year. Such a limit encourages a better quality nomination. Poor quality nominations multiply the workload of both the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. It said that the thematic criteria for limiting the number of nominations needed to be further developed. Criteria should not be limited to simple architectural typologies. The Committee should attempt to reinforce capacity building, which would further improve the quality of nominations, notably through regional workshops and meetings. States Parties should be involved in these meetings.

11. In closing the list of speakers, the **Chairperson** declared that a two-minute limit would be imposed on each speaker.

12. The Delegation of **South Africa** recalled the principal mission of the *Convention*, in protecting World Heritage properties regardless of the territory in which the property is located. It called attention to the need for countries whose heritage was well represented on the World Heritage List to assist under-represented countries, saying that it was in the interest of the international

community to protect the heritage of the world, regardless of boundaries.

13. The Delegation of **Mexico**, agreed with the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Lebanon, and referred to the need to study the thematic analysis reports currently being prepared by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation made five additional points: First, the need to strengthen regional cooperation; second, the importance of technical and thematic meetings; third, more decisive financial support to under-represented countries; fourth, increasing the capacity of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in reviewing nominations; and fifth, the need for the Centre to update regularly the information on Tentative Lists and the different categories represented in the Tentative Lists.

14. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled the intervention of the Delegation of Zimbabwe concerning the process and the work which had made it possible to arrive at the Cairns Decision. The Delegation also underscored, like Lebanon and Argentina, that the Cairns Decision had put a brake on the increasing imbalance on the List and that it had also improved the quality of the nominations made as well as the quality of the State of conservation reports. The Delegation supported the remarks of the Delegations of India and United Kingdom for whom all the factors allowing the Cairns Decision to be reviewed were not yet available and asked how a group could study this question without this information. Moreover, the Delegation insisted on the need to make an analysis of the List, but above all to identify the properties which are not inscribed on the List and should have been on it for a long time.

15. The Delegation of **China** said that although the Cairns Decision was well intended, it did not prove effective and was not in conformity with the *Convention*. In addition, the quota system imposed by the Decision was not equitable. A system based on objective value and criteria would be more appropriate. It stressed the importance of the typology study, which would help to increase the representativity of the List and keep the growth in the number of properties at a manageable level. The Delegation recommended no limit on the number of Natural properties proposed for inscription. Furthermore, China wished to share its experience in preparing difficult and challenging nominations with other States Parties which may benefit from this experience.

16. The **Delegation of Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of the United Kingdom: it was too soon to review the Cairns Decision.

17. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its support for the objectives fixed by the Cairns Decision, although it was necessary to identify more effective implementation mechanisms. The Delegation informed the Committee in particular of the actions undertaken by Portugal, and particularly the training actions in the preparation of nominations, which were intended for several Portuguese-

speaking countries in Africa. On the other hand, the Delegation considered that a working group could be extremely useful, as long as its work was not limited to a few days. Furthermore, in agreement with the intervention of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation of Portugal noted that it would be difficult to analyse the impact of the Cairns Decision at the moment and that it would be better to wait until 2006.

18. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the concept of a working group and wished to be a member of the group.

19. The Delegation of **Greece** recalled the intervention of the Delegation of China and underlined that the only criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List as stipulated in the *World Heritage Convention* was "Outstanding Universal Value". It further stated its readiness to provide support and assistance to the Advisory Bodies and the Centre thus avoiding unnecessary quotas.

20. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** stated that it was delighted at the creation of a working group which could look into the numerous ideas expressed in the room. Recalling the objectives and the philosophy of the *World Heritage Convention*, in particular as an instrument of international cooperation, the Delegation, whilst confirming its support for the philosophy of the Cairns Decision, insisted on the fact that it was important to find a consensus in drawing up any new measures, if those established at Cairns were no longer adequate. The mechanisms could certainly be improved with more resources, by means of twinning schemes, as others had already suggested. It would therefore be useful to set up a working group in which the Delegation of Italy could participate.

21. The **spokesperson for ICOMOS** noted that this was the first phase, essentially based on statistics, was complete and the second phase, more analytical, was now underway and would be ready for the 28th Session of the Committee.

22. The **Chairperson** concluded the discussion by recognizing that no consensus had been reached. Although the majority supported the creation of a working group, the timeframe and mandate of the group was still unclear. The Chairperson made two proposals, assuming that no Delegations were opposed to the creation of a Working Group: a short term Working Group to report back to this Session of the Committee on Thursday 3 July or a longer term Working Group to study the issue throughout the year and report to the next Session of the Committee in 2004.

23. The Delegation of **Finland** was in favour of a long term Working Group.

24. The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested a third alternative to those proposed by the Chairperson: not to constitute a working group until the Advisory Bodies'

studies are published. The Delegation expressed itself in favour of the creation of a working group which would take account of the reports of the Advisory Bodies.

25. The **Chairperson** rephrased her proposal and asked the Committee to give its views on the duration of the Working Group.

26. The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the mandate of a short term Working Group should be to address the issue of thematic categories and requested the Centre to provide the statistical information needed to analyse the List and set the terms of reference for the establishment of a long term Working Group.

27. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** was in favour of a long term Working Group.

28. The Delegation of **Mexico**, agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon, which maintained that the Working Group could not complete its work until the Reports of the Advisory Bodies were available.

29. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed itself in favour of the creation of a long term working group which would work with the Advisory Bodies.

30. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** called attention to the need for terms of reference for a long term Working Group that would help to advise on the way forward. The Committee should start a process by setting up a working group, but should not attempt to review the Cairns Decision at this time. The Delegation suggested that the Working Group could report back to the Committee at its next session, or in 2006.

31. The Delegation of **India** noted the importance of establishing a short term Working Group to identify the objectives and develop clear guidelines for a longer term Working Group. Statistical information would be needed from the Centre to develop the Terms of Reference.

32. The Delegation of **Nigeria** was concerned about the postponement of this item until the next session of the Committee and thus highlighted the need to establish both short term and long term Working Groups.

33. The Delegation of **Portugal** and the Delegation of **Lebanon** declared that they were in favour of the creation of a long term working group.

34. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that there was no point in setting up a working group as long as the Advisory Bodies's statistics and studies were not available.

35. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Belgium. Nominations currently under evaluation do not provide an adequate basis for review as they have been in preparation for an extended period of time, sometimes even years.

36. The Delegation of **China** agreed with the Delegation of Egypt. The long term Working Group scenario was favored, but the Delegation considered that this Group could have both short and long term mandates. Provisional measures could be elaborated by the end of this Session of the Committee and once the Reports of the Advisory Bodies become available, the Working Group could make a more comprehensive evaluation of the Cairns Decision and report on this issue to the 28th Session of the Committee.

37. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** recommended the creation of two working groups. The first, short term, to define the directions for the work and the second to look in depth at the options proposed by the previous group and to be able to present results at the 28th Session of the Committee.

38. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco**, supporting the intervention made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, recalled that the Cairns Decision was a major step in the work of the Committee and that it was too early to deliberate on this question.

39. The **Chairperson** expressed concern over the fact that no consensus had yet been reached. She proposed to leave this agenda item open and come back to it later in the week or to continue the discussion.

40. The Delegation of **South Africa** suggested to set up a short term Working Group to make recommendations to the Committee concerning the need to establish a long term Working Group and if so, to determine its terms of reference, timeframe and benchmarks.

41. This proposal was in turn supported by the Delegations of the United Kingdom, Finland, Hungary, Oman and Nigeria.

42. The **Chairperson** then declared the Decision to create a short term Working Group to define the terms of reference and time frame required to evaluate the Cairns Decision adopted. This working group would report back to the Committee on Thursday, 3 July with recommendations for adoption by the Committee at this session.

43. It was further decided that the working group would be composed of members of the following members of the Committee: Hungary, India, South Africa, Egypt, China, Lebanon, United Kingdom, Greece, Finland, Republic of Korea, Zimbabwe as well as the Advisory Bodies. The working group would appoint its own chairperson at its first meeting and would be open to all other delegates wishing to participate (see Decision **27 COM 14**).

6A STATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC 2003: SYNTHESIS PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/6A

1. The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre**, introduced Item 6A of the Agenda. She highlighted the great variety of the Asia-Pacific region with 39 States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, and the tremendous differences in the size of countries and types of World Heritage properties.

2. She underlined the participatory approach taken from the start towards the Periodic Reporting process, involving the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and various UNESCO Field Offices and UNESCO Divisions. Nine national preparatory meetings and three regional consultation meetings were held between 2001-2003. She stated that National Periodic Reports were submitted by 36 States Parties, but that Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Tajikistan had not submitted Section I reports. She described the tabular structure of the working document, which was a synthesis of over 3,000 pages of the national reports received, and expressed great satisfaction in the 100% rate of responses on the state of conservation of the 88 cultural, natural and mixed properties of the Asia-Pacific Region. She highlighted the importance of a regional approach to issues like legislation, tourism and international assistance, and highlighted the usefulness of the list of recommendations and sub-regional proposals for the follow-up action to the Periodic Reporting exercise.

3. The Deputy Director then drew the attention of the Committee to some of the common threats and risks identified through the Periodic Reporting for the Asia-Pacific Region, which include: development and population pressure; urban expansion and agricultural development; uncontrolled tourism; vandalism, theft and destruction of heritage; natural disasters; military and armed conflicts. Population increase is a major trend in many Asian countries, often resulting in mass migration and rising demands for natural resources. She noted the possible contribution of World Heritage to poverty alleviation. She highlighted other common threats such as atmospheric pollution, intrusive commercial development and insensitive public and private construction works, which often lead to destruction or alteration of the heritage value. With regard to the Pacific, she referred to the net population decline of some of the island countries. Global climate change and vast remoteness are some of the other threats and challenges that the Pacific region is faced with. She concluded by recalling the need for property boundaries and better-defined World Heritage protected areas, and greater linkages with poverty alleviation schemes.

4. **The Ambassador and Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO, H.E. Mrs Neelam Sabharwal**, reflected upon the Periodic Reporting for the Asia-Pacific Region as a useful exercise for the States Parties. Such an exercise helps focus on the main issues of cultural and natural heritage in the region. She gave a bird's eye view of the region, highlighting the great disparity in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* within the region, from unrepresented to under-represented to nominally represented categories of World Heritage. The enormous diversity of situations is the result of the size of this region and of the late recognition of certain categories of heritage at national and international levels. World Heritage programmes should especially encourage the unique heritage of sacred properties, intangible and associated heritage.

5. Ambassador Sabharwal said that the fixed periodicity of the Regional Periodic Reporting was a way to monitor the vulnerable heritage of the Asia-Pacific Region. She referred to initiatives taken prior to the Periodic Reporting for the Asia-Pacific Region, with the support of the Committee and the World Heritage Centre, together with the co-operation of the UNESCO Field Offices. She agreed that, while these numerous initiatives have assisted the States Parties in the Asia-Pacific Region in identifying unrepresented categories of heritage or in mobilizing technical and financial support to prepare sound nominations, the rich heritage of this region was still far from being well represented on the World Heritage List, and she illustrated her point by citing the ICOMOS 2000 analysis of World Heritage categories.

6. Ambassador Sabharwal recognized that the rich and diverse heritage of the region had yet to be duly represented: such as tropical coastal marine and small island ecosystems, including areas with migratory marine species, cultural landscapes, karst and steppe areas, as well as deserts, forests, karst systems and other bio-diversity hot-spots that are increasingly endangered. Fossil hominid, rock art, prehistoric and proto-historic areas which are linked to human evolution over different periods also require attention, as do numerous major land, maritime and religious routes brought about by the long, rich and diverse history of Asian civilizations. She also highlighted that although the number of monumental properties was already high in the Asia-Pacific region, the archaeological and monumental properties inscribed on the World Heritage List to date were not fully representative of the long and varied history of the region. As for vernacular settlement areas, modern and contemporary architecture, they are greatly under-represented and the strengthening and conservation of such heritage must be elaborated on a mid- to long-term basis. She drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the industrial and technological heritage was only starting to be recognized as an important yet endangered heritage category in the Asia-Pacific Region, with the Darjeeling Himalaya Railway in India, and the Irrigation System of Dujiangyan in China. Canals,

of which China has old and unique examples, need to be recognized as World Heritage.

7. Ambassador Sabharwal noted that with over 60% of the world population, the Asia-Pacific Region was faced with the challenges of poverty alleviation and development, together with conservation of its rich heritage. To this end, the World Heritage Committee must look at how the *Convention* can be a catalyst for protection, as the region calls for stimulating and catalyzed action. She expressed her wish that the Committee take into account the geopolitical reality of the region when promoting cluster and transboundary nominations. She concluded by differentiating the possible actions to be taken. At the Committee level, she suggested promoting a new approach in the inscription and recognition process, while avoiding the 'Bamiyan' situation. She underlined the need, at the national level, for strengthened legislation, a more positive, proactive approach to in-Danger listing, upgrading of management and conservation skills, and awareness-raising on the possible co-existence of heritage conservation and development.

8. **The Chairperson of the Thai National Committee for World Natural and Cultural Heritage, Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen**, informed the Committee on the issues concerning legislation which were raised within the Periodic Reporting for the Asia-Pacific Region. He recalled that three fundamental questions concerning legislation had been posed, which were:

(i) Have States Parties succeeded in complying with their treaty obligations under the *World Heritage Convention*?

(ii) Are the provisions in the *World Heritage Convention* and *Operational Guidelines* reflected in national laws?

(iii) Are the existing national laws adequate? Effective? Are they being implemented? Are they being updated?

9. The Periodic Reporting revealed that insufficiencies remain in national legal provisions, both in terms of definition and implementation. He also underlined that some States Parties required mechanisms for enhanced co-ordination between different levels of national and local administration, as well as new legal protection for new categories of heritage.

10. The Periodic Reporting had highlighted the need for increased sharing of information between States Parties on various legislation. The Region has requested and recommended that a database on legislation be established and regularly updated by the World Heritage Centre and be made available in both hard copy and through electronic means.

11. Dr. Wichiencharoen further highlighted a few innovative legal instruments identified through the Regional Periodic Reporting in Australia, China, Japan, Laos and Vietnam, such as inter-ministerial mechanisms for the protection of World Heritage and World Heritage-specific legislation.

12. Finally, specific follow-up actions related to legislation presented within the working document were referred to.

13. **The Deputy President of the Heritage Trust of Malaysia, Mr. Laurence Loh**, made a presentation on development and tourist pressures in Asia and the Pacific. He explained that the downside of these pressures was experienced in four areas, especially in urban areas: culture and its simplifications; the ethos of the Asian development paradigm; government, with the issues of promotion of private transportation and heritage tourism; and religion. He felt that the public's understanding of culture was simplistic, and that misinterpretation of its meaning resulted in bad decisions that often culminated in the devaluation or destruction of Asia's heritage, be it natural or cultural.

14. He suggested that the Asian development paradigm has resulted in the creation of urban architecture whose scale has overpowered the traditional forms in historic cores. Modern skyscrapers closed in on them, changing their settings forever.

15. He also stated that governments did not make heritage conservation a priority as evidenced by the funds invested. Instead, they actively promote tourism and a car ownership culture. Both activities often impose great strains on the environment and the built heritage. It is clear that in order to ensure that heritage properties live up to their educational and tourism potential, management strategies must be put into place. These include the delivery of an authentic heritage experience, defining limits of acceptable change and tourist facilities in accordance with the cultural setting.

16. He pointed out that religious or sacred properties had legitimate needs, which were often in conflict with conservation practice. These include spatial requirements for growing congregations, replacement of perceived dilapidated structures, redevelopment funds and the need to be financially self-sustaining.

17. He drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the imbalance of the World Heritage properties in Asia and the Pacific had been emphasized. Within the region itself, the imbalance between the monumental and the non-monumental is equally apparent. These factors and the mitigation of tourism and development pressures must be addressed.

18. **The Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO, H. E. Teiichi Sato** spoke about international assistance and co-operation.

19. Overviewing the trends of the International Assistance in the Asia-Pacific Region, H.E. Mr T. Sato drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that only 12% of all International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund had been allocated to this region between 1978 and 1992. This proportion had risen to 26% by 2001, partly due to an increase of properties and expanding threats facing them, as well as an increased demand for Preparatory Assistance. He underscored, however, that while International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to this region has increased, regular government budgets remain the primary sources of safeguarding the World Heritage properties, and are far from adequate in view of the pressing needs.

20. Mr Sato further underscored the imbalance within the Asia-Pacific region, pointing out that the Pacific Region, for example, had only received US\$ 100,000 between 1992 and 2001. Such imbalance is primarily a reflection of the diverse priority needs within the region as a whole, and more fundamentally, the difference in the number of World Heritage properties each State Party has. Some sub-regions require Emergency Assistance, while others need Technical Co-operation and Training Assistance. The number of properties and the amount of funds allocated to each State Party are not compatible.

21. Mr Sato stressed the need for in-depth analysis to discuss further how to address these issues. Noting that the World Heritage Fund provides assistance for various activities today, including monitoring activities, the prime role of the World Heritage Fund should focus more on serving in a catalytic manner, and as "seed money" to raise further financing. .

22. While recognizing that extra-budgetary funds mobilized by the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage, numerous bilateral and multilateral donors and NGOs, all contribute to try to meet the overwhelming assistance needs, he underlined that for many natural and cultural heritage properties, assistance mobilized through the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO has proved to be a vital "financial life-line" to protect the authenticity and integrity of the properties.

23. Mr Sato emphasized the need for the establishment of innovative partnerships with a wider range of players for sustainable financing of heritage conservation, while giving due attention to constant examination and re-evaluation of the present activities. He concluded by stressing the importance of diversifying funding and support bases for the activities, which are more effective.

24. **The Deputy Minister of Information and Culture of the Transitional Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, H. E. G. R. Yusufzai**, started by conveying

the best wishes from the Minister of Information and Culture of the Transitional Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, Dr. S. M. Raheen, who could not attend the meeting. He also congratulated the new Chairperson and wished her success. He drew the participants' attention to the endangered cultural heritage of war-torn Afghanistan. He also conveyed his Government's appreciation of the outgoing Chairperson's efforts and wished him success for the future.

25. Mr Yusufzai emphasized the rich and unique cultural heritage of West and Central Asian States Parties, which nevertheless need more recognition, and proposed publishing different types of surveys in order to increase awareness.

26. Mr Yusufzai reminded participants that improvement in heritage legislation is one of many identified needs of the sub-region. As an example, Afghanistan, with UNESCO's assistance has recently revised its law on the protection of historical monuments and cultural heritage. Revision and updating of the Tentative Lists and capacity-building measures for the preparation of nomination dossiers are considered as priorities for West and Central Asian countries. In order to do this, the Deputy Minister suggested exchanging expertise and know-how on good practices at national and international levels. He also suggested establishing better co-ordination between the responsible government agencies and professional organizations in the field of protection and management of cultural heritage. He appreciated the usefulness of the CentralAsianEarth 2002-2012 Programme in addressing the priority needs of the sub-region and the Asian region as a whole. He invited participants to look at document *WHC-03/27.COM/20B* concerning the World Heritage Programmes.

27. Mr Yusufzai suggested that professional training in the field of management should be enhanced. To this end, Afghanistan recently set up a Publicity and Awareness Committee within the Ministry of Information and Culture to raise awareness on the protection of Afghan cultural heritage. He stated that security and stability have always been two decisive factors in the protection of heritage, and that the enhancement of the sub-region's security could only benefit cultural heritage.

28. While thanking the World Heritage Centre for its co-operation in the field of protecting, conserving and managing cultural properties, he expressed his hopes that this co-operation would be expanded in the future, especially to address the shortage of financial resources available for heritage protection in West and Central Asian countries. He expressed his high hopes in the continuing efforts of the World Heritage Committee to provide financial and technical support to West and Central Asian States Parties for the revision of Tentative Lists and the preparation of nomination dossiers, in particular for natural heritage.

29. **The Deputy Permanent Delegate of Pakistan to UNESCO, Dr. Rukhsana Zia**, started by emphasizing some of the recommendations of the South Asian States Parties for Section I of the Periodic Report. She highlighted the need to include various categories of heritage into national inventories, and to apply complementary legal UNESCO instruments for the protection of tangible and intangible heritage. She pointed out certain management needs which could be addressed by cultural impact assessments, the setting of models and precedents and a heritage legislation database among others tools. She recommended that management plans be elaborated with local communities, who are often the owners or stakeholders of World Heritage properties. In the same way, traditional custodians should be trained for the protection of, and education about World Heritage.

30. Dr. Zia stated that tourism aspects of Managements Plans were considered a prerequisite for inscription on the World Heritage List, and that they could benefit from the approaches on ecotourism and sustainable tourism. Taking financial resources into consideration, she suggested that systematic revenue collection take place at the national level (Sri Lanka being a good example), and at the international level through innovative ways of funding. She explained that professional needs could be addressed through the establishment of a database of professionals, training programmes, closer networking of States Parties, participation in the Asian Academy of Cultural Heritage Management, and the optimal use of GIS, information maps and scientific advances in conservation. She suggested the prioritizing of the identified needs, and noted that the needs of the Asia-Pacific region were general.

31. Dr. Zia recalled that education on heritage, both formal and informal, was indispensable in South Asia and recommended a site-specific assessment for World Heritage guides to ensure proper education and information. As a conclusion, she proposed to set up a network for documentation, management, conservation and training at sub- and regional levels, as well as an interim review of heritage in the sub-region every two years.

32. Dr. Zia went on to present recommendations for Section II. Proper definitions were needed for statements of significance and property boundaries, due to a lack of understanding of the current terminology. She recommended that boundaries, management and visitor plans be more site-specific and that while site managers be trained in international conservation principles. She referred to the need for World Heritage funding of personnel, staff training, GIS, research and networking in the sub-region. She mentioned the threats identified in the regions and recommended elaborating counter-actions and monitoring mechanisms to address these threats. She considered that the preservation of authenticity through continuous and periodic monitoring of conservation and measuring the impact of tourism on World Heritage

properties, were high priorities. She concluded by recommending that Section II be even more site-specific.

33. **The Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of the Philippines to UNESCO, H.E. Mr Hector Villaroel**, focused his speech on the identified needs and proposed actions adopted by the eight South-East Asian States Parties, following consultations held in 2001 and 2003.

34. Considering the needs of the sub-region in terms of national inventories, legislation for the identification of natural and cultural heritage, updating of Tentative Lists and capacity-building for the preparation of sound nomination dossiers, the Ambassador suggested that UNESCO provide States Parties with good examples of the following: definitions of heritage, inventory formats, Tentative List format, statements of significance, management plans and nomination dossiers. All these should be gathered from various countries and exchanged via the UNESCO website and through the organization of national and regional workshops.

35. Mr Villaroel stated that the need for integration of World Heritage zoning into comprehensive planning as well as monitoring needs could be addressed by strengthening cooperation between responsible agencies and organizations, and by publicizing examples of existing inter-ministerial or interdepartmental commissions at different levels of administration. UNESCO should provide the States Parties with examples of good practices related to local community involvement, tourism revenue collection and tourism management to address needs in these fields. He proposed that capacity building activities with multiplier effect be increased to promote management and conservation skills.

36. The Ambassador then talked about needs and actions concerning Section II of the Periodic Report. He proposed that States Parties prepare new statements of significance according to UNESCO guidelines. He suggested that the principle of "leopard spots" be incorporated into the World Heritage protection zoning, and that model forms for different heritage categories be incorporated in the Tentative Lists. He recommended that innovative management plans (such as Luang Prabang's or Angkor's) be disseminated as models to other countries in the region. He supported the Asian Academy of World Heritage Management and the Forum UNESCO as a tool to address the problem of inadequate staffing and training. Regarding financial arrangements, he suggested that feasibility studies be undertaken to evaluate different types of financial trust funds. Information Technology training needs, especially on GIS mapping techniques, were also acknowledged by the Ambassador. Finally, he proposed that a comparative study on possible tourist tax mechanisms be undertaken, as well as the creation of new tourist itineraries to diffuse on-site visitor pressures.

37. The Ambassador specified that he would not conclude, leaving this task to **Mr. Richard Engelhardt**,

UNESCO Regional Adviser for Culture in the Asia-Pacific, who presented the Pan-Asian Recommendations on Cultural Heritage. He expressed his gratitude to the World Heritage Centre for its assistance during the preparation of the Periodic Report for the Philippines, and for enabling a direct contact between national authorities and the Centre, key to a better understanding of the importance of the *World Heritage Convention* in the preservation and protection respective cultural heritage.

38. **The Chief of the Education and Culture Division of the Republic Korean National Commission for UNESCO, Mr. Huh Kwon**, stated that two out of the five North-East Asian States Parties had no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and that inscription of their heritage should be considered a priority to enhance the representativity of the List. He informed the Committee that the site managers of North-East Asia had met for the first time at the UNESCO regional meeting. He expressed his appreciation to the World Heritage Centre for its support and invited the Committee members to refer to pages 29-30 and 60-63 of document *WHC-03/27.COM/6A Rev.*

39. He informed the Committee that Section II for North-East Asia only applied to China and Japan, and went on with the recommendations for Section I. He stated that the five States Parties had agreed that legal provision for protective buffer zones should be provided at the national level, as well as a clear legal definition of the status of World Heritage zoning. He recalled that the Hanoi workshop recommendations highlighted the role of world cultural and natural heritage in poverty alleviation projects.

40. He supported the idea that management authorities should be in control of tourism planning, and that the tourism industry should provide inputs for the protection of World Heritage, especially the List of World Heritage in Danger. He recognized the need to establish financial mechanisms such as Trust Funds or bonds, to increase heritage conservation resources. He stated that education, information and awareness-raising were considered as high priorities, with the integration of heritage education into school and university curricula, as well as the sharing and dissemination of information. As a conclusion to the presentation of Section I recommendations, he highlighted on the further implementation of capacity-building activities and the setting-up of a sub-regional network of heritage managers.

41. He drew a general picture of the Chinese and Japanese properties included in Section II of the Periodic Report. He reported that the North-East Asian States Parties identified a common difficulty, namely that traditional building material industries and craftsmanship should be revived, and that they recommended reinforcing training of traditional skills and know-how. He explained that funding was generally considered insufficient at site-level and that countries in the region were facing the same

challenges to improve property management plans and relations with local communities as a whole. He emphasized the need to integrate heritage interpretation at the local level.

42. In conclusion, he drew the attention of the Committee to North-East Asia's urgent need to devise and implement preventive measures for the protection of World Heritage and risk-preparedness strategies taking into account wooden architecture as the main component of most cultural heritage in the sub-region.

43. The **Secretariat** then presented a summary of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Pacific Island Countries (PICs). It informed the Committee, that despite the generous financial support of Norway, it had not been possible to ensure the participation of a representative of Samoa to attend the Committee session and present the Periodic Report for the Pacific as had been planned.

44. The Secretariat referred to the unique and rich biological and cultural diversity of the Pacific and named the ten Pacific Island Countries, who in addition to Australia and New Zealand, have now joined the *Convention*. It then highlighted the state of implementation of the *Convention* in the sub-region, noting in particular that East Rennell in the Solomon Islands is the only World Heritage property amongst any of the Pacific Island Countries, that Fiji has prepared a Tentative List and was preparing a nomination of the colonial capital, Levuka and that Papua New Guinea had prepared a draft nomination of the early agriculture property of Kuk in the Western Highlands. She noted that other States Parties had only joined recently and were therefore only beginning to work to implement the *Convention*. She commented that despite three written requests, no Pacific Island Countries had sent Periodic Reports by February 2003. The convening of a Capacity-Building workshop in Apia, Samoa, funded by Italian Funds-in-Trust, had therefore been an opportunity to assist States Parties in the preparation of Periodic Reports. The nine Pacific Island Countries that attended the meeting prepared recommendations to the Committee as summarized in *WHC-03/27.COM/6 A Rev.*

45. **Bruce Leaver, First Assistant Secretary, Heritage Division of Environment, Australia**, made a presentation on the recommendations of the Blue Mountains workshop held in Australia in 2002 on Periodic Reporting for natural and mixed properties in the Asia-Pacific Region.

46. He informed the Committee that there was successful State Parties consultation on World Heritage issues in the region. He stressed that major gaps and needs in monitoring of the World Heritage properties in the Asia-Pacific region need to be addressed. Referring to the Hanoi meeting on Periodic Reporting for natural properties in the Asia-Pacific Region held in January 2003, he stated that it was follow-up of the Blue Mountains meeting. He further explained that one of the positive outcomes of the Hanoi

meeting included an agreement for the presentation of a paper on Asia-Pacific Periodic Reporting to the World Parks Congress in Durban, South Africa, in September 2003. On the role of Asia Pacific Focal Point, he said that the Hanoi meeting supported its role and urged the need of Information Technology in the region. He affirmed that Australia would work closely with New Zealand in promoting the *World Heritage Convention*, and would look forward to supporting New Zealand initiatives in the Pacific, the region which is the most under-represented on the World Heritage List.

47. **Mr Brian Sheppard, Senior Officer of the Department of Conservation of New Zealand**, presented natural and mixed heritage recommendations of the Regional Synthesis Report Planning Workshop for the Asia-Pacific held in Hanoi, Vietnam in January 2003.

48. He stated that the Hanoi Workshop identified the need to undertake case studies to examine current and potential conflicts, propose partnerships for sustainable tourism and document heritage conservation strategies. He stressed the role of communities in conservation and management referring to Article 5(a) of the *World Heritage Convention*. Regarding poverty issues in the Asia-Pacific Region, he informed the Committee that the action plan recommended by the Hanoi meeting should be considered by the Committee to ensure International Assistance from donors, support poverty alleviation projects and seek heritage conservation and management funding opportunities. He referred to the importance of considering the social and economic livelihoods of local and regional communities in decision-making concerning World Heritage.

49. **UNESCO's Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific** presented the PAN-Asia Recommendation on Culture Heritage, informed the Committee of the need to revise the statement of significance, borders and management plans of the inscribed World Heritage properties in the Asian Region. On the basis of these revised statements of significance, the borders of some properties might have to be redefined to ensure protection of the entirety of the World Heritage property.

50. He stressed that national inventories should be prepared, elaborated, revised and updated within the framework of the Global Strategy for a credible representative and balanced World Heritage List, to reflect the diverse socio-cultural heritage of the Asian region. He noted that national legislation might also have to be reviewed, revised or consolidated. He defended the harmonization of action at the World Heritage properties.

51. He underscored the need to monitor the impact of the Official Development Assistance projects on heritage properties. Furthermore he highlighted the need to conduct cultural impact assessments of all proposed development activities at World Heritage properties with donor agencies and on-site project teams.

52. He supported the idea that examples of best practice of local community participation in heritage conservation should be transmitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the development of manuals and other on-site training materials.

53. Furthermore, he emphasized the need for the site managers to be trained in management as well as for the on-site staff to be trained in new tools (GIS, ICT, non-invasive and remote sensing techniques and scientific monitoring techniques). He further underscored that particular attention should be paid to the application of traditional building techniques in conservation practice.

54. It was recommended these new tools and enhanced training need to be backed up by improved information services to ensure that all necessary and adequate information is available to site managers so that they can make better management decisions.

55. Finally, he focused on the need to establish monitoring indicators and to move from reactive monitoring to predictive instruments. Furthermore, Mr Engelhardt drew the attention of the Committee to the necessity of controlling theft and vandalism at the World Heritage properties in Asia. He concluded with the request to the World Heritage Centre and to the Advisory Bodies to establish and test monitoring indicators, through a series of sub-regional workshops.

56. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make observations on the presentations.

57. The Delegation of **Belgium** requested clarification of the Secretariat concerning the two Draft Decisions **27COM 6A** and **.27 COM 20B**: It observed that there was some overlap in the subjects dealt with by these two drafts.

58. The **Chairperson** responded to the Delegation of Belgium that the overlapping of Draft Decisions only concerned paragraph 6 of the present Draft Decision, and that this paragraph 6 would be adopted formally only after discussion of Agenda Items 20B and 11.

59. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the substantive and comprehensive presentation made, while noting with satisfaction that time limit of two hours had been respected. However, it expressed concern about the shorter amount of time allocated for discussion of the follow up to the Periodic Reports in the African and Arab regions. It therefore requested that the World Heritage Committee allocate at least the same amount of time for discussing the follow-up of the other Periodic Reports in order to facilitate equal consideration of the different regions.

60. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested clarification on the meaning of 'publication' in paragraph

4 of Draft Decision **27 COM 6A**. The Delegation believed that an electronic version was sufficient and financially more adequate. With regards to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision **27 COM 6A**, it suggested that the word 'strengthen', be deleted as it believed that requesting the Director-General of UNESCO to strengthen operations of the World Heritage Centre was beyond the Committee's mandate.

61. Upon invitation by the Chairperson, and in response to the question raised by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the Secretariat intended to disseminate the Final Periodic Report for the Asia-Pacific Region through electronic means as well as a paper publication.

62. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** highlighted that the Final Regional Periodic Reports should be disseminated through electronic means rather than paper publication.

63. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed his appreciation for the impressive presentation of the Periodic Report for the Asia-Pacific Region, and recognized that the Committee and the Secretariat had taken lessons learnt from previous Periodic Reports in the Arab and African Regions to improve the presentation process. The Delegation of Egypt stated that, while heritage conservation may contribute to poverty alleviation and sustainable development, heritage conservation could not alleviate poverty. The Delegation of Egypt furthermore believed that it was unnecessary to stress the importance of harmonizing national legislation with the *World Heritage Convention*, as ratification of the *Convention* implies that it is already reflected in national law. Clarification on the use of the terms 'support zone' was requested. Noting that cultural heritage was drawing the attention of the Committee, while natural heritage received less attention, the Delegation of Egypt underscored the need to give due emphasis to natural heritage which is equally important. Finally, acknowledging the importance of the Asia-Pacific Region with more than half the world's population, it appreciated the scope and length of the Periodic Report presentation for the Asia-Pacific Region.

64. The Delegation of **India** expressed its disagreement with the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom to disseminate the outcome of the Periodic Reporting exercise only through electronic means. Noting that more than 65% of Asia-Pacific site managers responded to the Periodic Reporting Questionnaire that they have no Internet access, the Committee's attention was drawn to the necessity and importance for paper publication for this region.

65. The Delegation of **Hungary** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the excellent organization of the impressive presentation of the Periodic Report for Asia-Pacific region. Concerning paragraph 4 of the Draft

Decision, it was suggested that the final report be disseminated “through electronic and/or other appropriate methods”.

66. Observing that paragraphs 4 and 5 of Draft Decision **27 COM 6A** contained no deadline, the Delegation of Belgium requested the insertion of a deadline for these two paragraphs.

67. The **Chairperson** stated that the Committee agreed to paragraph 1, 2, 3 and 7 of the Draft Decision **27 COM 6A**. With regard to paragraph 4, she suggested inserting the phrase ‘a publication to be funded with extra budgetary funds within 3 months’. With regard to paragraph 5, she suggested to use ‘Recommends’ instead of ‘Requests’ and to delete ‘strengthen’. As for paragraph 6, she suggested to keep it in brackets until the Committee decides on the budget and after examining document *WHC-03/27.COM/20B*. Paragraph 7 should remain unchanged.

68. The Delegation of **India** suggested adopting the whole Draft Decision when the Committee would decide on the budget referred to in document *WHC-03/27.COM/20B*.

69. The **Chairperson** closed the debate by adopting the Draft Decision **27 COM 6A** as amended, leaving paragraph 6 in square brackets until examination of document *WHC-03/27.COM/20B*.

6B FOLLOW-UP TO PERIODIC REPORTING IN THE ARAB STATES AND AFRICA AND PREPARATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND IN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/6B

1. The Delegation of **Belgium** requested of the Secretariat that the exercise of the Periodic Reports for the Arab States be published in the same way as those for Africa and Asia/Pacific are.

2. The **Secretariat** confirmed that the publication of the Arab Periodic Reporting had been planned, including information on the follow up since its adoption in the year 2000.

3. The **Chairperson** proposed that the request by the Belgian Delegation be integrated into the final decision on this item (see Decision **27 COM 6B**).

20B WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMMES

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/20B
WHC-03/27.COM/6A.Rev
WHC-03/27.COM/6B
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.20B*

1. The **Secretariat** introduced Item 20B of the agenda on World Heritage Programmes and presented the Regional Programmes for the Arab States and Africa.

Overall approach to Thematic and Regional Programmes

2. The Delegation of **Argentina** welcomed the general approach of the Cities Programme, relevant to the issues faced in urban areas in Latin America.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of Belgium, suggested that the Secretariat should produce a draft consolidated budget to foster coherence. The Secretariat proposed that the allocation for each Programme be examined along with the budget (Item 11).

4. The **Secretariat** recalled that the contribution from the World Heritage Fund to the Regional Programmes is to be considered as seed funding, to be complemented by extrabudgetary funding. The Africa 2009 Programme serves as an example in that regard, with the initial contribution from the World Heritage Fund in addition to extrabudgetary funding support from various donors.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** invited the Secretariat to structure the programmes according to the four strategic objectives, in accordance with Decisions **26 COM 17 A**, **26 COM 17 B** and **26 COM 20**. It recalled that the Budapest Declaration provides for an evaluation of the progress accomplished in 2007 (Decision **26 COM 9**).

6. In order to foster coherence in the Programmes’ approach IUCN proposed: (i) to make use of the existing networks of the Advisory Bodies (regional as well as technical); (ii) to co-ordinate Thematic Programmes with other programmatic activities of the Advisory Bodies; (iii) to ensure linkages between Thematic and Regional Programmes and other World Heritage Programmes, such as the Global Training Strategy.

7. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** welcomed the workshop organized within the framework of the Programme on Sustainable Tourism, and proposed that a comprehensive study on this crucial matter be developed.

8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the methodology developed for each programme was very specific (particularly for Africa and the Arab States). These different approaches may be justified, but require evaluation.

9. The Delegation of **The Netherlands** suggested that the conclusions of the workshop “Linking universal and local values: managing a sustainable future for World Heritage” (Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 22-24 May 2003) be used in designing the programmes.

10. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by other Delegations, suggested that all Draft Decisions be placed at the end of the document for ease of reference.

Regional Programme for the Arab States

11. The Delegation of **Lebanon** pointed out that the international assistance modules proposed within the scope of the Regional Programme for the Arab States should be drawn up in consultation with States Parties in order to meet their specific needs. The general methodology of the programme is of course drawn up in connection with the conclusions of the Periodic Reports, but the assistance modules are more technical tools that must be the subject of a specific workshop.

12. The Delegation of **Hungary** congratulated the Secretariat for the innovative approach of this Regional Programme and remarked that Article 3 of the Draft Decision already aimed to encourage cooperation between the Secretariat and the States Parties in the design of the assistance modules. The Secretariat recalled that the Regional Programmes are run directly by the States Parties, and that the Africa 2009 programme could once again be taken as an example in this regard.

13. The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of the Regional Programme for the Arab States and suggested to ensure linkages between the Regional Programmes for Africa and the Arab States, as these two regions face similar issues in similar types of properties or ecosystems.

14. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** invited the World Heritage Centre to provide an evaluation of the Regional Programme for the Arab States, using the various indicators proposed in document *WHC-03/27.COM/INF.20A*.

15. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed making amendments to Draft Decision **27 COM 20B.1** to (i) ensure that the links are established between the programme and the results of the Periodic Reports; (ii) specify the nature of the cooperation with the Advisory Bodies; (iii) extend the deadline for the evaluation of the programme to 2007.

16. The Delegation of **South Africa** suggested that a regional workshop be organized to ensure that needs are defined by the ultimate beneficiaries of the regional programme and the necessary training activities designed accordingly.

17. When speaking of workshops, the Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the importance of involving site managers from both the Arab and Africa regions.

18. The **Secretariat** recalled that the proposed Regional Programme had been prepared on the basis of the needs

identified by the States Parties themselves through the Periodic Reporting Exercise, and recalled that a number of national and regional meetings had been held which provided opportunities to further consult with States Parties on their needs and most appropriate responses (Decision **27 COM 20B.1**).

Regional Programme for Africa

19. The Delegation of **Belgium**, supported by the Delegation of Thailand, proposed better co-ordination between Module 1 (Africa 2009) and Modules 2 and 3 of the Regional Programme for Africa. The Secretariat indicated that Africa 2009 was an on-going programme, and would serve to provide a methodology for the development of Modules 2 and 3 of the Regional Programme.

20. In supporting the Regional Programme for Africa, the Delegation of **Nigeria** remarked that when dealing with tangible heritage one is also indirectly addressing the intangible heritage. The Delegation proposed that more training and capacity building programmes should be carried out, as this is what Africa needs most. The Delegation called for the promotion of private sector involvement and more multinational funding of programmes as well as exploring how development agencies could assist in executing such programmes.

21. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed making amendments to Draft Decision **27 COM 20B.2** in order to (i) emphasize the close connection between the Regional Programme and the results of the Periodic Reports (Article 7); (ii) switch Articles 10 and 11, which are general in their scope, into a new decision concerning all the programmes (Decision **27 COM 20B.2**).

Regional Programme for Asia

22. The Delegation of Belgium, supported by the Delegations of **Hungary** and **Thailand**, suggested adopting a prudent attitude when formulating the decisions, in order to avoid creating excessive expectations in relation to the initial budget, and proposed in this respect an amendment to Article 4 of the Draft Decision. Thus, objective 4 (reduce poverty) should be made more precise: the aim above all is to show that the reduction of poverty and the protection of the heritage are not contradictory objectives, more than to aim to achieve a significant drop in poverty (Decision **27 COM 20B.3**).

Regional Programme for the Pacific

23. The **Chairperson** asked for comments. There were none (Decision **27 COM 20B.4**).

Regional Programme for the Caribbean

24. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by the Delegation of Barbados, noted that the Draft Decision did

not take into account the results of the meeting held in June 2003 (meeting on the Application of the Periodic Reporting for the Caribbean, Port-au-Prince, Haiti, 17-19 June 2003), and proposed amendments to the Draft Decision (1) to underscore the fact that the proposed programme is the preparatory phase of a comprehensive programme to be developed for the Caribbean, and potentially extended to other sub-regions; (2) to foster linkages between the regional programme and the results of the Periodic Reporting Exercise to be completed in 2004.

25. Proposed amendments to the Draft regional programme were as follows. The main objectives of the programme shall be to (i) create and develop partnerships for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Caribbean sub-region, through a one-day workshop for Regional Organizations (governmental and non-governmental) in the Caribbean; (ii) promote the benefits of the *Convention* to the governments and people of the Caribbean sub-region through: (a) economic impact study of World Heritage in the Caribbean; (b) Caribbean World Heritage properties brochure; (c) a meeting on serial nominations; and (iii) design a ten-year capacity building programme for the Caribbean sub-region through: (a) analyses of existing World Heritage Programmes; (b) completion of Periodic Reporting Exercise and (c) workshop for designing the ten-year programme.

26. Following the proposals and recommendations of the Delegations, the Chairperson proposed that: (i) the five Draft Decisions **27 COM 20B.1** to **27 COM 20B.5** be amended; (ii) a sixth Draft Decision **27 COM 20B.6** be included with recommendations from ICCROM. Articles 10 and 11 of the initial Draft Decision for Africa, the planning for the assessment of the programmes and the necessary linkages with the four Strategic Objectives; and (iii) all articles relevant to the budget be examined in Item 11.

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

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/7A and 7A Corr
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7B
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7E*

1. The Committee was informed that since the 26th session, the Secretariat had received new information on 32 properties (18 natural properties and 14 cultural properties).

NATURAL HERITAGE

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

1. The **Secretariat** reported that Mr. Iokem, technical advisor to the Minister of Water, Forests, Hunting,

Environment and Tourism of CAR visited the Centre on 30 May. Mr. Iokem reported that the contract between the government and a company, called Manovo, that was in charge of the management of the property was interrupted. He also highlighted that the emergency rehabilitation plan that was developed, and whose implementation was suspended by the Centre after the political turmoil, was no longer adapted to the current situation and should be revised. He reported that a new organization, regrouping the safari companies active in the region had been created which would try to mobilize additional private funding for the property.

2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to make an early intervention. It observed that his comment concerned a number of general points concerning properties in Danger. It stressed the need for consistent approach to be adopted for all Recommendations and Decisions, and noted that at present certain Decisions continued to be prepared in different styles of presentation. It stated that there was a need to be precise and clear concerning the relevant reasons to decide to remove properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation reiterated the need for Action Plans to be included for all Draft Decisions. The Delegation queried whether it was in fact essential to present all the Danger properties to the Committee at every session. In conclusion, it proposed that two separate categories would need to be created. The first for all properties where decisions would be needed and another where no new decisions would be required and for which the Committee would have to take note of progress. He mentioned that Decisions were in general too long and were encumbered with too many general considerations.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that for sites in danger, it had no objection to the length of certain draft decisions and insisted on the need for the members of the Committee to take the time to read them for they must not be considered merely as principles. It also recalled that the decisions submitted to the Committee were very important for they generally referred to those taken previously. It is necessary to reduce the length on the state of conservation but maintain the general length of the descriptions.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that the two interventions of the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Lebanon were not contradictory and that it was possible to find a middle way in the process of drawing up the draft decisions to be submitted to the Committee.

5. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** recalled the situation of countries which, like Central Africa, encounter delicate problems in the protection of their sites. It expressed its wish that the Committee take over the responsibility for ensuring the implementation by the State Party of the recommendations formulated for them. Recalling that a large number of sites in countries encountering the same problems have been on the List of

Heritage in Danger for several years, it expressed the wish that the Committee change its current method of working. It therefore expressed its wish that the latter would make clear commitments such as for example becoming involved in favour of aid and international assistance actions so that these States can effectively protect their heritage.

6. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** observed that if looked at closely, the situation in Manovo case might appear to be 'out of control'. The Delegation questioned what the Committee could do, and recommended to send a mission organized by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. The Delegation did not approve of a "paper solution" as the situation was getting precariously close to the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

7. The Delegation of **Greece** stressed that the Committee should carefully examine the issue, and ensure that the will of the State Party to protect the property is evident, otherwise deleting the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger should be taken into account.

8. The Delegation of **Thailand** enquired whether in the light of the statement made by the Delegation of Zimbabwe, an amendment to either paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 would be needed.

9. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Zimbabwe to prepare the required amendments.

10. The **Secretariat** observed that by reducing the length of the decisions, substantial information would have to be left out. This could result in property managers not understanding the Decisions, since often they do not receive the additional documentation and reports provided to the State Party.

11. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** highlighted that it is necessary to join forces to maintain the credibility of the World Heritage List and proposed to ask IUCN and the Centre to evaluate the property objectively over the next 1-2 years in order to enable the Committee to take decisive action.

12. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the amendments presented by Zimbabwe and recalled that the decisions should concentrate mainly on substance, all the problems and the directives.

13. The Delegation of **Finland** expressed support for the view of Saint Lucia to get the advice of the Advisory Bodies on the question if the values for which the property was nominated still exist.

14. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported this and proposed to add a time-scale to the decision, for example 2005.

15. The Delegation of **South Africa** seconded the previous three speakers.

16. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** requested IUCN and the Secretariat to increase its assistance to the property and to send a mission to the property to report to the 28th session of the Committee.

17. The **Chairperson** requested agreement on dates for the mission foreseen.

18. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** requested that given the gravity of the situation, the mission should report to the 28th session. The Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested 2005 be given the difficult conditions in the country.

19. **IUCN** noted that, taking into consideration the number of missions requested by the Committee, priority should be given to this property relative to other properties and the mission to Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park would be sent as soon as possible.

20. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the wording "if possible" be added to the new paragraph of the Decision, requesting the submission of the report to the Committee's 28th session.

21. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.1** as amended.

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that following new information was received since the completion of the working document:

(i) **Okapi Wildlife Reserves** (a) Troops are still present in the reserve and in a recent meeting early June with park and NGO staff, rebel commanders refused to retreat from the reserve. (b) Guard patrols are again taking place, but have to be communicated to the military beforehand hence reducing their effectiveness; (c) through several channels, the Centre is continuing to try to influence rebel commanders to allow free patrolling of the reserve by ICCN staff and to reduce the impact of the military presence.

(ii) **Kahuzi-Biega National Park** (a) Since April, the highland sector was demilitarised and the Park management was able to reopen several patrol posts abandoned since October 2002; (b) The Centre was informed by the Park authorities that MONUC installed military observers as requested on May 21; (c) the low altitude sector of the Park remains off-limit to Park staff due to the persisting insecurity; (d) although coltan extraction has ceased, most miners apparently remain in the Park and reverted to bushmeat hunting and trading and gold panning.

(iii) **Virunga National Park** (a) an aerial survey carried out in April 2003 in the northern part of the Park showed similar problems as in the Kirilirwe area; (b) with the recent attack on Lubero by Rwandan troops, fighting broke out around the Tchiaberimu gorilla sector.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** noted his impression that in spite of efforts of the Committee and donors, the situation in these properties was not improving and raised the question whether considerations for delisting some of the properties should be initiated.

3. The **Secretariat** explained that the situation varies enormously between different properties. The situation in Garamba could be considered stable and despite the presence of the SPLA the population of Rhinos was currently not affected. In Okapi Faunal Reserve, the current situation was setting back previous achievements but the conservation of the property could improve rapidly if security conditions for the work of Park staff improved. The problem is similar in Kahuzi-Biega and Virunga. The Salonga National Park is extremely vast and the deterioration could also be reversed if there is peace.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that this question had already been posed in Budapest at the 26th session, and that there was in Decision **26 COM 21(a)2** an appeal for diplomatic initiatives. It also stressed that this has always been Belgium's position regarding the sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Finally, it proposed to the Rapporteur to that this decision be used to reiterate this diplomatic appeal.

5. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that on page 3 of the report a reference to widespread deforestation has been made, mentioning charcoal burning, illegal settlements, crop growing and even the establishment of schools. Further on a reference to a transition of the landscape from savannah to agricultural land is made, mentioning that elephants and buffalo have disappeared. The Delegation therefore questions if the outstanding universal value still exist and if a de-listing of the property could be necessary.

6. The **Secretariat** explained that this description refers to a particular part of the property, that has been impacted by settlement and encroachment. In general, the savannah sectors have been more impacted but the forest areas, in particular the gorilla sectors, have been far less impacted. As for the savannah sector, which is in part adjacent to Queen Elizabeth Park in Uganda, there is a significant capacity and resilience in the ecosystem thanks to the possibility of repopulation of the Park across the international border from Uganda. This was the case with elephants for example. However, it is clear that the property is severely threatened and needs special attention.

7. The Delegation of **Nigeria** appreciated the explanation given by the Secretariat and hoped that peace

would return quickly to the country, enabling a recovery of the properties.

8. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, in reaction to the interventions made by Saint Lucia and the IUCN, expressed its wish that the Committee not envisage deletion from the List of Heritage in Danger. It suggested to the Advisory Bodies the possibility of a redefinition of the boundaries of some of these sites, so that they no longer include the zones occupied by armed groups.

9. The Delegation of **Hungary** was keen to express its appreciation of the efforts of the Centre and of the State Party for the safeguarding of the Congolese sites. It also underscored that without international cooperation, the universal value of these sites would already have been lost. It noted that a possible deletion of the sites from the World Heritage List would be premature. Finally it proposed to adopt the Draft Decision with the amendments proposed.

10. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** noted an incoherence in the drafting of paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision **27 COM A.2**. It wondered if it would not be better to replace the words "*Congratulate*" by "*Thank*", "*invite*" by "*solicits*" and "*guarantee the future*" by "*concretize*".

11. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus among the Committee and declared Decision **27 COM A.2** adopted as amended.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia)

1. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by Nigeria, noted the lack of time during the session, and requested the Secretariat to limit its presentation only to new information.

2. It also questioned if the situation in this property would have been changed substantially by February 2004 to request the State Party to report again.

3. The **Secretariat** clarified that, although a report was received from the State Party, it did not give information on all benchmarks set by the Committee. Furthermore, as explained in the working document, the new project that will tackle some of the issues started in November 2002 and hence, substantial new information might be available by February 2004.

4. The Delegation of **United Kingdom** reminded the Committee that benchmarks had been set up some time ago, and such things obviously take a long time to be achieved on the ground.

5. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus and declared Decision **27 COM 7A.3** adopted.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)

1. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the property is a strict nature reserve, IUCN Category I. However, given the issues relating to mining and logging and so on, it questioned if this status was appropriate.
2. The **Secretariat** responded that the Guinean part of the World Heritage Sites was the Core Zone of a Biosphere Reserve, providing for sustainable use of the natural resources outside the Core Zone. It confirmed that core zone areas were impacted, but also pointed out that solutions were needed to the broader regional issues rather than to simply change the status of the core zone.
3. **IUCN** noted that key values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, despite conservation problems, still remain present in the core areas which could allow natural recuperation of the nearby areas in the future. IUCN also informed that BHP-Billeteon is undertaking baseline biodiversity assessments that, once completed, would provide valuable up to date information on the state of conservation of the property.
4. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.4** adopted.

Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)

1. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its concern on reading the report. Furthermore, it remarked that the Committee had still not received a reaction on the part of the State Party, nor on the question of the vehicles donated by the Committee and which had been declared stolen, nor on the infrastructures built on the site. It expressed its wish that these questions be posed to the State Party once again, in a "serious" way. Finally, it proposed to replace the word "*recommends*" by "*requests*" in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision **27 COM 7A.5**.
2. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus amongst the Committed on the proposals of the Delegation of Lebanon, and declared Decision **27 COM 7A.5** adopted as amended.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal)

1. The **Chairperson** proposed that since this was a straightforward case, the Committee could immediately discuss the Draft Decision.
2. The Delegation of **Nigeria** approved the Draft Decision.
3. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** agreed with Nigeria, and recommended to use the case as a model.
4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the view of Zimbabwe and proposed to amend the Draft

Decision by congratulating rather than commending the State Party.

5. The Delegation of **South Africa** questioned if the Committee should consider removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.
6. The **Chairperson** suggested to keep the Draft Decision as it is with the possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the following Committee session.
7. The Delegation of **Finland** seconded the position of the United Kingdom.
8. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.6** adopted as amended.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda)

1. The Decision **27 COM 7A.7** was adopted without amendments.

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)

1. Following an introduction by the Centre, the **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Tunisia to make a presentation.
2. The Observer Delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Centre for having provided financial assistance for the drawing up of a management plan for the site. A Scientific Monitoring Programme had been drawn up, along with the IUCN, within the framework of this assistance. A workshop of experts was also held in January 2003 on the site.
3. The Delegation announced that a consensus was reached amongst the participants at this workshop of experts on the importance of the actions carried out until now by Tunisia to ensure the safeguarding of this exceptional site; and in particular the implementation of the decision relating to the supplying of the lake with water from the dam by water releases. The site is now considered as a consumer of water in the same way as the other development sectors within the context of the allocation of the available water resources.
4. Other no less important actions have already been undertaken. The Delegation mentioned in particular: (i) the rehabilitation of the lock which would allow, before the end of this year, a more adequate management of the flows; (ii) the bathymetrical and topographical survey of the marches and the lake which will allow the sedimentary evolution of the lake and the marshes since 1994 and any improvement actions that may be necessary to be evaluated; (iii) the implementation of the Scientific Monitoring Programme validated by the workshop and which allow a better appreciation of the evolution of the ecosystems of the Ichkeul.

5. The interest of Tunisia and the international community in safeguarding this park also took the form of the granting to the Ichkeul park of approximately 2 million dollars by the GEF/World Bank within the framework of the national protected areas management project. This project whose aim is the implementation of the management plan will constitute a coherent framework for all the management and protection actions and will lead, eventually, to the creation of the park's own management structure.

6. The Delegation was also pleased to be able to announce, following favourable climatic conditions during the winter and the bringing into service of the system of water transfers to the Ichkeul as part of the Comprehensive Northern and Extreme Northern Water Plan, the beginning of the reestablishment of environmental conditions favourable for all the sections of the ecosystem in the Park. The water arriving in the lake was considerably more than the inter-annual average of the arrivals before the construction of the dam. It exceeded 500 million m³, and allowed a significant raising of the water level in the lake, a flooding of all the marshland during February and March as well as a spectacular drop in the salinity of the waters of the lake from 80g/l in September 2002 to less than 10g/l during February, March and April.

7. These favourable conditions were followed by: (i) a an important increase in scirp vegetation in all the marshes during April and May; (ii) a clear improvement in the presence of birds nesting in the marshes; (iii) a very significant entry of fry and juvenile fish into Lake Ichkeul. Thus, it seems that the ecosystems of the Ichkeul have considerable capacities for adaptation and survival in the difficult conditions of the environment and that they retain their potential for regeneration as soon as these conditions improve.

8. Before completing his intervention, he suggested making some modifications to paragraph 1 of the draft text: to replace "*the Secretary of State for Hydraulic Resources*" by "*the competent hydraulic resource management authorities*"; and to replace "*carry out annual releases of 80 to 120 million m³ of water*" by "*provide an average supply of 80 to 120 million m³ per year from the dam water in the form of releases, overflows or desludging*".

9. The Delegation of **Belgium** congratulated the State Party on its work. It suggested completing the first paragraph of the Draft Decision by taking note of the State Party's firm commitment.

10. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** questioned if the reports need to be submitted on an annual basis.

11. The Secretariat noted that they would prefer information on an annual basis regarding the lake system since the recovery rate of the property could fluctuate

depending on annual rainfall and other weather conditions. The **Secretariat** furthermore suggested that unless important issues arise, the report is submitted to the Committee for noting only.

12. The Chairperson noted the consensus and declared Decision **27 COM 7A.8** adopted as amended.

Manas National Park (India)

1. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** highlighted the need to ensure consistency with International Assistance requests.

2. The **Secretariat** explained that the Secretariat will try to mobilize finances for the project developed under the UNF before 2004, which makes this date important.

3. The Chairperson declared the Decision **27 COM 7A.9** adopted.

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the management plan has been received on 25 June 2003, which would comply with the conditions set by the Committee. Therefore the Decision could be revised to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

2. The representative of **IUCN** noted that IUCN had reviewed the information provided, and stated that Bulgaria did not fully acknowledge the World Heritage significance of this property in the plan, but it certainly met the Committee's request for a management plan.

3. The Observer Delegation of **Bulgaria** stated that the main issues identified by the Committee in 1992 had been addressed by the State Party and that it had distributed further data on the situation of the property and its monitoring system. The Observer Delegation of Bulgaria agreed to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed to change the Draft Decision, as the current draft would make no sense.

5. The Delegation of **Greece** underlined that the State Party had addressed all issues and that it had requested removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

6. The Delegation of **Oman** seconded the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

7. The **Chairperson** agreed.

8. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked if IUCN had had the time to examine the management plan for the site submitted by the State Party on 25 June 2003.

9. IUCN informed the Committee that it had reviewed the management plan despite the late submission and that it is also a success story of the *Convention* and the Committee to have followed this case closely.

10. The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked whether IUCN agreed with the State Party.

11. IUCN responded in the affirmative.

12. The **Chairperson** concluded that the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as there was consensus in the Committee.

13. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party and recalled that Srebarna was inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that the State Party had undertaken a remarkable effort in restoration. He underlined that the List of World Heritage in Danger is an effective tool of the *World Heritage Convention*.

14. The **Chairperson** stated that the Observer had congratulated the State Party on behalf of the whole Committee.

15. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.10** as amended

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

1. The Delegation of **Nigeria** requested clarification from IUCN on whether to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

2. IUCN informed the Committee that this is a long-term restoration project.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** questioned whether the date of 2004 would be viable for the progress report.

4. IUCN noted that the State Party has regularly provided progress reports and it is good to monitor progress made with complex problems.

5. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it agreed with the Decision as drafted.

6. The Delegation of **Thailand** questioned whether it still needed to be on the List of World Heritage in Danger and whether the conditions would be there to remove it.

7. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** underlined that US\$ 8 billion have been committed to the restoration of the property to address very complex solutions. His country is happy with the property remaining on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

8. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.11** adopted.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that new information was received mainly from NGOs and the civil society, including 5000 e-mails requesting to leave the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

2. IUCN welcomed the actions taken by the State Party, however stated that since the document was prepared new information was received which indicates that major issues still have to be resolved. The mining project was abandoned, but the other 6 issues, including the bison population, the cut-throat trout, sewage, road and visitors are long-term matters. He suggested to change the Draft Decision.

3. The representative of IUCN noted that, having examined this additional information and as is recognized by the State Party's report, there remain management problems in respect to these six issues at Yellowstone, which will need to be addressed as part of a continuing strategy.

4. If the Committee agreed with the request from the State Party to remove the property from the in-Danger list, the representative of IUCN suggested that the following actions should accompany this decision:

- (i) The State Party should be invited to declare its intention to continue its commitment to address the matters that have concerned the Committee in the past;
- (ii) The State Party should be requested to provide existing recovery plans before the Committee's 28th session, setting out targets and indicators for the six remaining long-term management issues;
- (iii) The State Party should continue to report to the Committee on the conditions of the original threats and the progress made toward resolving these issues until such time as the Committee decides they are no longer needed. These reports shall include public input, including that of independent experts, NGOs and other key stakeholders.

5. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak in favour of the removal of Yellowstone National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It stated that the removal of Yellowstone from the List of World Heritage in Danger would represent the culmination of the cooperative process articulated in and intended by the *World Heritage Convention*. The Committee in 1995 reviewed the serious and imminent threat of the proposed New World Gold Mine just outside Yellowstone's north-

east corner. The Committee concurred at the time and with the consent of the State Party Yellowstone was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. There were other threats facing Yellowstone National Park at that time and while those additional challenging problems were included as reasons for declaring Yellowstone in Danger, none of those additional threats, either singularly or cumulatively, constituted a serious and imminent threat to the outstanding universal value for which Yellowstone was originally inscribed as a World Heritage property. In addition to the serious and imminent threat of the proposed gold mine, other reasons for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger, were the bison migrating out of Yellowstone because of the potential transmission of brucellosis to domestic livestock herds, the potential for invasive Lake Trout to decimate the Native Cutthroat Trout fishery of Yellowstone Lake, failing sewer systems that periodically dumped raw effluent into Yellowstone waters, seriously deteriorating roads, and visitor use issues, especially winter use and snowmobiles. It pointed out that political awareness of the threats to Yellowstone was heightened and the United States Congress appropriated US\$ 65 million to buy out the mining interest of the proposed New World Gold Mine. He highlighted that the only serious and imminent threat was removed.

6. It also informed the Committee that an intergovernmental committee, including multiple federal agencies, representatives from the states that border Yellowstone and the 26 Native American tribes that have a historic and cultural link with Yellowstone, developed an Interagency Bison Management Plan. Bison may be removed from the system only under certain prescribed situations. He stated that the bison population was over 3,000 animals, about 10 times the bison population in Yellowstone 40 years ago. Yellowstone implemented an operation with the hope of curtailing Lake Trout population growth in Yellowstone Lake. While complete eradication may never be possible, it now appears controlling the Lake Trout population numbers is achievable. Cutthroat Trout populations are monitored closely and while the Native Trout population is down, it still remains nearly double the 1970 population levels.

7. Concerning the sewer system problems, the United States Congress has appropriated US\$ 11 million and the 100-year-old sewer systems are in the process of being reconstructed.

8. Since 1995, the Federal Highway Administration has spent approximately US\$ 112 million repairing, rehabilitating and reconstructing roads in Yellowstone. There are continuing needs in this area and the proposed new highway funding bill contains over US\$ 300 million for all National Park roads including Yellowstone. Visitor use, especially winter use, continues to be a challenging issue, and funding has been spent in planning public use to ensure protection of the property. Snowmobiles will have the best available technology, cleaner and quieter 4 cycle engines. Daily entrance limits will be set to reduce

overcrowding and snowmobile guides will be required in order to reduce stress on wintering wildlife. Extensive monitoring will evaluate the impacts on a continuing basis and modifications to the plan will be adopted as necessary to protect the park. He concluded that all of these efforts are a testimony to how the *World Heritage Convention* can be used as a call to action for State Parties and that this is a World Heritage Committee success story that should culminate with the removal of Yellowstone from the List of World Heritage in Danger. He also stated that critics of this effort will claim that new challenges threaten Yellowstone, or that protections will be removed and that his government is aware that the Committee has been bombarded with more than 4,000 e-mails in opposition to the de-listing of Yellowstone and apologized for the hardship. He pointed out that it is very important that the Committee understand that these offer no new information or conflicting science that would refute the State Party reports over the past 8 years. The Committee should consider the strategy of the NGOs to choose to launch a campaign at the last moment. The issue before the Committee is not whether there are impacts to Yellowstone, but whether any of those impacts rise to the level of serious and imminent threat to the outstanding universal value for which Yellowstone was originally inscribed as a World Heritage Site. He emphasized that it is the State Parties who are largely responsible for the protection of World Heritage properties. In his view, the Committee has no authority or ability to impose protections over the sovereignty of the States Parties and that the United States of America is a World leader in the conservation of natural, cultural and historic resources and will continue to apply all the legal protections available to Yellowstone regardless of its status as a World Heritage property.

9. The Observer Delegation of the United States of America concluded that the threats to Yellowstone were identified, the actions were taken and the threats are removed or are being aggressively resolved. The system put in place by the *Convention* has worked. It urged the Committee to do the right thing and to celebrate this conservation success story by removing Yellowstone from the List of World Heritage In Danger.

10. IUCN clarified that a few actions have still to be taken before removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

11. The Delegation of **Thailand** asked why there was no advocacy to remove the Everglades from the List of World Heritage in Danger when the NGOs have prompted the Committee to reconsider Yellowstone. The mining issues were solved, but this was not the only reason stated at the time of the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee has to provide a scientific and objective decision and has to be impartial to either side.

12. The Delegation of **Greece** noted that the State Party has undertaken a lot of efforts and that even IUCN had

been persuaded to remove it from the List. It suggested to alter the Draft Decision to take into account the points by IUCN and to collaborate with local NGOs.

13. The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the Draft Decision and noted the efforts by the State Party.

14. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that the political nature of the questions asked be considered and the type and quality of the information received by private individuals, in particular NGOs, be distributed to the Committee. It requested that IUCN, in its capacity and with its responsibility as an expert, guide the Committee in its decision. The Delegation of Lebanon also recalled the independence of the States Parties and the Committee emphasizing the fact that the Committee has firm authority over decision-making matters.

15. The Delegation of **Hungary** questioned the usefulness of the List of World Heritage in Danger and suggested following the proposals made by IUCN taking into account the two positions expressed. It underlined the difficulty of judging the quality of the information and the photos transmitted by the NGOs and recalled that the credibility of the Committee and IUCN would be called into question if their decision was based on this type of information.

16. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the main document is the *World Heritage Convention*, which clearly indicated serious and specific dangers for danger listing. There would be no reason to change the Draft Decision.

17. The Delegation of **China** noted that Yellowstone was the first National Park on earth and one of the first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The State Party has taken steps to eliminate the threats and improved the situation considerably. These are encouraging facts. He agreed with the Draft Decision and the IUCN conclusions.

18. The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegations of China and Hungary.

19. The Delegation of **India** noted the sound record of IUCN and stated that the property had now been on the List of World Heritage in Danger List for eight years and furthermore, the State Party had identified a timetable for action. In general the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger need to be removed if the main threats were no longer present.

20. The Delegation of **Oman** asked to keep the Draft Decision.

21. **IUCN** referred to the foregoing comments and underlined that the current Decision was drafted before the new information was received. This new information questioned the accuracy and completeness of the State Party report. IUCN was not able to review fully the

contradictory information. In case the Committee decided to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, IUCN would like to add a text concerning the long-term issues that remain to be solved.

22. The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to comment.

23. The Delegation of **Thailand** noted that in light of this clarification a Decision needed to be postponed to the next session.

24. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its concern at the impossibility for IUCN to give a directive opinion which would therefore lead to an unfounded or purely political decision. It underlined that in such cases the principle of precaution must be applied, recalling that the credibility of the *Convention* depends on the decision to be taken. In this respect, the Delegation of Lebanon supported Thailand's remarks.

25. The Delegation of **Nigeria** was not happy to delay the Decision to another session and called for an objective and scientific approach and believed that the Draft Decision was satisfactory.

26. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee agreed to the Draft Decision with the amendment by IUCN.

27. The Delegation of **Hungary** stated that the Committee was paralysed with its discussions and could not understand that IUCN was not in a position to advise the Committee on this. It said that these new documents are for journalists and not for scientists and that the credibility of the Committee would be challenged. IUCN normally is very wise and it is not normal to change their proposed decision in the last minute.

28. The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegation of Hungary and stated that there is full documentation of the State Party and that it was not known what the NGOs were saying. It recalled the fact that the Committee is inter-governmental rather than NGO-related. The issue could be monitored under normal state of conservation.

29. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** took note of the difficulties created by the e-mail campaign and questioned the seriousness of the information. It underlined the requirement for a professional judgement given in the IUCN/UNESCO evaluation and advocated the need to refer to the original report. Recalling the Committee's responsibility, the Delegation of the United Kingdom proposed to establish a reactive monitoring list based on serious information.

30. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reiterated its opinion consisting of not taking any decision without clear recommendations from IUCN. The Delegation recalled

that if a decision were taken, this should not happen again for other sites.

31. IUCN clarified that it has tried to integrate many cases and information to be totally fair with the Committee, States Parties and NGO's.

32. The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its favour to concentrate on a professional rather than a political decision. It also recalled that the Committee's credibility is at stake if it decided according to simple inclinations.

33. The Delegation of **Hungary** stated that the Committee did not need to agree with IUCN's opinion. It recalled that the Committee has to take a position and that not deciding would correspond to a political decision.

34. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that IUCN establish if the information included in the document was incomplete.

35. The Delegation of **Nigeria** emphasized the lack of scientific data and asked for suspension of the Decision.

36. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** recalled the situation of a Court and that some evidence must be available. It inquired whether the Decision could be changed at this stage.

37. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received 5000 e-mails by 27 June 2003 and approximately 50 letters per day. It stated that the information IUCN referred to included letters by Mr Finlay (former Superintendent, Yellowstone) dated 27 June 2003 and by Mr Kennedy (former Director National Park Service) dated 25 June 2003 which were only received just prior to the Committee session.

38. The Delegation of **Morocco** reminded the Committee of earlier cases such as that of Nepal, whilst underlining the advisory nature of IUCN and the independence of the Committee as regards the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies. It declared that it was confident that the State Party would assume its responsibilities, whilst remaining aware of the risk that the dossier be reopened with the same problems a few years later.

39. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the Committee to take a decision and emphasized that there is no new scientific information included in the e-mail campaign. It further stated that the credibility of IUCN is at risk and that the report to the Committee is on good scientific footing. It would be happy to provide further information if necessary.

40. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** recalled that the initial reason for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger was the issue of the gold-mine which by now has been solved. It underlined that the other issues raised in the report are normal threats, which proves in general the

requirement of an action-plan. It further stated that even in the absence of advice by the Advisory Body it is up to the Committee to take a decision. It expressed being in favour of removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and to attach certain conditions to it.

41. The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the opinion of the Delegation of India recognizing the efforts made by the State Party to reduce the threats to the property. It expressed its favour for removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

42. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** wished to clarify whether it is the Delegation of India that the Delegation of Mexico supported.

43. The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to two non-governmental organisations (NGO), which were accredited observer status.

44. The Observer from the **Natural Resources Defence Council (NRDC)** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak and explained that his NGO represents 500,000 members and that the decision to be taken is of crucial importance. He underlined that all information provided is based on objective fact-finding. He referred to the relevant paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines* (paragraph 83) recalled the Committee's Decision of 1995 to put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger for ascertained as well as for potential threats. He commented that many problems could have been avoided if the State Party had reacted with an action plan on time.

45. The Observer from the **Greater Yellowstone Coalition** explained that the NGO is a group of concerned scientists comprising 20 organizations with 15 million members who are against removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. To emphasize the widespread and deep concern he referred to the letter addressed to the Committee by Roger Kennedy. He also referred to the issue of the native lake trout, which is threatened by invading non-native fish. He further referred to the implementation of the management plan, the continuing problems with snowmobiles and pollution.

46. The **Chairperson** summarized the opinions of the Committee, which seemed to indicate one third wanted to postpone the Decision, one third wanted removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger and one third remaining silent. She emphasized that the Committee had only the choice of voting, accepting a compromise solution or taking the property off the Danger list with certain conditions.

47. The Delegation of **Thailand** questioned the nature of a Decision with conditions.

48. The Delegation of **Hungary** invited IUCN to formulate a new Decision by the end of the session.

49. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that the Delegation of Thailand is technically correct, however, the conditions could be reviewed regularly under state of conservation reports.

50. The Delegation of **Thailand** said that it would support the Decision of the majority.

51. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reasserted its opinion concerning the taking of a decision without the recommendations of IUCN. It noted that in this case a majority decision would be necessary.

52. The Delegation of **Thailand** underlined that further work is needed to ensure that the remaining threats will be properly managed.

53. **IUCN** recalled that in its last statement it suggested not to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and referred to 3 points to be reviewed by the Committee. It also recalled that scientific findings can be interpreted in different ways and that in this case it should be up to the national level to take the responsibility and to confront the information from several institutions. He cited the example from Australia as being a successful one for continuing cooperation between the State Party and IUCN. The Committee is in charge of taking decisions whereas all further implementation has to be assured on the domestic level. He stressed that IUCN's credibility is not at stake.

54. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to decide on whether it wanted to vote or to find a consensus.

55. The Delegation of **India** took up the question of which recommendations would be given in case of a removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also underlined that it would be the State Party's responsibility to resolve the actual problems.

56. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** recalled the seriousness of the Decision to be taken and asked for time to reflect on the issue.

57. The **Chairperson** announced a coffee break and requested the Secretariat, IUCN, the State Party and the Advisory Body to come up with a text.

58. After the break, the **Secretariat** read out the new point 7 as an addition to the existing Draft Decision.

60. The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its satisfaction with the addition to the Draft Decision but asked to also include a reference to the role of local communities and NGOs involved in on-site consultations.

61. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** wished to reassure the Committee of its commitment, that all measures would be taken to further

improve the property's state of conservation and that under United States law public input is being sought.

62. The Delegation of **Thailand** asked for a more explicit wording of the Draft Decision.

63. The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its satisfaction with the wording of point 7.

64. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** also expressed its satisfaction with the wording.

65. The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its satisfaction with the wording proposed.

66. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support for the formulation but wished to see two remarks included into the Draft Decision: 1. The concerns expressed by the Committee; and 2. The review of any new issues not covered by the 6 remaining issues to be solved.

67. The Delegations of **Oman** and **Mexico** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Egypt.

68. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed itself in favour of the compromise solution accepted. It drew attention to the fact that the same words had been chosen to refer, in Decision **26 COM 21(a) 8** at Budapest, to the reasons for retaining the site on the In Danger List and now for deleting it from that List.

69. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the proposal to remove the site from the In Danger List.

70. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support for the Draft Decision as amended, as paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines* require the State Party to inform the Committee of any new developments.

71. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support for the Draft Decision as amended.

72. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.12** adopted as amended removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Sangay National park (Ecuador)

1. Decision **27 COM 7A.13** was adopted without discussion.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

1. Decision **27 COM 7A.14** was adopted without discussion.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the Government of Japan, under a Funds-in-Trust agreement with UNESCO, has contributed US\$ 420,000 for a project to restore the King Behanzin Palace, which is a property being considered for extension to the World Heritage property of the Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin). This project is executed by the UNESCO Cultural Heritage Division of the Culture Sector. The Secretariat suggested that the Committee might add a sentence to the Draft Decision thanking the Japanese Government for its support.
2. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked the Secretariat if the threats which had led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger were still present or if the deletion of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger could be envisaged.
3. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, whilst supporting Belgium's request, observed that there were no particular recommendations in the Draft Decision, and that it was important to know if the Committee would decide to delete or retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also said it would like to have the opinion of the Advisory Bodies on this subject.
4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed on the remarks made by previous speakers and wondered whether a property in Danger should be extended. The Delegation, however, expressed appreciation for the extra-budgetary funding made available for this property.
5. The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that the new information given by the World Heritage Centre ranges from progress on 'rehabilitation work' to information on the extension of the property and wondered why the enlargement of the property is included at this point in the Committee report. He indicated that, normally, there should be a report on the state of conservation of the property and also a request from the State Party for its extension.
6. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** remarked that notwithstanding the inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, there could be a valid reason to extend the property if this should add to the integrity of the property. It expressed appreciation of the injection of funds by Japan for this property and proposed that the Draft Decision be amended to thank the Government of Japan. It took note of the Draft Decisions, and furthermore proposed that the Draft Decision be amended to request a state of conservation report.
7. The Delegation of **Benin** congratulated the Chairperson of the Committee for her brilliant election. It confirmed to the Committee that Benin had undertaken restoration work on the King Behanzin Palace thanks to the financial support of Japan, work which should be completed in February 2004. Furthermore it was keen to underscore the historical importance of the King Behanzin Palace, which is an indissociable link in the series of Royal Palaces of Abomey and pointed out that the aim was to consider the protection of the palaces together. It also informed the Committee of the different activities that Benin intends to organize around the theme of tangible and intangible heritage, in particular a seminar on the restoration of the palace and a cultural festival, which will take place on the site. The Delegation also thanked the Government of Japan, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the Culture Division of UNESCO, for their support for the protection of the Royal Palaces of Abomey.
8. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the possibility of removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has not yet been studied, as to date, no mission has been undertaken to the property. The Secretariat agreed with the Committee's recommendation to add a paragraph to the Draft Decision on retaining the Royal Palaces of Abomey on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
9. The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested that the Committee consider the opinion of Benin on the need to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
10. The Delegation of **United Kingdom**, observing that the property has been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for the past 18 years, proposed that the decision should be amended to include the assessment of the property in order to decide whether to remove the property from the in List of World Heritage in Danger and request a formal report.
11. The Delegation of **Hungary**, in agreeing with the Delegation of United Kingdom, suggested that the extension may be one of the elements that could improve the overall situation.
12. The Delegation of **Nigeria** remarked that the elements that contributed to the property being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger should have been removed by now after 18 years on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
13. The Delegation of **Finland** proposed that reference to the extension of the property be removed from the Draft Decision.
14. The Delegation of **Egypt**, in agreeing with Delegations of the United Kingdom and Finland, recommended that the reference be removed entirely and be replaced by one recommending an evaluation mission by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.
15. The **Chairperson** summarized elements for the formulation of a new Decision : (i) the request for

extension of the property be deferred; (ii) the ICOMOS/WHC evaluation mission be foreseen; (iii) the property remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger; and (iv) thanks the Government of Japan for its generous financial contribution.

16. The Delegation of **Benin** supported the idea of an evaluation mission by the Centre and ICOMOS to the site. Nevertheless, it insisted on the need to take into account during this evaluation mission, the considerable restoration work which is currently being done on a part of the King Behanzin Palace.

17. The Delegation of **Belgium** appreciated the summary made by the Chairperson. It pointed out in particular that if the ICOMOS mission was envisaged, the latter could study the proposal to extend the site to the King Behanzin Palace.

18. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the recommendations as made by the Chairperson and the Delegation of Egypt as it considered them to be more practical.

19. The **Chairperson** noted the Committee's consensus on the new revised text and declared Decision **27 COM 7A.15** adopted.

Timbuktu (Mali)

1. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that the question of the extension of the Timbuktu site was the same as that posed for the Royal Palaces of Abomey, and that it was necessary to adopt the same approach concerning the revision of the Draft Decision.

2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the report did not clarify the reason why the property was still on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It mentioned that good site management was a means to improve the condition of the property, and agreed with the proposal of Delegation of Lebanon.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** was in agreement with the remarks of the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

4. The Chairperson noted the Committee's consensus and declared adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.16** as amended.

Tipasa (Algeria)

1. Further to the presentation by the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its concern on the wording of a paragraph in the proposed decision, whereby the State Party was encouraged to adopt legislation "in consultation with the Centre". This would mean overstepping the sovereignty of the State Party.

2. The Delegations of **Hungary** and the **United Kingdom** agreed with the remark made by the Delegate of Thailand. The latter also asked the Centre to number the sub-paragraphs in the decision, and wondered whether it would be realistic to expect the State Party to comply with the proposed recommendations and provide a report by the 28th session of the Committee. On this issue, the Delegate of Oman requested the view of the State Party.

3. The Observer Delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Committee, reassuring it that progress had been made for the protection of the property, and confirmed that the date of 1st February 2004 was appropriate for the presentation of its report to the Committee so as to be able to envisage deleting the property from the In Danger List for the 28th session. The Delegation also indicated that it was in agreement with the Delegation of Thailand concerning the deletion of the passage "in consultation with the Centre" contained in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision in the next to the last paragraph, as well as the adjective "*official*" in front of the word "*Decree*".

4. The Delegation of **India** considered that if the sentence "in consultation with the Centre" was meant to suggest an advisory service, than it could be left as it was in the decision. The Delegation of Thailand objected to this.

5. The **Chairperson**, suggesting to keep the deadline of February 2004 for the progress report due by the State Party, declared Decision **27 COM 7A.17** adopted as amended.

Abu Mena (Egypt)

1. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its gratitude towards the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for the excellent, realistic and effective report produced. It commented that the verb "strongly encourages", at the beginning of paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, should be replaced by "recommends". Furthermore, in the reference to the establishment of a Cultural Resources Planning Unit, the Delegation of Egypt suggested that the term "planning" be replaced with "coordinating".

2. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked for clarifications concerning the role of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre when reference is made to "expert missions", in the reports of the Secretariat. It noted that greater coherence would be desirable in the draft decisions.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for clarifications concerning the Cultural Resources Impact Assessment, referred to in the report of the Secretariat, and its relation with standard Environmental Impact Assessment policies. In its opinion, the latter would necessarily include concerns for cultural heritage values, and therefore there would be no need to develop a new specific procedure. Moreover, concentrating only on the cultural heritage values would narrow the scope of the

exercise, which normally takes into account also important environmental and social aspects.

4. The **Secretariat** noted that the idea behind the proposal was to reinforce the Egyptian Supreme Council of Antiquities by setting up a Unit, which will coordinate with other concerned governmental agencies before any major infrastructure project with potential adverse effects on a cultural heritage property is implemented. This was the reason why emphasis was put on the assessment of the impact on cultural resources.

5. The Delegation of **Egypt**, acknowledging the point made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, pointed out that within the Egyptian institutional framework, the responsible authority for cultural heritage was the Supreme Council of Antiquities. The term “Environmental Impact Assessment” might engender some confusion, since a Ministry of Environment exists, but with a different mandate.

6. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.18** adopted as amended.

Bahla Fort (Oman)

1. The **Secretariat** presented to the Committee additional information received at the end of June 2003, concerning the completion of this first phase of the Management Plan, which appears to be progressing according to schedule. Concerning the construction of the new market, the Secretariat explained that the current project, elaborated by the Omani Ministry of Trade and Industry, involved a reinforced concrete structure, covered with traditional *sarouj* plaster and timber. While recognizing that the existing market, built mostly in the 1970s, did not seem to have any special heritage value, the Secretariat emphasized the importance of using traditional techniques and materials in the Oasis of Bahla, in character with the vernacular architecture. In consideration of the progress achieved with the development of the management plan, the Secretariat suggested to add a new paragraph (number 6) to the Draft Decision, to suggest that the Committee might consider to remove the property from the World Heritage List in Danger at the 28th session of the Committee, should the Omani Government finalize and adopt the Management Plan.

2. The Delegation of **Oman** extended the deep thanks and appreciation of his government for the cooperation given by the World Heritage Centre and CRAterre. It also underlined that a permanent team responsible for the maintenance of the property has been established at the site. The Committee created to supervise the project, together with the Management Plan team, met last March and is going to meet again in September, when a workshop involving all stakeholders is foreseen. Finally, the Delegation of Oman stressed that the proposed market is not entirely a new project, since a market already existed although with limited capacity owing to its bad state of

conservation and the recent heavy rains. It also noted the important socio-economic implications of the project. Concerning the construction materials, it clarified that concrete will be used in the structures, but external facing will be done according to traditional techniques.

3. In reply to a remark by the Delegation of **Belgium**, suggesting that a too close implication of the Secretariat in the proposed market project might engender a potential conflict of interest, the **Secretariat** clarified that what it intended to do is only to ensure that recognized standards of conservation be adhered to through a constant dialogue and cooperation with the State Party. It, at any rate, requested that ICOMOS be associated with the process and took part in the evaluation of the proposed projects.

4. The Delegation of **Oman** proposed to delete the word “officially” in the newly proposed paragraph, since the Decree will be of course issued by the Omani Government.

5. The representative of **ICOMOS** stressed that its Organization had since many years a scientific Committee for Earthen Architecture and that it stood ready to cooperate on Bahla. The Chairperson proposed then to amend the new paragraph of the Draft Decision to request that an assessment by ICOMOS of the Management Plan be conducted. The Delegation of Belgium recalled that the scope of ICOMOS assessment would have to encompass all other aspects related to the conservation of the property.

6. The Delegation of **Morocco** spoke of its concerns regarding the the project to build a new market inside a site inscribed, and wondered about the Committee's decision on this point.

7. The Delegation of **Finland** pointed out that it would be impossible to evaluate the proposal for the new market, and answer the question of the Observer Delegation of Morocco, without actually seeing the project.

8. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the Centre was currently examining the project with the Omani authorities. Although the project was interesting from an urban planning perspective, the World Heritage Centre recommended that traditional techniques and materials be used.

9. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.19** adopted as amended

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the Centre carried out four missions before the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

2. The Secretariat stated that, despite of the enormous efforts made by the Yemeni authorities, the reasons which

led to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in Danger are still present. The Secretariat recalled that an International Assistance request for technical cooperation is going to be submitted for the attention of the Bureau during the present session.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** underlined that the situation of this property is as serious as when it was inscribed on the List in Danger. Therefore, it considered it appropriate to request a specific date for the submission of the Management Plan.

4. The representative of **ICOMOS** recalled that Zabid has been inscribed from the beginning on the List of World Heritage in Danger and asked the representatives of GOPHCY, attending the Committee as observers, to inform the Committee about any optimistic news concerning the Management Plan for the property.

5. The **director of the GOPHCY** expressed his gratitude for having received the opportunity to explain to the Committee the efforts made by the Yemeni authorities in order to preserve the Historic Town of Zabid. He also thanked the World Heritage Committee for the satisfactory assessment report prepared. The director of GOPHCY stated that Yemen is aware of the situation and that efforts are already undertaken by the Government, the International Cooperation Agencies and NGOs. He also explained the need for a reinforcement of the GOPHCY itself and stated that the final draft of the Conservation Plan is ready for approval, but that at the same time GOPHCY has undertaken the drafting of the solid waste management project, of the sewage project, of the street paving and lighting project, and also of several restoration projects starting with Al-Ashan Mosque, which has been put on the Government budget for this year. The director of GOPHCY concluded that for any other information a short report was made available at the entrance.

6. The Delegation of **Morocco** noted that the main problem in safeguarding the site was linked to the insufficient financial resources. It underlined that by seeking aid from new partners, such as the World Bank, for example, the national authorities could solve this problem.

7. The **Chairperson** asked for clarification about the dates.

8. The **Secretariat**, taking into consideration that the State Party stated that the Management Plan is ready for adoption, suggested the 1 February 2004 as deadline for the submission of this plan, so as to enable the Secretariat to present it to the Committee at its 28th session.

9. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.20** adopted as amended.

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan)

1. The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the Committee to the State of conservation of the property presented in documents *WHC-03/27.COM.7A and 7A Corr.* Additional information was presented on the generous contributions from the Governments of Italy and Switzerland for emergency consolidation and conservation work for the Minaret. Recalling that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage of Danger simultaneously in June 2002, the Secretariat drew attention to persisting threats including looting, the absence of management, infrastructure development pressures and the instability of the Minaret. The state of conservation of the property was the subject of discussion during an International Expert Meeting (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, January 2003) and the first plenary session of the International Co-ordination Committee (ICC) for the Safeguarding of Afghanistan's Cultural Heritage (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 16-18 March 2003), in which the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Dr Tamás Fejérdy also participated. During the first session of the ICC, the Government of Greece announced a generous contribution for the elaboration of comprehensive management plan and to enhance site interpretation. In light of this new information, the Secretariat suggested the Draft Decision **27 COM 7A 21** paragraph 3 be amended as follows: *"Expresses appreciation to the Secretariat for its efforts to safeguard the minaret of Jam and to the Governments of Greece, Italy and Switzerland for their generous contributions for the protection of the property;"*

2. The **Deputy Minister of Information and Culture of the Transitional Islamic Government of Afghanistan** was invited to make a presentation to the Committee.

3. The Deputy Minister of Information and Culture of Afghanistan thanked the World Heritage Committee for its continued assistance to his Government in the preservation of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan. He referred to immediate dangers, which were still threatening the Archaeological Remains and Minaret of Jam and noted that several UNESCO missions had been undertaken to save the property. The Deputy Minister specially thanked Professor Bruno and Professor Borgis for their work. He further indicated that protective measures against illicit excavations had been recommended and that, despite the high floods of the rivers in April 2002, the gabions protecting the base of the Minaret remained effective. He expressed his appreciation for the efforts of the Director-General, the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre to ensure the inscription of Jam as the first Afghan World Heritage property for the International safeguarding activities to commence. The cleaning of the river beds of the Jam-rud and Hari-rud, the consolidation of the minaret and limited archaeological remains were named as urgent priorities.

4. The Deputy Minister thanked the Governments of Italy and Switzerland for their generous contributions for

the consolidation of the Minaret and the Italian and Greek Governments for the elaboration of a management plan. He further commented that the construction of the road by Afghan-Aid had been stopped by the Department for the Protection of Historical Monuments, Ministry of Information and Culture, as it conflicted with the National Law for the Protection of Historical Monuments. The diversion of the road is being considered, as well as the demand of the local community to construct a bridge. The Deputy Minister expressed his hope to witness tangible positive results for the conservation of the minaret in the near future.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its surprise at the use of the term "with concern" in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision and suggested deleting the whole paragraph. Furthermore, Belgium proposed to modify paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision as follows : « *Encourage the State Party to continue its efforts in the protection, conservation and management of the property and to implement stability measures, to prevent illicit excavations and to develop a management mechanism* ».

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that the expression "before the construction of the road" in paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision was ambiguous and did not make clear enough whether the word "before" referred to the drawing up of plans for the road or the finalization of the road.

7. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, was impressed with the amount of International Assistance which the World Heritage Centre was able to raise for the property in a short time. It stressed the importance of consistency of the Committee's Decisions at a technical level, as elements such as the Secretariat, the Centre and donors were introduced in the Draft Decision for this property and not for others. In particular, it was questioned why, in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, the Secretariat should be requested explicitly to continue to co-operate closely with the national authorities, when, in fact, this is its job. There should be consistency in the Draft Decisions and rhetorical phrasings should be avoided. Moreover, the Delegation of the United Kingdom stressed the necessity of an environment impact assessment prior to the construction of the road.

8. Requested by the Chairperson to elaborate on its proposal, the Delegation of the United Kingdom expressed its wish to delete, in addition to paragraph 2 as proposed by the Delegation of Belgium, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Draft Decision.

9. The Delegation of **India** referred to the comments of the Delegation of Belgium concerning the illicit excavations as pertinent and that they should be made more operational. However, it expressed its wish to retain paragraph 2 which it considered essential and to amend paragraph 4 as follows: "*Encourages the State Party to*

develop a management plan for the site and to prevent illicit excavations."

10. It further commented that the State Party did not have the full capacities at present to adequately protect, conserve and manage the property. Therefore, paragraph 3 is not a rhetorical phrasing, but underlines the imperative of international co-operation. It said that Afghanistan has been the victim of a tragic deliberate crime against culture. The Delegation wished to maintain all the paragraphs.

11. Requested by the Chairperson whether it was agreeable to amend paragraph 4 as proposed by the Delegation of Belgium, the Delegation of **India** responded positively but highlighted the necessity to assist the State Party in implementing the Draft Decisions .

12. **The Deputy Minister for Information and Culture of Afghanistan** remarked that the State Party has already taken steps for the construction of the road and expressed its wish to keep paragraph 4 as it was, and to delete paragraph 2.

13. The Delegation of **Belgium** regretted that its suggestions had been misunderstood and insisted on the fact that in the Draft Decision it would be necessary to encourage the State Party to continue its efforts, helped by the Secretariat and not vice versa – the first responsibility for a site being that of the State Party.

14. The Delegation of **India** indicated that the comments made by the Delegation of Belgium could easily be incorporated and proposed to change the phrasing of paragraph 4 to the following: "*Requests the State Party to continue to co-operate closely with the Secretariat.*"

15. The representative of **ICOMOS** pointed out that although financial resources were not lacking and excellent research work had been undertaken (Professor Bruno completed measuring all the cracks on the Minaret), secondary problems such as looting remained. He expressed the hope to start work in autumn 2003.

16. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested a new paragraph to be introduced to thank the donors.

17. In response, the **Secretariat** suggested to add at the end of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision "*and the Governments of Greece, Italy and Switzerland for their generous contribution for its protection*".

18. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Secretariat for this proposed amendment and suggested to mention the donor nations before the Secretariat. It questioned why the donors were singled out for this property and not in other cases.

19. The **Chairperson** suggested the review of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. No comments were made on the first paragraph and it was adopted. Contrary

to the Delegation of India, some State Parties had expressed the wish to delete paragraph 2. Requested by the Chairperson, the Delegation of **India** reaffirmed its wish to maintain paragraph 2 as it contained a description. The Chairperson resumed that there were two different positions on paragraph 2.

20. The Delegation of **Finland** supported the view of the Delegation of India and expressed its wish to maintain paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision.

21. As no other interventions were made, the **Chairperson** announced that paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision was adopted. After summarising the proposal of the Delegation of Belgium to add the issue of instability of the Minaret to paragraph 4, the Chairperson asked the Committee if they agreed. No comments were made and paragraph 4 was adopted. Summarising the wish expressed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom to conduct an environment impact assessment for the road construction and to include this in paragraph 5, the Chairperson asked the Committee if they were agreeable and paragraph 5 was adopted.

22. The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that it was not in favour of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

23. The **Chairperson** observed that it probably mistakenly skipped paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision and summarised the comments made by some Committee member and the Secretariat to add a mention to the donors.

24. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its comments about the need of consistency in the Committee Decisions.

25. The Delegation of **South Africa** requested to mention Japan's contribution.

26. The **Chairperson** summarised the comments of other State Parties stressing that the donors should be thanked as had been done before in the case of the Benin site. Nevertheless, the Secretariat should not be mentioned, as it had not been in the previous case.

27. The Delegation of **India** asked why the efforts of the Secretariat should not be mentioned, as the assistance for the State Party had the form of an International Campaign. The Delegation of India requested clarification from the Secretariat.

28. The **Director of the Centre** said that the assistance for the State Party was quite general and not an International Campaign. Furthermore he stressed the very swift response of donors to the call of the Secretariat.

29. The Delegation of **India** commented that it did not mean an International Campaign, but that it wished to underline the combined efforts of UNESCO. It further indicated that it would not insist if the other States Parties

wished to delete the "appreciation to the Secretariat" in paragraph 3.

30. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if they were agreeable to the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom. No more comments were made.

31. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7A.21** adopted as amended.

Angkor (Cambodia)

1. The **Secretariat** pointed out that the reference to the generous contribution from the World Monuments Fund had been inadvertently omitted from the working document. Therefore, the Secretariat suggested that the Draft Decision be amended to include recognition of this contribution in paragraph 1.

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that Angkor had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992, noting that since then enormous amounts had been allocated to the safeguarding of the site (some 6 million dollars). The Delegation expressed its incomprehension at the state of conservation report on the Angkor site, which mentions only the advances and progress made, but which, at the same time, recommends that the site be maintained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It asks for more details on the risks that the site runs and on what remains to be done and requested that these problems be mentioned in the Draft Decision.

3. The Delegation of **Thailand** requested clarification on the issue of legislation, recalling that the Committee had been informed that a law had been drafted and adopted some years ago. He suggested that the Draft Decision should be more specific if outstanding issues still remained. Furthermore, he requested clarification for paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision **27 COM 7A.22**, which referred to the continuation of the implementation of the "existing management plans". He suggested that if there are many management plans, the Committee should recommend the harmonization of management plans into one comprehensive management plan. Finally, he proposed that paragraph 2 be separated into two paragraphs.

4. With regard to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the **Secretariat** recalled that while the APSARA was established as a management authority, and substantial work has been accomplished together with extensive international co-operation including that from Japan and France among others, the State Party still wished to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in light of the persistent threats facing the property, although these threats had decreased over the years. With regard to the management plan, she confirmed that there is only one plan, and that there had been a clerical error with the working document. Responding to the question of the legislation, she informed

the Committee that regulations still needed to be established to activate the law which had been established. The Secretariat however agreed that the question of removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger should be examined in the near future, together with the State Party and Advisory Bodies.

5. The **Chairperson** invoked Rule 15 of the *Rules of Procedures* and requested the Vice-Chairperson from the United Kingdom to replace her.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** repeated its request for clarification concerning the existing problems. It expressed its doubt as to whether the threats still facing the property were sufficient to maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

7. The Delegation of **Thailand** repeated the two questions posed earlier.

8. The Representative of **ICOMOS** expressed his view that the property should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger for the time being in light of the persisting issues still being addressed. The Committee's attention was drawn to the work of at least nine international conservation teams, which applied varying conservation principles but nevertheless worked in close co-ordination within the 400 km² property with many monuments still in a precarious state of conservation.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested to separate paragraph 2, one on implementation of the existing management plan and the other one on tourism development.

10. The **Chairperson** noted the Committee's consensus on paragraph 1 and 3, and paragraph 2 as amended by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** declared that it was not opposed in principle to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, whilst wondering if this paragraph would not apply to all the sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

12. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Belgium if it could make a proposal.

13. The Delegation of **Belgium** suggested the deletion of paragraph 4.

14. The Delegation of **India** underlined the importance of the message contained in paragraph 4, and recommended its retention.

15. The Delegation of **Thailand** commented that paragraph 4 would be instrumental for further mobilization of International Assistance to protect the property. He further commented this was one of the main reasons why

the State Party wished to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

16. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed that paragraph 4 become a general decision that the World Heritage Committee could adopt for all the World Heritage in Danger sites.

17. The **Chairperson** responded to the proposal made by the Delegation of Belgium by stating that this was a general policy question which could not be discussed within a discussion concerning a specific property.

18. The **Secretariat** suggested the retention of paragraph 4 stressing the importance for a better co-ordination between the central authority and local authorities.

19. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed to the importance of stressing better co-ordination between national and local authorities, but pointed out that paragraph 4 in the Draft Decision does not actually address this issue.

20. The **Chairperson** requested clarification by the Secretariat.

21. Responding to this question, the **Secretariat** suggested an amendment to paragraph 4 as follows; "*Requests UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and other international partners to support the strengthening of the continued co-operation between APSARA and the provincial authorities to implement the above-mentioned action by providing appropriate International Assistance*". It also suggested that the Deputy Director of the Division of Culture Heritage inform the Committee of further available information.

22. The **Deputy Director of the Heritage Division of UNESCO** pointed out that as the International Coordinating Committee on the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor was meeting in November 2003 to mark its tenth year of existence, it seemed important to him that the World Heritage Committee retain the formulation of paragraph 4 as a strong gesture of encouragement.

23. The Delegation of **India** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Belgium to have one paragraph concerning International Assistance within all Draft Decisions for all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the future.

24. The **Chairperson** stated that there was a consensus on paragraph 2 as amended by the Secretariat and for paragraphs 5 and 6.

25. Concerning paragraph 6, the Delegation of **Lebanon** reminded the Committee that it had accepted a Draft Decision in which a property retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger « *à la demande de the State Party* » for

the Everglades National Park in the United States of America. He suggested that such a phrase be added for this property too.

26. The Delegation of **Thailand** informed the Committee that the wish of the Government of Cambodia to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger had only been expressed in an informal way.

27. The Delegation of **Lebanon** agreed to withdraw its proposal.

28. The Delegation of **South Africa** recommended that the Committee examine whether or not to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 28th session.

29. Taking into due consideration of the 10th Anniversary of the International Co-ordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor (ICC/Angkor) the **Secretariat** suggested the following amended text as for paragraph 5: "*Requests the State Party to provide a report on the state of conservation of the property to be examined by the 28th session of the Committee in 2004 to enable the Committee to decide whether or not to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger*".

30. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.22** as amended.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India)

1. A UNESCO mission to Hampi was carried out from 1 to 11 May 2003 by the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre together with an international urban planner seconded from the Government of France, to examine the state of conservation of the property and progress in the implementation of corrective measures. The mission noted that since the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the following measures had been taken by the State Party: Demolition of the foot bridge; Suspension of completion work of the vehicular bridge, pending construction of a by-pass road to ensure deviation of traffic away from the core area as recommended by UNESCO expert mission of 1999/2000; Official establishment by special legislation of the Hampi World Heritage Management Authority composed of the Central Government (Archaeological Survey of India), Karnataka State Government, local authorities, community representatives and NGOs; Adoption of State regulations banning stone quarrying within the World Heritage protected area (core and buffer zones), and designation of new quarrying area elsewhere; Adoption of official decision to remove illegal informal commerce and squatters from the historic arcade which had been deformed by illegal construction of additional floors and extensions; Purchase by the State Government of land to build a visitor centre near the main temple to accommodate tourist buses, shops, and other amenities, the

design of which is under preparation; Initiation of legal measures for purchase of land for the by-pass road (total 4.6 kms of which some 2.5 kms stretch of land under ownership of 21 proprietors); Allocation of special Central and State Government funds for monument conservation, archaeological surveys, management planning, etc.

2. The Delegation of **India** expressed its appreciation for the excellent work achieved by the UNESCO mission. As for the paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of India suggested that reference to the "Hampi World Heritage Management Authority" was unnecessary as action could be taken by the Federal government. It also suggested deleting the phrase "frequent rotation of civil servants" from paragraph 4 as the Hampi Management Authorities had just been established and the core members appointed would not be rotated immediately. Finally, it suggested that the phrase in paragraph 6 "to review the architectural design of the visitor centre" be removed as the recommendations of the UNESCO mission had been taken into consideration by the Government.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon** congratulated the State Party for its efforts in view of the improvement of the state of conservation of this site since its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Moreover, it expressed its desire to see this site deleted from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future. In paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, it proposed to replace "*stresses the importance of postponing the completion of the vehicular bridge*" by "*welcomes with satisfaction the State Party's decision to postpone the completion of the vehicular bridge*".

4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recommended that retention of a reference to a reporting system at the state level within paragraph 4 could be useful. It suggested that a realistic deadline be included within the decision for the elaboration of a management plan, such as April 2004.

5. The Delegation of **India** agreed to the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, and informed the Committee that a report on the progress made in elaborating a management plan could be submitted if the date is advanced. However, the submission of a completed management plan would require more time.

6. The **Chairperson** summarized the debate by noting that the Delegation of India accepted the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom to include a sentence within the Draft Decision indicating that a technical unit should be established to advise the Federal Government, which would ensure co-ordination between the State government authorities and local bodies.

7. The **Secretariat** suggested amendment of paragraph 3 to "welcome" instead of "stress" "the importance of postponing the completion of the vehicular bridge" and proposed to separate paragraph 4 into two for clarification

purposes. The first new paragraph should be to "Recommend the State Party to establish a technical unit to support the Hampi World Heritage Management Authorities, with trained staff and financial resources to ensure building control and community advisory service for conservation", while the latter new paragraph should "Ensure continuity of the top decision-makers of the Hampi Management Authorities".

8. As for the reference to the visitor center design and planning referred to in paragraph 6, the **Secretariat** explained that the UNESCO mission did not have the opportunity to discuss the design, and therefore underlined the importance of raising this point at the national level, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested paragraph 5 be amended to "invite" the State Party instead of "encourage".

10. The Delegation of **India** informed the Committee that it could transmit the revised design of the visitor centre to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it was officially reviewed.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** emphasized the need to send a mission organised in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies such as ICOMOS, in order to evaluate the location of the future visitor centre.

12. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM.7A.23**, as amended.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (continued)

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/2 Prov. 2
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.2 Rev*

1. At its morning session on Wednesday 2 July, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that according to the timetable proposed at the beginning of the session, the Committee was a day behind in its work. After consultations with the Rapporteur and the Secretariat, the Chairperson made the following proposal.

2. The Committee would begin its work on Wednesday by examining the remaining state of conservation reports for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and then continue with nominations to the World Heritage List.

3. For the state of conservation reports of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (more than 100 properties), the Secretariat will prepare two lists, one with those properties only for noting and another list with those properties which require discussion by the Committee.

4. After this the Committee will discuss the following items.

8B. Nominations of properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger

11. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the World Heritage Fund budget for 2004-2005

14. Evaluation of the Cairns Decision

18A. New voting mechanism and revision to the procedures for the election of the members of the World Heritage Committee

5. The Chairperson then proposed that the following agenda items be noted by the Committee: 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18B, 19, 20A and 20C.

6. After this, agenda items 22 (*Provisional Agenda for the 28th session of the Committee*), 23 (*Other Business*), 24 (*Adoption of the List of Decisions*) and 25 (*Closure of the session*) would be discussed by the Committee.

7. The *International Assistance requests* (item 12) would be examined by the Bureau of the Committee who would meet on Friday morning (8:30 - 9:30).

8. The Chairperson then asked the Committee for comments on this proposal.

9. The Delegation of **Argentina** stated that certain agenda items, such as *the revision of the Operational Guidelines* (item 10), *the implementation of the Global Strategy* (item 13) and *the World Heritage Partnerships Initiative* (item 20C) were of such importance that that the Committee should discuss these. In particular, the item on Global Strategy also had implications for the discussions on the budget, thus making discussion on this item very necessary.

10. The **Chairperson** said that the Committee might also consider the possibility of deferring until the 28th session certain of those agenda items, which have been proposed only for noting.

11. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** stated that the agenda item on the Progress Report on the 31 C/4 and the 32 C/5 could not be referred until the next session as this item had to be discussed before the 32nd session of the General Conference (September 2003).

12. The **Rapporteur** noted that so far she had not received any texts from Committee members on changes to Draft Decisions which had been promised during their interventions.

13. No further discussion on this agenda item took place. The **Committee**, at the time of adopting Decision **27 COM 2**, decided that it would take note of the following agenda items:

15 *Ways and means to reinforce the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

16 *Progress report on the revision of UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy (31C/4, 2002-2007) and the preparation of the Draft UNESCO Programme and Budget (32C/5, 2004-2005)*

17 *The relationship between the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO) and 20A (Concept paper on the future development on an international statement or charter of conservation principles*

14. The Committee also decided to defer the following agenda items to the 28th session of the Committee in 2004:

9 *Implementation of the World Heritage Global Training Strategy*

19 *Performance Indicators to assess the implementation of the 2002 World Heritage Strategic Objectives (Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-Building and Communication)*

20C *World Heritage Partnerships Initiative: Performance Indicators and Progress Report (only Section A)*

15. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 2** (the revised timetable can be found in **Annex III**).

16. During the adoption of the Decisions, the Committee clarified that, whilst it had had time to examine items 8B and 13, items 9 and 19 were deferred to the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004. It was also clarified that the Committee had taken note of working documents and not of agenda items. Working documents *WHC-03/27 COM/15*, *WHC-03/27 COM/16*, *WHC-03/27 COM/17* and *WHC-03/27 COM/20A* were noted.

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

Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)

1. The **Secretariat** provided the Committee with the following new information: In close consultation and co-operation with the State Party, the World Heritage Centre organized a Reactive Monitoring Mission by an international expert to the property, combined with an international expert mission being undertaken under the UNESCO - Japan Funds-in-Trust Project to Enhance the National Capacity for the Conservation of World Heritage in the Asian Region, being implemented by the World Heritage Centre. This mission was completed only on 29 July 2003, and reported to the World Heritage Centre with the following findings:

(i) Following the recommendations of a 1999 ICOMOS mission and the International

Assistance allocation by the World Heritage Committee in 2000, the authorities of the State Party have undertaken basic archaeological and scientific research for determining the original garden design of the Shalamar Gardens;

(ii) A US\$ 900,000 two-year project funded by the Government of Norway has been commenced since March 2003 to examine the threats facing the Lahore Fort, undertake conservation measures for the Shish Mahal Pavilion within the Lahore Fort, elaborate a comprehensive management plan for Lahore Fort, including the redefinition of meaningful core and buffer zones based upon careful analysis of the heritage assets of the property, elaborate a comprehensive management plan for the Shalamar Gardens, through intense discussions between the national, provincial, and local authorities.

(iii) The Committee was informed that progress for the implementation of this large-scale project is expected by early 2004.

(iv) Encroachment around the Shalamar Gardens is expected to be redressed through co-operation between the national, regional and local authorities.

2. Following this new information, the Secretariat suggested that the Committee add three new paragraphs to the Draft Decision.

3. The Delegate of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the Draft Decision could be presented as a Powerpoint presentation on the screen before the Committee.

4. The Delegate of **Belgium** reminded the Committee that the presentation on the screen was only in one working language, and is difficult to follow for Delegates which use the other working language of the Committee.

5. The **Chairperson**, reminded the Delegate of the United Kingdom that the Committee had decided during its 26th session that all Draft Decisions with substantial changes were to be presented in written form in the two working languages of the Committee before adoption. Therefore, she requested the Secretariat to distribute the new Draft Decision in English and French to the Committee Members, and in the meantime, decided to continue.

6. The Committee returned to this report later in the day (see Decision **27 COM 7A.24**)

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)

1. In view of the fragility of this property, the Delegation of **Thailand** proposed a new paragraph 3 to be added in the Draft Decision “*Requests UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and other international partners to support and strengthen the international co-operation activities with the competent national and local authorities by mobilizing, to the maximum extent possible, appropriate International Assistance*”

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the addition of this new paragraph to the Draft Decision as proposed by Thailand.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** clarified that the deadline for the submission of the progress report should be 1 February 2004.

4. The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its appreciation to the Thai Delegate for his proposal and drew the Committee attention to the fact that the mobilization of International Assistance should be applied to all properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Chairperson and the Secretariat clarified this point and it was agreed that a final decision would be taken while reviewing all the Draft Decisions on the state of conservation for the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.25** as amended.

Butrint (Albania)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the property was designated as a Ramsar property under the *Ramsar Convention on Wetlands* (1971) and therefore its natural values are better protected. A mission will take place in October 2003 as was decided by the Committee in 2001.

2. The Delegation of **Greece** referred to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision and asked that the mission should report on the main issues that caused the property being put on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, it informed the Committee about an agreement on the return of confiscated Albanian antiquities once the situation in Albania becomes safe.

3. The Delegation of **Belgium** requested that in future reports on the state of conservation mention the reasons why the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

4. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.26** as amended.

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Serbia and Montenegro)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it was the first time in 24 years that the Committee was reviewing the state of conservation of this property, following the mission in March/April 2003. Furthermore, new information was received on 1 July 2003 by the State Party on the preparation of the Round Table that is foreseen in October 2003.

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted some contradictions between the results of the report of the mission on the site and the Draft Decision. It underlined that, even if the threats caused by the earthquake have been reduced, the site should be maintained on the List of Heritage in Danger because of other persistent problems.

3. Recalling similar discussions of the day before, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** underlined that the State Party had already dealt with the main threat for which the property was included in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1979, namely the earthquake.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted, like the Delegation of Lebanon, that the Draft Decision did not correspond to the results of the mission report and that the site must be maintained on the List of Heritage in Danger. It asserted that the Committee must support the actions that the Heritage Administration of the State Party is taking in response to the new threats. The Delegation pointed out that the State Party must commit itself firmly to the conservation of site, in particular, for example, by drawing up a plan of action for its preservation.

5. The Delegation of **Nigeria** wondered whether the report requested in the Draft Decision under item 5 could be submitted within the deadline foreseen so that the Committee would be in a position to de-list.

6. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the Belgian position.

7. The Observer Delegation from **Serbia and Montenegro** thanked the World Heritage Centre for organising the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the property, and agreed with the mission's conclusions to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Integrated conservation work, in particular for the cultural landscape will continue and protection measures are being taken. The State Party welcomed the recommendations made, especially concerning the Round Table, which is useful in preparing the management plan for the property. A prompt reply from the Committee concerning much required technical and financial assistance would be appreciated.

8. The Delegation of **Greece** supported removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger with the recommendations made in the Draft Decision.

9. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the Draft Decision as the reason for inscription on the List

of World Heritage in Danger had disappeared and that the State Party had the intention to continue with the restoration works. Therefore it supported removal.

10. The Chairperson asked whether the Committee could come to an agreement.

11. The Delegation of **Thailand** said that there was no need for further recommendations and amendments as these were already covered by paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

12. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that it had no objection to the removal of the site from the In Danger List if that corresponded to the wishes of the majority. However, it requested that a paragraph be included in the Draft Decision reflecting the concerns of the Committee in relation to the effects of urbanization and it offered to submit a written text.

13. Finland agreed with the Draft Decision.

14. As no consensus was achieved, the **Chairperson** asked for a vote. Five Committee members (Belgium, Egypt, Lebanon, Mexico, and Portugal) voted for retaining the property on the List in Danger; fifteen Committee members supported removal from the List in Danger (China, Colombia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Nigeria, Oman, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Saint Lucia, Thailand, United Kingdom and Zimbabwe), and one Committee member abstained (Argentina).

15. The Delegation of **Thailand** highlighted that no additional recommendations should be added to the Draft Decision.

16. While expressing concerns about the implementation of the management plan, the Delegation of **Greece** in principle supported the Draft Decision.

17. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed that the Committee express its concerns as to the effects of urbanization and that a new paragraph 3 be added to this effect.

18. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** underlined the importance of a management plan, and suggested that a progress report and a deadline for its submission should be requested.

19. Following a request by the Chairperson whether this was feasible, the **Secretariat** indicated that the head of the mission was present, who would be able to respond.

20. The Observer Delegation from **Serbia and Montenegro** explained that a Round Table would take place in October 2003 which would be the basis for the management plan. A report would be provided on progress made in February 2004.

21. The **Chairperson** proposed that the final submission date for the management plan be provided at a later stage.

22. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed adding to the Draft Decision the following paragraph: "Expresses its concerns on the risks that excessive and uncontrolled urbanization imposes on the outstanding universal value of the site;"

23. The Delegations of **Hungary** and **Nigeria** requested approval of the Draft Decision with this amendment.

24. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.27** as amended.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

1. Decision **27 COM 7A.28** was adopted without amendment.

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls

1. The Delegation of **Oman** asked the Secretariat for information concerning the follow-up report on the Old City of Jerusalem.

2. The **Chairperson** stated that there was no report for the moment.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reminded the Committee that Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls were inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

4. The **Secretariat**, recognizing that this issue is bigger than the report itself, said that it wasn't able to conduct a mission to Jerusalem and stressed the impossibility to implement a normal process of evaluation of the property, because of the situation in the area. The Secretariat explained that, although aware of the need to provide a report to the Committee, a first mission carried out last year was not able to make a proper survey or to prepare the report for security reasons. However, recalling the address of the Director-General at the opening of the present session of the Committee, the Secretariat declared that it considered the above-mentioned issue a very important task and is confident for its future development.

5. The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that the Centre was able to carry out missions to areas affected by armed conflicts. It therefore requested the World Heritage Centre to submit a report on Jerusalem for the Committee at its 28th session.

6. The **Chairperson** proposed that, taking into consideration the importance of the issue, the Committee might wish to decide about it during the week.

7. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** stressed the need for a professional and academic discussion on Jerusalem.

It emphasized that the third and final stage of the "Road-Map" for a peace agreement, supported by the United Nations, the E.U., the U.S.A. and the Russian Federation, will provide the possibility for a dialogue on the conservation of Jerusalem as a city sacred to the three monotheistic religions. It moreover stated that it was in that spirit of reconciliation that it agreed to the proposed *corrigendum* in the Tentative List of Israel, on the understanding that the issue will be dealt with when "an agreement on the status of the City of Jerusalem in conformity with International Law is reached or until the parties concerned submit a joint nomination". Finally, it stressed that the "Road-Map" provided an intermediary phase during which a multi-lateral discussion on the safeguarding of Jerusalem was possible, and called upon the Palestinian delegation, the professional and academic community and the World Heritage Community to come together to that end.

8. The Observer Mission of **Palestine** underlined the need for an evaluation of the state of conservation of this site.

9. The Observer Mission of Palestine expressed its deep surprise concerning the following three points:

(i) the contradictions of the statement made by the Centre, recalling that several missions have been undertaken by members of the World Heritage Centre, while the Secretariat had just underlined the impossibility of conducting a proper survey in order to finalize the requested report on the Old City of Jerusalem;

(ii) the way with which the Committee mixes technical and political issues, such as the Road-Map, concerning which it is optimistic but does not pertain to this Committee; and

(iii) the awareness that the Committee keeps on postponing resolutions on the matter. The Observer Mission of Palestine concluded expressing its gratitude and underlining again its disagreement towards the mixture of technical and political problems.

10. The Chairperson declared this subject closed (see Decision **27 COM 7A.29**).

Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)

1. Returning to the examination of Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan), the **Secretariat** confirmed that the Draft Decision had been distributed in English and French to Committee Members.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7A.24** without amendments.

3. During the adoption of the Decisions under item 7A and 7B, it was decided that the framework and content of the State of Conservation reports as well as the deadline for the reception of the reports requested from States Parties should be made consistent as described and detailed in Decision **27 COM 7B.106**.

4. Also, during the adoption of the Decisions, it was decided that the term "UNESCO", when used to designate the World Heritage Centre should be replaced by the "World Heritage Centre". It was also decided that the reference to the date of the next session of the Committee be standardized in all Decisions as follows "28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004".

8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8A TENTATIVE LISTS

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/8A

1. Upon the proposal of the Chairperson, the World Heritage Committee took note of the Tentative Lists as presented in the working document (Decision **27 COM 8A**).

2. The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that from their Tentative List, as presented in the working document, are missing the natural properties recently submitted and would like to see them added as soon as possible. It also asked for clarifications about four properties presented in the Israeli Tentative List suspected to be in occupied Palestine territories and requested the addition of a footnote on these properties as in the case of Jerusalem.

3. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** stated that they considered that none of the properties presented in their Tentative List are within occupied territories. Therefore, the Observer Delegation objected to any further addition of a footnote.

4. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** cited Article 11 of the *World Heritage Convention*. In particular he mentioned that: "Every State Party to this *Convention* shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list".

5. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its satisfaction with the Director's intervention.

6. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, referring to the proposal made in the working document, said it was strongly convinced that the Tentative Lists should be made public.

7. The Delegations of **Lebanon** and **Saint Lucia** supported the intervention of the Delegation of United Kingdom.

8. The Delegation of **Belgium** said that it would like Article 11.2 of the Convention – concerning the Tentative Lists – to be quoted in the decision.

9. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 8A** as amended.

8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/7B
WHC-03/27.COM/8C*

1. The Committee confirmed the inscription (Decision **27 COM 8B.1**), maintenance (Decision **27 COM 8B.2**), and removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **27 COM 8B.3**).

8C NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST¹

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/8C
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.8A and ADD
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.8B
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.8C*

Changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

1. The **Secretariat** notified the Committee of the proposed change in the names of properties in Austria, Hungary, and Slovakia. The name changes were approved without discussion (Decision **27 COM 8C.2**).

NEW INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that five properties would not be examined in the 28th session, namely the extension to the Gough Island Wildlife Reserve, United Kingdom; the Historic City of Mardin, Turkey; the Natural System of ‘Wrangel Island’ Sanctuary, Russian Federation; the Franja Partisan Hospital, Slovenia, and the extension of Historic District of Québec, Canada (Decision **27 COM 8C.3**).

¹ The original order of presentation of nominations in the working document *WHC-03/27.COM/8C* was modified during the session to accommodate the schedules of visiting ministers of several States Parties presenting nominations. The following record follows the order of presentation during the session. The Decisions (*WHC-03/27.COM/24*), however, follow the original order of the working document.

Property	Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley
Id. N°	C 208 Rev
State Party	Afghanistan
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination and recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of criteria: C (i) (ii).

2. The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its full support for the ICOMOS recommendation.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the ICOMOS recommendation and expressed deep appreciation to the national authorities, UNESCO and ICOMOS for undertaking all the necessary steps to ensure that the nomination of the property was reformulated and completed in time for examination by the Committee at its 27th session. It also recognised, however, that the danger for the property was still present and justified the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as it did not derive from actions undertaken by the Iraqi authorities themselves.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand** supported the Draft Decision.

5. The Delegation of **India** expressed its Government’s full support for the inscription of the property as World Heritage, adding that if the Committee had inscribed the property on the World Heritage List in 1983 instead of deferring it on technical grounds, the destruction of the Buddhas and wall paintings may have been averted.

6. The Delegation of **Nigeria** underscored the importance of the archaeological remains of this property and supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

7. The Delegation of **Greece** supported the ICOMOS recommendation.

8. The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its full support for the recommendation made by ICOMOS.

9. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** was in full agreement with the ICOMOS recommendation.

10. The Delegations of **China, Oman, Lebanon** and **Mexico** expressed their support for inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

11. Noting the consensus, the **Chairperson** declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.43**) and on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **27 COM 8C.44**).

12. Following the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List, the **Deputy Minister of Information and Culture of the Transitional Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, H.E. Mr G. R. Yusufzai**, expressed his deep appreciation on behalf of his Government, his Minister and the people of Afghanistan, to the World Heritage Committee for finally inscribing the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley on the World Heritage List, and simultaneously on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He underscored the significance of this historic decision, which he was convinced would be welcomed enthusiastically throughout the cultural circles of the world and remembered for years to come.

13. Mr Yusufzai thanked the Director-General of UNESCO for ensuring that the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Kabul Office provided assistance to his Government in a timely manner to ensure the completion of the nomination file of the Bamiyan Valley.

14. He recalled that the Bamiyan Valley and numerous other endangered yet irreplaceable cultural heritage of Afghanistan, such as the Archaeological Remains and Minaret of Jam, were nominated for the World Heritage recognition in the 1980's by his Government. Yet, due to technical questions and continued national unrest, all previous attempts in this respect had led to failure, contributing to inadequate protection of the Afghan heritage. The Deputy Minister stated that many Afghans felt that if the World Heritage recognition had been bestowed upon such heritage, international support to prevent its destruction could have been more effectively mobilized.

15. Mr Yusufzai expressed his hope that the tragic events of 2001 in Afghanistan, and now in Iraq, may pave way for the World Heritage Committee to strengthen and enhance existing mechanisms in the inscription process of heritage on the World Heritage List and, in particular, the List of World Heritage in Danger, in order to maximize the protection of the world's endangered heritage and make use of the *World Heritage Convention* as an effective legal tool.

16. The Committee was assured that new opportunities existed for the rehabilitation and revitalization of Afghan's heritage, and that his Government was committed to protect, conserve and revive both tangible and intangible cultural heritage of Afghanistan. While thanking the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO, ICOMOS and numerous donor governments and NGO's for their continued efforts to safeguard the cultural heritage of war-torn Afghanistan, the Deputy Minister underlined the persisting need for comprehensive international co-operation to restore and rehabilitate the Afghan heritage. He stated that further international co-operation is both a source of hope and confidence to the Afghan people and is needed now, more than ever before.

17. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Minister for his intervention, and underscored the significance of this historic decision taken by the World Heritage Committee to finally inscribe the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of Bamiyan Valley on the World Heritage List and the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

Property	Ashur (Qala'at at Sherqat)
Id. N°	C 1130
State Party	Iraq
Criteria	C (iii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription under cultural criteria (iii) and (iv), as well as the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

2. This recommendation was supported by the Delegations of **Thailand, Hungary, Nigeria, Egypt, China, Lebanon, Oman, Finland** and **Greece**.

3. The property was inscribed by the Committee with acclamation on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.45**) and on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **27 COM 8C.46**).

Property	The First Railway Bridge over the Yenisei River
Id. N°	C 1071
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	

1. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that it could not carry out a property mission and that the requested information was not submitted by the State Party. It recommended deferring the nomination, which was supported by the Delegations of Hungary, Saint Lucia and Oman.

2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed to add to paragraph 3 of the Draft decision, after the word "nomination", the phrase "in accordance with the normal procedures for inscription".

3. The Draft Decision was adopted with the amendment made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom (Decision **27 COM 8C.47**).

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1 New Nominations

1. The representative of **IUCN** began the presentation of nominations by recalling its founding principles guiding the rigorous process of evaluation it undertakes in

conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* to reach a corporate decision.

Property	Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas
Id. N°	1083
State Party	China
Criteria	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee that the evaluation report for this property was the longest ever prepared for a natural property by IUCN and the area covered presented an exceptional complexity. IUCN recommended that the serial nomination of 8 cluster properties be inscribed on the List according to all four natural criteria.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** stated that it was very impressed by the technical report and presentation and therefore agreed to the Draft Decision as presented.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its support to the nomination and commended the State Party for its excellent and outstanding property.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** very strongly supported IUCN's recommendation and thanked it for having highlighted the cultural aspects of this site. However, it remarked that the human population was presented in it as a threat for the site, which was not acceptable. It asked that the text be revised.

5. The Delegations of **Zimbabwe**, **Oman** and **Nigeria** fully supported the Draft Decision. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the property on account of its extraordinary features.

6. The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed that only interventions, which suggested a modification to the support to the property need be voiced and that silence would be taken as an indication of *de facto* support for the nomination.

7. The **Chairperson** concurred with the Delegation of Colombia and asked the Committee whether they approved the suggestion made by Colombia.

8. The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that it supported both the nomination as well as the suggestion made by Colombia. The Delegation of **Finland** stated that it seconded the revised wording submitted by the Delegation from Belgium. The Delegation of **Egypt** added that the human population within the area could not be considered to be a problem and that it was rather the behaviour of any population that needed to be scrutinized.

9. The Delegation of **Belgium** reiterated its request to delete the mention, in paragraph 2, of the resident human population.

10. The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the List and congratulated the State Party (Decision **27 COM 8C.4**).

11. On behalf of his Delegation and his government, the **Representative from China** thanked everyone wholeheartedly who had been involved in the nomination. He gave special thanks to IUCN and on a personal note invited everyone to visit the property during the next session of the Committee in China in 2004.

12. The **Chairperson** asked that this invitation be included in the Summary Record.

Property	Ras Mohammed
Id. N°	1086
State Party	Egypt
Criteria	

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee that it recommended deferral on account of the insufficient size of the nominated area.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** asked IUCN whether the negative aspects raised in its evaluation had been previously made known to the State Party concerned to allow it to respond with the required information.

3. The **Chairperson** accorded the Delegation of Egypt the opportunity to take the floor in order to answer this specific question regarding the nomination.

4. The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the State Party had been made aware of IUCN's evaluation report only a month before the Committee. It observed that the State Party had not been notified of the Draft Decision and had only received the information from the website of the Centre. It added that the buffer zone of the marine protected area was under control through a special law for natural resources, and that the 600 km² of the nominated area was within a broader 4,000 km² region of national parks. It observed that this arrangement appeared to be a good management option for a buffer zone.

5. The Delegation of **Hungary** understood the IUCN proposal to enlarge the area, but requested Egypt to supply a response as to why it had only nominated the given area.

6. The Delegation of **Thailand** seconded the Delegation of Hungary and asked IUCN whether it would have been possible to bring this matter to the attention of the State Party in order to allow it time to address the issue of the buffer zone as clarified by the Delegation of Egypt. It added that this would be helpful for States Parties to receive IUCN evaluations. This could be said also for cultural heritage properties evaluated by ICOMOS.

7. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that the Committee had reached certain conclusions and that it would be advisable to accept the recommendation of

IUCN and allow time to elaborate the changes with the State Party.

8. IUCN responded by observing that the session of the Bureau had been eliminated, resulting in difficulties in providing an initial assessment of the nominations. He noted that it was customary to remain in contact with the State Party, as had been the case with Egypt, but that procedurally it was not in the mandate of IUCN to hand out its evaluations, which was the responsibility of the World Heritage Centre.

9. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the absence of a Bureau session in 2003 on account of the Committee's Extraordinary session in March 2003. She added that a solution would be sought over the next year to find a mechanism for the next year and to should increase communication between States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

10. The Delegation of **South Africa** wondered whether it would be possible for Egypt to have had time to have the property extended and therefore endorsed by IUCN. He requested the State Party to inform the Committee whether it was opposed to the IUCN recommendations.

11. Responding to the question from Hungary as to whether to add peripheral properties to the nomination, the Delegation of **Egypt** contended that the adjacent protected areas contained less species than the nominated core zone and that further species were also present in the Ras Mohammed marine park. He noted that the geographic position of the park was a natural *cul de sac* in the Red Sea providing important reasons for the value of its biodiversity. He stated that this was Egypt's position on the outstanding universal value of the property. With regard to the question from South Africa, he expressed his agreement that the first condition can be met, and that the second condition would actually take a very long time to resolve through considerable consultations with the neighbouring countries.

12. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** addressed a question to IUCN on whether it objected to the size of the nominated area because it was too small, or because it impacted upon the property's integrity. It added that it could understand an objection on grounds of integrity, but would have a problem if the objection related to the size of the area for its own sake.

13. IUCN responded that the evaluation noted the small size of the area and that marine species move around a great deal. He remarked that the majority of the dive sites, which are normally abundant in species, lay outside of the nominated area, and that the key population of Dugong was outside the eastern edge of the area, and that he hoped that the range of this species could be included within the nominated area. He was pleased to hear that Egypt would be willing to revise the nomination, adding that the area was not large enough to encompass a complete population

of representative species, nor wide enough to include significant migratory routes.

14. The **Chairperson** suggested adoption of the Draft Decision and recommended that the property be deferred. She passed the floor to the Secretariat to clarify the enquiry regarding information provided to the Advisory Bodies on evaluations.

15. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a decision had been adopted previously concerning this subject, which stated that the Secretariat would provide States Parties with advisory body evaluations at the earliest opportunity. In 2003, the Secretariat received the IUCN evaluations on 17 May, which were sent to the States Parties on 19 May. She also addressed the question of additional information supplied at the time of nomination or immediately after. It concurred that the absence of a Bureau session and discussion at the Extraordinary session would be clarified in the light of the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. It further added it had to be submitted first to the Secretariat who provides it to the Advisory Bodies.

16. IUCN offered further clarification on this matter of additional inputs, stressing that IUCN could not in any way change nominations, as its task is to evaluate nominations as put forward by the State Party.

17. The Committee decided that the nomination be deferred (Decision 27 COM 8C.5).

Property	Saryarka - Steppe and Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan
Id. N°	1102
State Party	Kazakhstan
Criteria	

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee that the Steppe Grassland nominated may have outstanding universal value, but a regional overview for such a type of heritage would be necessary for Central Asia.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** stated that the presentation made by IUCN had been very convincing and that it supported the recommendation for deferral.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the position of deferral and hoped that the thematic study would be carried out.

4. The Committee decided that the nomination be deferred (Decision 27 COM 8C.6).

Property	Monte San Giorgio
Id. N°	1090
State Party	Switzerland
Criteria	N (i)

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee that the area was a worldwide point of reference with one of the best known fossil collections for its geological period and recommended inscription under natural criterion (i).

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** said that it would be an excellent property and that it therefore supported IUCN as well as the proposed future extension of the property in collaboration with the authorities in neighbouring Italy.

3. The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that the previous property of Ras Mohammed had been deferred for similar reasons, but in this instance the property had been recommended for inscription.

4. IUCN responded to what he considered was a fair question by the Delegation from Egypt. Regarding fossil deposits, he observed that the best part of the collections were in Switzerland, and that roughly only 10% of the deposits were to be found on the Italian side of the frontier. He observed that in the case of the marine park in Egypt, the ideal site would be 5-10 times as large than the nominated area with a greater spread of natural characteristics over the entire area.

5. The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked IUCN for its elucidation and assured the Committee that his government would consider an extension of the boundaries of the nominated area.

6. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the IUCN recommendation following the explanation from IUCN.

7. The Committee inscribed the Mont San Giorgio on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.7**).

8. The Committee also adopted Decision **27 COM 8C.1** emphasising to States Parties the importance of including a global comparative analysis when preparing natural heritage nominations under natural criterion (i) for geological heritage

9. The Observer Delegation of **Switzerland** thanked the Committee and acclaimed the professionalism of IUCN. It wished to inform the participants that the protection of the site - the 6th Swiss site to be inscribed on the List and the second natural site – would be guaranteed by the federal, cantonal and municipal authorities, which have committed themselves to this. It also applauded the possibility of an extension of the site into Italy.

Property	Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park
Id. N°	951 Rev
State Party	Viet Nam
Criteria	N (i)

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee that it recommended deferral of the nomination, but that it

considered that the property had very strong potential under natural criterion (i).

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** asked whether it would be possible to hear the view of the State Party concerning the road proposal described by IUCN.

3. The Delegation of **Greece** mentioned that in the report by IUCN it was stated that the mission was postponed due to logistical technicalities, which may have been to the disadvantage of the State Party. It observed that this may have limited the ability of the State Party to carry out further work on something as complex as transboundary cooperation with Laos.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand** recalled that the nomination had been discussed by the Committee in 1999 regarding the transboundary status of the property and that the Committee had requested the State Party to negotiate with Laos to make the nomination “highly significant”. It expressed the opinion that the area was very complex and represented the highest value in geological terms for the whole of Asia. It noted that he was concerned that developing countries, such as in South-East Asia, were all experiencing significant pressures resulting from development and foreign direct investment. It wondered what would happen if the Committee considered deferral in every case where transboundary conditions had not been fulfilled. It concluded that the Committee would risk losing a property, which should have been inscribed on the List. As a consequence, it recommended that the property be inscribed with the recommendations for the extension of the area with inclusion of the Laos side. It advised that the property be inscribed primarily for its geological value under natural criteria (i) and that the fauna and flora values could be re-examined at a later stage.

5. The **Chairperson** gave the opportunity to the State Party to respond the questions concerning the road project.

6. The Observer Delegation of **Vietnam** informed the Committee that the road had been in existence for many years and had been used to prevent natural calamities in the park, such as protection against fire, as well as to provide the ethnic minorities in the park with a way to reach markets outside the area and reduce pressure on hunting. It noted that it would be further refining its management plans.

7. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** felt that the Delegation of Thailand may have taken his ideas telepathically, and that IUCN was clearly aware that great progress had been achieved in reducing poaching and illegal logging in the area. It added that the road had already been made and that the recovery of the area could be closely supervised by IUCN. It also recognized the important pressure on conservation areas in developing countries.

8. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** strongly agreed with the previous speakers and asked the State

Party how they had made efforts to make contact with the authorities in Laos.

9. The Delegation of **Mexico** welcomed the explanation by the Observer Delegation of Vietnam, and noted important biological diversity and karst values associated with the property. As a consequence, it supported the inclusion of the property on the List with the recommendations from IUCN to complete the management plan.

10. The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the State Party for the clarification regarding the road. The Delegation of Finland asked whether the road would be used exclusively for foot traffic or also for vehicular traffic.

11. On the issues of cooperation with Laos and the road, the Observer Delegation of **Vietnam** responded that his country had been working with the local and central government authorities in Laos, but PDR Laos did not have its part of the nomination ready at this point. He stressed that inscription of the Vietnamese portion would act as an encouragement to the Laotian authorities. On the subject of the road, he informed the Committee that his government had no plans to enlarge the link road and that two other separate highways outside the park carried the main traffic in the area.

12. The **Chairperson** noted that the road would therefore be used mainly for walking and for firemen.

13. The Observer Delegation of **Lao People's Democratic Republic** indicated that, as regards the form and the principles, its country was willing to make all efforts in order to join this site. It added, however that, as Thailand and Viet Nam had indicated, there was a basic problem concerning legislation, management and personnel for which its country was not yet quite ready. It indicated that the PDR Laos would like to join in the dialogue with Viet Nam as IUCN had so justly remarked in its recommendation.

14. The Delegation of **Nigeria** noted that all roads are not the same, as some of them had historical value as trade routes and a road could also be a positive force. In this way, it supported inscription of the property on the List.

15. **IUCN** explained that its recommendation to defer the property was based on the principle of integrity of the area outlined in paragraph 44(b) of the *Operational Guidelines*. IUCN further pointed out that its report stressed that the property had strong potential to meet natural criterion (i) on the outstanding universal value of Karst systems. However, IUCN noted that the nominated area did not meet natural criterion (iv). He therefore advised that a recommendation be included to encourage collaboration between Laos and Vietnam.

16. The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that transboundary nominations are often very complex and

that he therefore endorsed the earlier statement made by Mexico. The Delegation of South Africa concurred with the position of Thailand, but observed that the State Party satisfied his outstanding areas of concern.

17. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** recognised that this property presented a complex issue and presented a suggestion to facilitate the decision. He supported the view of IUCN and commended the State Party commitment towards the park. He noted the IUCN decision not to recommend inscription according to natural criterion (iv), relating to the integrity threat posed by the road, but suggested instead inscription solely under natural criterion (i) with the condition that the State Party report back on the road impacts and on its proposed extension with PDR Laos.

18. The Delegation of **Finland** commented that following the information provided by Laos and the information on the road, that Finland would be favourable to inscribe the property under natural criterion (i) with the recommendations of the Delegation of Thailand. The Delegation of Oman supported the position of the United Kingdom.

19. While supporting the position of the United Kingdom, the Delegation of **China** made two points. Firstly, the road was clearly a country road for local peoples' use, which could not be considered as sufficient for deferral, and secondly that the joint nomination with a neighbouring country could only be encouraged through the proposed IUCN recommendation.

20. Although he was not sure of the precise level of survey work on biodiversity, the Delegation of Egypt considered that the assets of the property were sufficient for natural criterion (i) as well as for natural criterion (iv) for its biodiversity. It further commented that these properties are for people, not against people within the tenets of sustainable development.

21. The Delegation of **Thailand** reaffirmed his earlier statement concerning inscription under natural criterion (i), and further suggested that the additional scientific study be recommended to be carried out. In connection with transboundary aspects, he encouraged the efforts to be continued, whilst for the road he noted that it was also important for the livelihood of the indigenous populations resident in the area.

22. **IUCN** supported the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, but highlighted that the area impacted by the road be excluded from the inscribed property. He further did not agree with the position of Egypt that the area be nominated under natural criterion (iv) without an increase in the size of the area.

23. The Delegations of the **Russian Federation** and the **Republic of Korea** supported inscription under natural

criterion (i) according to the proposal by the Delegation of Thailand.

24. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, concerning criterion (iv), quoted the IUCN report, which indicates that "this site includes the whole of the world's population of François' langurs" and deduced from that that it would not shock to include this site for this criterion.

25. The Delegation of **Finland** remarked that it was difficult for the Committee to be wiser than IUCN, so he favoured inscription solely under natural criterion (i). The Delegation of India restated its position in the light of the statement from Vietnam and encouraged the inscription to be viewed as a catalyst for support to Laos. It further stressed that trans-boundary dimensions could not become limiting conditions for any nominations.

26. In response to the Chairperson, the Delegations of **Egypt** and **Lebanon** concurred with inscription under natural criterion (i). The Delegation of Hungary further encouraged the State Party to pursue its extension with Laos.

27. Regarding the management plan and recommendation requirements raised by the Chairperson, the Delegations of **Thailand** and the United Kingdom encouraged further trans-boundary cooperation and deletion of the reference to the impact of the road from the decision.

28. The Delegation of **Lebanon** wished to obtain an explanation from IUCN on the "François' langurs".

29. **IUCN** responded that he would need to consult IUCN's specialist groups.

30. The Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List under natural criterion (i) together with IUCN recommendations on mitigating impacts of the road and cooperation with Laos to prepare a trans-boundary nomination (Decision **27 COM 8C.8**).

31. The Observer Delegation of **Vietnam** expressed its emotion noting the applause in the room, which must have been heard as far as Hanoi. It then thanked, on behalf of the Vietnamese government and the indigenous populations on the site, the Committee and IUCN. It confirmed that it considered this inscription as an honour and a duty for the Vietnamese people, and as a solemn commitment, indicating that the Governor of the province where the site is situated was present in the room. It concluded by inviting all the participants to visit this site to see what its country would do there in order to honour its commitments.

32. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a new World Bank-World Heritage Centre cooperation programme expected to focus on the Annamite

Biodiversity complex along the Laos-Vietnam border to promote implementation of the *Convention*.

Property	Uvs Nuur Basin
Id. N°	769 Rev
State Party	Mongolia/ Russian Federation
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that as this property provides major refuge to a large population of the snow leopard and other species, it recommended inscription of the property under natural criteria (ii) and (iv).

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** fully supported IUCN's recommendation.

3. The Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.9**).

4. The **Chairperson** noted that there had been no opposition to the recommendation for inscription, adding that the decision had been an easy one, and congratulated the two State Parties.

5. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed his country's appreciation for the positive decision and congratulated Mongolia on its first property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Jaú National Park (extension to form the Central Amazon Conservation Complex)
Id. N°	998 Bis
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that, on the basis of further new information supplied by the State Party concerning natural criterion (iv), it had modified its written decision to recommend inscription of the extended areas according to both natural criterion (i) as well as natural criterion (iv).

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** commented that both the extension and the recent information provided by the State Party were indeed quite impressive and it would support the IUCN proposal.

3. The **Rapporteur** reminded IUCN of the necessity to submit a revised decision in writing as soon as possible. The Committee then inscribed the extended areas on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.10**).

4. In warmly thanking the Chairperson, the Observer Delegation of **Brazil** noted that the nomination had almost doubled the size of the protected area to a total of some 5.2 million hectares.

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

Property	Purnululu National Park
Id. N°	1094
State Party	Australia
Criteria	N (i) (iii)

1. IUCN presented the site and informed the Committee of its recommendation to inscribe the property under natural criteria (i) and (iii) on account of its outstanding geomorphology, sandstone gorges and scientific value for research.

2. ICOMOS informed the Committee of its recommendation to defer the nomination on cultural grounds to allow mapping of the cultural qualities of the area and to see if the cultural significance corresponds to current park limits. It requested the State Party to have cultural aspects in the management plan with clear arrangements for sustaining communities.

3. In the light of the ICOMOS recommendation, the Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the nomination which he observed sets a good example for the *Convention* in its combination of the cultural, natural and intangible aspects.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed his satisfaction with the natural aspects of the property and supported the IUCN recommendation. On the cultural aspects, he advised on the need for an updated management plan. It further wondered why the last management plan was no longer deemed to be appropriate and asked whether it had any negative impacts on traditional practices? It further expressed his concern over the traditional practices, which might impact on the natural values of the property. It added that a recommendation to update the management plan could be included.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the position of the Delegation of Thailand asking the State Party to clarify the issue of the natural and cultural heritage interactions.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recognized that the ICOMOS evaluation included some ambiguities which might lead people to believe the park is inhabited and that its inhabitants were displaced when the park was created. For this reason, it was of the opinion that it would be opportune to inscribe this site for a cultural criterion. It requested that this point be clarified. It indicated that it also wished to know the the indigenous populations could be reintegrated into the site. The Delegation also asked IUCN to provide the Committee with a guarantee that the site would not see a repetition of the events that occurred at the Kakadu site.

7. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked if the aboriginal populations had supported the application for the inscription of the site.

8. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** summarised that the property represented some 12 million years of geomorphological evolution, and that the separation of natural and cultural heritage had been “welded together” by the management arrangements in place. In particular, it mentioned the continuation of traditional fire burning practices on the property. It further informed the Committee that no mining operations were proposed in the area or in the region, and that it was indeed a serious offence in Australian law to negatively impact on a World Heritage area. It recalled that there had been no forced removal of Aboriginal people from the area following settlement of the pastoral industry in the area, and that the displacement had come about through progressive social change. It therefore concluded by encouraging resettlement of the park, and confirmed the joint management arrangements of the property already in place.

9. IUCN notified the Committee that many national parks had been placed on the World Heritage List where existing management plans were in conflict with the needs and requirements of indigenous peoples. The Canaima National Park in Venezuela was a good example of this. Relative to mining, the potential exploration outside of the park had been discussed with the State Party which provided confirmation of their implementation of all possible measures to avoid negative impacts on the property. In relation to the statement of Lebanon dealing with mining, IUCN felt assured that it would not develop into a major threat. It added that the situation of mining could not be compared with Kakadu.

10. ICOMOS commented that management of the area solely according to natural criteria was contrary to the ICOMOS position that the two dimensions were intrinsically linked, and that the property should only be considered as a mixed property according to both cultural and natural criteria together.

11. The Delegation of **Thailand** noted that given the mobility of indigenous people in Australia, and given the importance of the natural features in the form of geological features, he would take IUCN’s recommendations and the “comments and concerns” of ICOMOS on board and urge the State Party to “do the rest”. It further stressed that this was not the only property in Australia with a population of Aboriginal people and that the State Party was known for its sound practices in integrating indigenous needs into park management. He suggested that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List under IUCN recommendations, while cultural aspects be discussed at a later stage.

12. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the IUCN recommendation relating to natural criteria and supported the position of Thailand. Referring to the Draft *Convention* on Intangible Heritage, the Delegation of Hungary also supported Thailand and agreed that this

should be inscribed as a mixed property – if not necessarily immediately together.

13. The Delegation of **India** seconded the constructive proposal of Thailand and mentioned the need for ICOMOS to focus on updating the management plan for the property. It presumed that such a plan would follow the involvement of communities within the larger picture of settlement of Aboriginal groups in Australia, and requested ICOMOS to clarify this point.

14. **ICOMOS** replied that the national park management plan had not been prepared with cultural qualities uppermost in mind, but an “outline” to move forward on the cultural aspects of the management plan had been received.

15. The Delegation of **India** asked the State Party for comment on this matter.

16. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** informed the Committee that the cultural dimensions of management were part of a process, “but a process well under way” and that a plan to incorporate traditional owners within the management structure would be extended to all the property.

17. The Delegation of **Finland** stressed that the property should be inscribed as a mixed property focusing on the joint natural and cultural management aspects, which could not be easily separated in this case. It recommended deferral of the nomination in order to provide time for the provision of comprehensive joint management plan.

18. The Delegation of **Oman** asked ICOMOS whether it still insisted on a mixed inscription given the State Party response.

19. **ICOMOS** replied that its advice and opinion remained based on a mixed nomination proposal and felt that inscription as natural property might lead to confusion in the management. The Delegation of Thailand observed that the inscription could proceed as a mixed property while awaiting a progress report concerning the cultural aspects of the park.

20. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked IUCN to comment on the ICOMOS recommendation for deferral, added to the associated question of what timeframe should be given for the re-submission of cultural features.

21. **IUCN** reiterated that it evaluated the natural values of properties and that cultural values were left primarily to ICOMOS, and that as a consequence IUCN would not interfere with these questions. However, he noted the situation might change following the proposed revision to the *Operational Guidelines* for the *Convention*.

22. **ICOMOS** responded to the question of time-scales for cultural assessments observing that this was for the State Party to decide.

23. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed to the Draft Decision, keeping in mind the natural criteria of the *Convention* by themselves. The Delegation of South Africa concurred with the Delegation of Thailand for inscription according to natural criteria (i) and (iii) followed by cultural criteria at a later stage.

24. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Thailand what it wished to integrate into the decision, and inquired whether the compromise was acceptable to Finland.

25. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested an additional paragraph to take into account the ICOMOS queries and to get feedback from the State Party in a relatively short time.

26. The Committee decided to inscribe the property based on natural criteria (i) and (iii) and decided to integrate parts of the ICOMOS recommendation that expressed concerns over cultural management into the Decision and urged the State Party to take into account aspects highlighted by ICOMOS, as well as to submit in a relatively short time the re-nomination under cultural values (Decision **27 COM 8C.11**).

27. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** reiterated the commitment of his Government to assess the cultural values of the property, address all “unresolved questions”, and to work with ICOMOS towards a mixed property inscription in the near future.

Property	Rio de Janeiro: Sugar Loaf, Tijuca Forest and the Botanical Gardens
Id. N°	1100
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that it had recommended not to inscribe the property according to natural criterion (iii) as the geological formation of sugar loaf was not exceptional from a regional or global point of view. IUCN noted however that the Botanic Garden had played an important role in the promotion of conservation awareness in the region.

2. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that threats to the area included a large number of favellas in the immediate vicinity of the nominated areas and that boundaries of the Tijuca Forest National Park and the nominated area did not coincide.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** agreed that the area was a beautiful property and concurred with ICOMOS that the statement of significance was not very well identified. It suggested re-nominating the property as a cultural landscape.

4. The Delegation of **India** requested the State Party to address the questions posed.

5. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the intervention made by Hungary and observed that the site deserved to be nominated for inscription.

6. The Committee decided not to inscribe the area as a natural property, and deferred the nomination as a cultural property. The Committee further supported the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies (Decision **27 COM 8C.12**).

7. The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** expressed his appreciation for the efforts and comments provided, and informed the Committee that his government would study carefully the recommendations and comments of the Committee, and hoped to return with the revised nomination in 2004.

Property	Parque Nacional del Este and its buffer zone
Id. N°	1080
State Party	Dominican Republic
Criteria	

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that it had recommended not to inscribe the property on account of its natural characteristics. **ICOMOS** delivered its report which stated that although the property was a “virtually untouched cultural resource” and was well protected, increasing pressures existed in the area from tourism. As a result, **ICOMOS** recommended deferral to allow enough time for the State Party to appraise the extent and distribution of archaeological remains.

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that it would like the Committee obtain real guarantees as to the controlling of tourism pressures. It underlined that the States Parties must choose between "making money" through tourism or being inscribed on the World Heritage List in a spirit of conservation.

3. The Delegation of **India** stated that the decision did not help the Committee address issues such as lack of capacity in developing countries. It further wondered whether the decision for deferral would lead to an increased vulnerability of the property. It observed that inscription, on the other hand, could act as catalyst to overcome the dilemma of conservation pitted against tourism. It stressed that archaeological skills could not be developed in a single year, and recommended that the area be positively recommended for inscription.

4. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** endorsed the suggestion of the Delegation of India, on condition that certain minimum archaeological research be met.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** wondered about the possibility of inscribing this site on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger at the same time.

6. The **Chairperson** asked **IUCN** and **ICOMOS** to specify if this site was really in danger and if it was possible to inscribe it directly on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

7. **IUCN** responded by observing that it did not meet any of the natural criteria as stipulated in the *Operational Guidelines*. **ICOMOS** reiterated the identification of the values outlined in the nomination document, and confirmed by the mission to the property, namely that although there was a strong indication of cultural resources, further research needed to be undertaken.

8. In not giving the floor to the Observer from Morocco, the **Chairperson** recalled that according to the *Rules of Procedure*, it was not permitted for observers to speak during the process of examination of nominations.

9. The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked whether danger was really looming, and whether the Committee required further threats to appear before it could consider the urgency of placing the property on the World Heritage List.

10. The Delegation of **Hungary** noted the constructive point made by the Delegation of Zimbabwe and agreed the cultural criteria had not been very well prepared. It suggested that the State Party be allowed to deal with the problems raised by tourism pressures, and to later resubmit the nomination in a stabilized condition.

11. The Delegation of **Egypt** on the question of substance raised by **ICOMOS**, commented that contact between Amerindians and Spaniards in the Caribbean was well documented and it should be possible to interpret the artifacts with the help of available documentation. It enquired, however, why the State Party was not informed in advance of the fact that the words "buffer zone" should not be stated in the name of the property as buffer zones are not a part of the World Heritage property as such. On consultation, it stressed that it was essential that an exchange of views take place between Advisory Bodies and State Parties. It concluded by saying that if the natural attributes of the property were not inscribed, the magnificent mangroves in the area may in fact be sacrificed to the development of tourism.

12. The Delegation of **Lebanon** wished to summarize the previous interventions, namely that for **IUCN** this site should not be inscribed for natural criteria; that for **ICOMOS**, the potentialities of the site seem exceptional but were poorly documented and finally, that real dangers existed, with the government of the State Party itself admitting that it could not control them. It said it did not

wish this site to be inscribed, indicating that an inscription for cultural criteria without the government undertaking to protect the site, was tantamount to opening the way to unbridled tourist development. It concluded by asking that the inscription be deferred and that the text of the decision seek guarantees concerning the protection of the site.

13. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed a “slight difficulty” with the view of ICOMOS. He reminded the Committee that there would always be more research to be carried out. However, it appeared that ICOMOS had contradicted its recommendation for further research by confirming the outstanding universal value of the property on a previous page of its evaluation text. Nevertheless, it seconded the view that the property be deferred on account of issues relating to management.

14. **ICOMOS** elaborated that what had been discovered was indeed the “tip of the iceberg” which therefore suggested the potential for a much larger property. It reiterating that the Committee needed to know what exactly it would be protecting, and therefore reaffirmed the need for more detailed surveys of the cultural qualities.

15. The Delegation of **India** noted that the ICOMOS explanation was helpful, but the Delegation of Lebanon’s questions were also important. It concurred with the question posed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom that the property showed every indication of very strong potential. As a consequence, it felt that the preparation of a management plan was critical, and that the Committee would be in a position to offer further assistance.

16. The **Chairperson** presented two options to the Committee: either recommend inscription with recommendations, or agree with the position as outlined by the Delegation of India.

17. The Delegation of **Thailand** proposed that the wording be modified to referral.

18. The Delegations of **Hungary, Portugal and Oman** seconded this position.

19. The Delegation of **Nigeria** enquired what were the likely trends as regarded the threats.

20. **ICOMOS** took the floor again to observe that adequate legislation should be in place to provide protection for the national park.

21. The Observer Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** informed the Committee that the National Congress of its country had a project under way to protect all of its national heritage. It recalled that the Dominican Republic was a tiny developing country and that it did not understand the precise questions posed by the Advisory Bodies.

22. The Delegation of **South Africa** requested an explanation from the Delegation of Thailand concerning the meaning of the term referral. The Delegation of Thailand recalled that for cases where actions needed to be undertaken by the State Party deferral was necessary, whilst in cases of requests for supplementary information, such as more detailed maps, referral could be advised.

23. The Committee decided to refer the nomination back for further information from the State Party (Decision **27 COM 8C.13**).

24. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** requested clarification on Article 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure on the possibility of intervention by the Observers in the debates concerning nominations.

25. The **Chairperson** stated that she could not give the floor to an Observer Delegation during the debate concerning the inscription of a site, but only immediately after the adoption of a decision by the Committee.

26. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** indicated that it had a different reading of this Article, namely that only Observer Delegations whose site was being debated could not speak during the debate on that site.

27. The **Chairperson** notified the Committee that she would seek clarification on this matter with the Legal Advisor of UNESCO rather than open the floor for discussion on this point of order.

Property	Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture
Id. N°	1117
State Party	Portugal
Criteria	

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that it did not recommend the property under natural criteria as the volcanic features of the property were not outstanding, and the conservation value of the property, even within the regional context of the Azores, could not be substantiated.

2. **ICOMOS** recommended to the Committee to defer the nomination under cultural criteria on account of the small size of the nominated vineyard area, and the expected completion of a study on vineyard landscapes by ICOMOS. The recommendation proposed resubmission of the nomination to include a wider living and fossil cultural landscape spread across the island.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** alluded to a possible problem with the procedure for mixed nominations. It wondered firstly whether it was necessary to await the thematic study on vineyard landscapes as the nomination had been presented before the proposed study was discussed by the Committee, and suggested that in the case

of mixed nomination, such as this one, the Committee could recommend inscription for cultural criteria.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** wished to reformulate the problem posed by ICOMOS: the limits of the site being very restricted, they do not cover the real zone of the landscape. It insisted on the fact that a cultural landscape was inscribed and not samples and requested that the State Party look again at the boundaries of the site to be inscribed. Furthermore, it indicated that it would like this inscription to be deferred awaiting the results of the thematic study by ICOMOS on vineyard cultural landscapes requested after the inscriptions of Duoro and Tokaji.

5. Noting the great potential of the area as a cultural property, the Delegation of **Argentina** concurred with the Delegations of Hungary and Lebanon and therefore invited the Delegation of Portugal to resubmit the nomination. The Delegation of Argentina suggested that the recommendations relating to the thematic study be deleted.

6. The Delegation of **Greece** supported the decision to defer this nomination.

7. The Delegation of **South Africa** disagreed that the property was “too small” to be nominated as a cultural landscape, but considered that vineyard landscapes needed to be scrutinised by an expert as part of a broader landscape.

8. The **Chairperson** sought clarification from the Committee regarding this nomination “in the pipeline” which could not be stopped on account of the uncompleted thematic study.

9. Stressing that no failure was involved, the Delegation of **Nigeria** observed that more work was needed on the property, and recommended deferral. The Delegation of Thailand emphasised that the vineyard study was not for the benefit of ICOMOS, but rather for the Committee that had requested it to be undertaken. It recalled a discussion on this matter in Budapest and stressed that this nomination be the “last exception” to the need for a study. In the light of these remarks, he recommended referral to the State Party.

10. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented that if the boundaries of the property were not optimal, then it should be deferred in order for the borders to be revised. The Delegation of India supported the clarification of the Delegation of the United Kingdom and hoped that the State Party would develop a sound proposal. However, she asked the Secretariat to confirm the dates of discussions regarding the thematic study.

11. The **Secretariat** clarified that the first discussion on this matter had taken place during the extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 2001) and the session of the Committee at Helsinki in December 2001, when the

Duoro Valley (Portugal) had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. This had been followed by the discussion on Tokaji in Budapest in 2002.

12. The Delegation of **India** intervened by saying that the Committee should stop playing fast and loose with thematic studies and that it could not be whimsical about such matters. The Delegation stressed that it was important not to impose burdens on the Advisory Bodies with unreasonable demands for thematic studies.

13. The **Chairperson** inquired whether the majority of the Delegations were in favour of deferral. The Delegation of India supported the ICOMOS recommendation including all three paragraphs.

14. The Chairperson further enquired whether the Delegation of India was agreeable to the proposal to delete paragraph 2 as proposed by the Delegation of Argentina. She further enquired whether it would be possible to adopt the decision without paragraph 2. The Delegation of India stressed that if the nomination were to be considered the paragraph needed to stay.

15. The Delegation of **Lebanon** commented that the property could be protected and felt that if the thematic study was anticipated for December 2003, this would be in time for the next Committee session. It supported the proposal to retain the paragraph.

16. The Delegation of **Egypt** noted the four types of decisions available to the Committee: inscription, referral, deferral and not to inscribe which he considered to be a “death penalty for a property”. The Chairperson noted the need to decide whether or not to retain the paragraph concerning the thematic study. The Delegation of Egypt felt that a State Party should not be penalised on account of an unfinalised study, even with the assurance of the forthcoming promise of the report in December 2003.

17. The **Chairperson** asked for a show of hands on the need to retain the reference to the comparative study.

18. The Delegation of **Thailand** proposed the substitution of the word “deferral” by “referral” in the decision.

19. In connection with its previous intervention, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated the need to clarify the boundary issues and recommended deferral to avoid a “long agonised debate”.

20. In order not to involve the Committee in policy issues and block consensus, the Delegation of **India** agreed to the deferral.

21. The **Rapporteur** noted that a separate sentence would be needed, which could be drafted with the Secretariat.

22. The Delegation of **South Africa** was pleased to adopt the deferral and retain paragraph 2.

23. The **Chairperson** then took a vote from the floor, which led to 7 members in favour of retention of the paragraph, 10 in favour of deletion and 4 abstentions.

24. The Delegation of **India** asked to hear the view of the State Party.

25. The Delegation of **Portugal** recognized that a lot had already been discussed, and understood the reasons for the IUCN recommendations. In response to the ICOMOS recommendations it commented, however, that they were not clear in the case of referral. He felt that some of the evaluation was entirely fair as it did not understand whether the enlarged area proposed would form part of a buffer zone or core area. It added that some of the problems associated with this mixed nomination would not arise following the introduction of the integrated natural and cultural criteria in the revised *Operational Guidelines*.

26. The Delegation of the **India** enquired whether the State Party considered the proposal presented by the Delegation of the United Kingdom would help avoid the impediments described for the resubmission of the property.

27. The Delegation of **Portugal** called for more clarity regarding the suggested extension of the property for the Decision.

28. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the ICOMOS recommendation was to extend the zone. It added that this task was not one for the Committee, but for the State Party, with the aid of ICOMOS.

29. The Delegation of **Thailand** supported this position.

30. The Committee decided not to inscribe the property under natural criteria and referred the nomination back to the State Party for re-submission for consideration under cultural criteria only (Decision 27 COM 8C.14).

Property	Serra da Capivara National Park
Id. N°	606 Bis
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	<i>C (iii)</i>

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that the nomination for the park had been initiated in 1991, but hadn't been evaluated by IUCN until 1999. He emphasised that although the Catinga biome in north-eastern Brazil was not represented on the World Heritage List, the park was not outstanding on account of its natural beauty or biodiversity as compared with other properties such Serra de Confusoes in the region. IUCN recommended not to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List under natural criteria, but encouraged the

State Party to consider resubmitting it as part of a serial nomination for the Catinga.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the recommendation as stated.

3. The Delegation of **Egypt** commented he would have wanted to see more precise terminology in the Draft Decision, which reflected the negative appraisal by the advisory body. He suggested that if the recommendation was not to inscribe the property, it was not possible to recommend further measures later on. IUCN responded that it hoped to encourage a larger serial nomination along the lines of the 3 parallel rivers nomination presented by the government of China.

4. The Delegation of **Egypt** enquired, however, why in the case of Ras Mohammed in Egypt the decision of IUCN had been to defer on the grounds of the need to add further protected areas to the nomination, whereas in the case of Serra da Capibara the decision was not to inscribe. IUCN replied by saying that it had applied precise guidelines to consider the protected areas within their regional context, and that the State Party had been fully informed of the procedures employed.

5. The Delegation of **Hungary** suggested a change to the first paragraph of the Draft Decision not to inscribe the property with the third paragraph for added information and so on.

6. The Delegation of **Egypt** couldn't help noting that whilst IUCN had referred to the park as "one of the best protected in Latin America", the final decision was not to inscribe. It further added that a serial nomination would not add any natural characteristics to the property, and therefore recommended that the property be deferred as part of the serial nomination proposal.

7. **IUCN** responded by emphasising that the biodiversity features of the Catinga should form part of a wider corridor to link many different areas, and that the current property under examination did not meet natural criterion (iv). He conceded, however, that whilst it had only been a "paper park" in 1991, it was currently very well managed.

8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with IUCN on the decision not to inscribe, but agreed with the Delegation of Egypt that on the ambiguous congratulatory language in the light of the negative decision.

9. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the revised wording proposed by the Delegation of Egypt, and suggested that the recommendations be "forwarded" to the State Party.

10. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that the IUCN's text, in spite of a few ambiguities, was clear since

no outstanding universal values had been shown for the natural criteria as far as this site was concerned. Unless IUCN's opinion was challenged, this site could not be inscribed as a natural site. The Delegation of Lebanon asked the Committee not to have the State Party waste its time, for it would submit a new nomination if the decision was not clear.

11. The **Chairperson** requested a clarification on the decision not to inscribe as part of a serial nomination.

12. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed that it was confused how a property that been rejected by the Committee could be resubmitted.

13. The Delegation of **Hungary** noted that paragraphs 1 and 3 were connected.

14. The **Chairperson** suggested placing paragraph 1 after paragraph 3, followed by paragraphs 2, 4 and 5.

15. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed removing any geographical reference from paragraph 3, and simply encouraging a serial nomination.

16. The Delegation of **Argentina** noted that no changes had been made to paragraph 1.

17. The Committee decided not to inscribe the property under natural criteria (Decision **27 COM 8C.15**).

18. The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** gave the floor to the Park's Director, who indicated his willingness to go along with IUCN's recommendation. It underlined that the possibility had been emerging for years, through research programmes, that the two sites, Capivara and Confusoes, 60km apart, be linked, as they constituted one of the richest areas in Brazeil as regards biodiversity. It would involve joining the two parks as well as the intermediate zone.

19. At the request of the Chairperson, the **Legal Advisor** for UNESCO clarified the point of order concerning Rule 22.4 of the *Rules of Procedure* (see paragraph 27 above, concerning the Parque Nacional de Este and its buffer zone, Dominican Republic). He interpreted the first sentence which stated that any members of the Committee or national observers were not permitted to take the floor if they were directly implicated in the property under discussion. He interpreted the second sentence as referring to all other observers. The intention of such a Rule was to ensure that State Parties or observers concerned with a particular nomination would not be able to speak in order to advocate the inscription of the property under consideration.

Property	Saint Catherine Area
Id. N°	954 Bis
State Party	Egypt
Criteria	C (i) (iii) (iv) (vi)

1. **IUCN** presented the site and informed the Committee that the biodiversity features of this cultural property inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2002 were not of outstanding universal value and the recommendation of IUCN was not to inscribe the property under natural criteria.

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed to retain paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision as it was and to insert a paragraph corresponding to what IUCN recommended in order to encourage the State Party to submit a new nomination as a cultural landscape. The designation of the site as a Biosphere Reserve could be done in accordance with the UNESCO MAB programme. It added that paragraph 2 would become paragraph 3 and would remain unchanged.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** noted that IUCN had certain doubts on the importance of Saint Catherine at the global level, such as for migratory birds. In this way, the recommendation could therefore be changed to deferral to allow Egypt to provide further information.

4. The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the Delegation of Hungary as to whether it was in fact referring to a cultural landscape renomination.

5. The Delegation of **Hungary** confirmed that the property was already inscribed for its cultural values, and that it would have strong potential as a cultural landscape.

6. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** referred to the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon as plausible. However, it considered that more data needed to be supplied, and therefore suggested deferral.

7. The Delegation of **Greece** considered that more effective protection could be developed for this monument and cultural landscape of outstanding value.

8. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the IUCN recommendation.

9. The Delegation of **China** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon and concurred that it would be better if the nomination was deferred. It noted further that numerous properties in China were also UNESCO Biosphere Reserves.

10. The Delegation of **Mexico** seconded the need for additional information to be submitted on the impact in different zones and the appropriateness of a Biosphere Reserve designation.

11. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** considered that IUCN's recommendation for resubmission, as a cultural landscape appeared to be quite clear.

12. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that in Budapest, the question had been raised as to whether to inscribe this site under both cultural and natural criteria and it asked for clarification on this point as well as on the mission.

13. **IUCN** responded to the Delegation of Hungary pointing out that it had carried out a comparative analysis of 260 protected areas in the same region. It observed that it was "highly unlikely" that its evaluation would be more favorable following resubmission on a subsequent occasion.

14. The Delegation of **Belgium** apologized to IUCN concerning the confusion concerning the protection zones.

15. The Delegation of **Egypt** asked the Committee why the property had been deferred as a natural property in Budapest, referring to problems in fixing the dates of a visit by the evaluator. As the mission had taken place in December 2002 it observed that the winter was not a good season, and that had it visited in April the desert would have been in flowers. As concerns re-nomination as a cultural landscape, he saw no objection if the Committee accepted.

16. The **Chairperson** repeated the decision not to inscribe under natural criteria and recommendation to re-nominate as a cultural landscape.

17. The Delegation of **India** enquired whether the State Party wished to include natural features as part of the mixed nomination.

18. The Delegation of **Egypt** responded by asking the Secretariat whether a cultural landscape would in fact be considered again as a mixed nomination.

19. **IUCN** commented that different processes of evaluation had taken place for the single nomination including both field analysis and extensive consultation of databases. He further added that winter would not be problem for the evaluator who was himself from a cold northerly latitude.

20. The **Director of the Centre** clarified that a cultural landscape was technically considered to be cultural category, and therefore any cultural landscape nomination could be supplemented with additional natural criteria.

21. The Delegation of Thailand agreed that the property would not be inscribed for its natural values and confirmed that the property be resubmitted as a cultural landscape.

22. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 8C.16**.

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

Property	Quebrada de Humahuaca
----------	------------------------------

Id. N°	1116
State Party	Argentina
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)(v)

1. Following the ICOMOS presentation, the Delegation of **Mexico** declared that it was in favour of this nomination. It mentioned that this site was an example of an under-represented category, namely: cultural itineraries. This road, full of history and indigenous habitats, and very well conserved, is evidence of the richness of this natural corridor.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** said that it was "almost sad" that ICOMOS did not have more time for its presentation. It qualified this site as "extraordinary" and brought its heartfelt support to the ICOMOS proposal and the State Party's request.

3. The Delegation of **India** emphasized the importance of the property, which is one of the largest and more complex of its kind, documenting a significant movement of people. It further expressed its wish to learn more on the property from its Management Plan, as soon as it is available.

4. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the inscription stressing its significance as a cultural itinerary, while looking forward to the completion of the Management Plan.

5. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Hungary** also expressed their full support for inscription.

6. The Committee decided to inscribe this property under criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) on the World Heritage List by acclamation (Decision **27 COM 8C.17**).

7. The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its satisfaction and thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the Secretariat for the support received. It further stressed the importance of the work carried out together with the local communities, who have been fully involved in the nomination process and are aware of its implications.

Property	Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso
Id. N°	959 Rev
State Party	Chile
Criteria	C (iii)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii).

2. Following the presentation by ICOMOS, the Delegations of **Finland** and **Hungary** supported the nomination stressing the great interest of this early 20th century property, which appears to fill a gap on the World Heritage List.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, supporting the nomination, asked ICOMOS whether in this case criteria cultural (ii) and (iv) could not be also applied.

4. The Delegation of **India**, for its part, suggested that cultural criteria (ii) and (v) be taken into consideration, in addition to (iii).

5. The Delegation of **China** supported the recommendation by ICOMOS to inscribe the property under cultural criterion (iii), but could also accept (ii) and (v).

6. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supporting the nomination, stressed the importance of the Master Plan and the question of how soon it will be implemented.

7. The Delegations of **Zimbabwe, Egypt, Portugal, Russian Federation, Oman** and **Thailand** supported the recommendation by ICOMOS to inscribe the property under cultural criterion (iii).

8. The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the State Party for this new nomination and recognised the exceptional value of the property, the most important port on the Pacific Ocean, a multicultural hub along the “*corridor bioceánico*”, the commercial route at the root of the economic development of the Region.

9. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked for the opinion of ICOMOS on the change in criteria. It pointed out that it was difficult to identify the boundaries of the sites by consulting the evaluations of the Advisory Bodies on the Internet.

10. The Delegations of the **United Kingdom** and **Thailand**, considering that the information provided through the internet to the Delegations did not include plans or illustrations, warned against adding other criteria to the proposed recommendation by ICOMOS during the current discussion, stressing how this would need to be the result of a serious consideration and rigorous process.

11. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** was in favour of inscription including criterion (ii), but requested ICOMOS to further elaborate on this possibility.

12. **ICOMOS**, after addressing a concern of the Delegation of Nigeria on the proposed change in the title of the nominated property, expressed its readiness to draft a new paragraph to justify consideration for criterion (ii).

13. The Delegation of **Colombia** underlined the relevance of criterion (ii), and stressed the great involvement of the local community in the nomination process, an issue which is increasingly on the agenda of conservation efforts in the Latin America Region.

14. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** then suggested encouraging the State Party to submit a new nomination under other criteria.

15. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, supported by the Delegation of India, recalled that port cities are by definition zones of exchange combining different influences, which would justify in this case using criterion (ii), and supported the suggestion made by ICOMOS to draft a new paragraph for the Decision in that respect.

16. The Committee decided to inscribe this property under criterion (iii) on the World Heritage List by acclamation (Decision **27 COM 8C.41**).

17. The State Party, represented by **Mrs Soledad Alvear, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile**, took the floor to congratulate the Committee for inscribing Valparaiso on the World Heritage List, it being both an honour and a responsibility for her country. It further recalled that Valparaiso represented, since the beginning of the industrialization process, the memory and dream of the projection of Chile towards the Pacific Ocean, as well as the embodiment of the national spirit, open to all cultures. Finally, the State Party gave assurances of its full commitment, in collaboration with UNESCO and its World Heritage Centre, towards the conservation of Valparaiso, whose designation as the cultural capital of the country could be envisaged in the future.

Property	Franciscan Missions in the Sierra Gorda of Queretaro
Id. N°	1079
State Party	Mexico
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (ii) and (iii).

2. The Delegations of **Finland, Egypt, Oman, Hungary, Argentina, China, Saint Lucia, Russian Federation, Portugal**, and **Zimbabwe** supported the nomination, emphasizing that it clearly testified to a significant cultural interchange under severe environmental conditions.

3. The Delegation of **Argentina** stressed the importance of this property, as a witness to the evangelisation period.

4. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its reservation on the use of the word “colonisation” in the proposed recommendation, and offered some alternatives.

5. The Committee decided to inscribe this property under cultural criteria (ii) and (iii) on the World Heritage List by acclamation (Decision **27 COM 8C.26**).

6. The Delegation of **Mexico** took the floor to thank the Committee and ICOMOS for its support. It also stressed

that the World Heritage listing constituted an additional, fourth landmark in the history of the State of Queretaro, since it was there that the Independence of the country was achieved, that the Republic was proclaimed, and the Constitution adopted. Recognizing the honour and responsibility deriving from the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, the authorities are fully committed to protect its values, including the context and landscape surrounding the Missions.

7. The Observer Delegation of the **Holy See**, whilst congratulating the State Party for the inscription of this property, underlined that these missions represented a successful example of the inculturation of the Christian faith, which, brought by European missionaries, was able to express itself within the framework and through the forms of a different culture, that of the Indios. It underlined that these missions could be the subject of a study on the relationship between culture and religion.

Property	The Jewish Quarter and St Procopius' Basilica in Třebíč
Id. N°	1078
State Party	Czech Republic
Criteria	C (ii) (iii)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (ii) and (iii).

2. Following the presentation by **ICOMOS**, the Delegation by **Thailand**, noting that cultural criterion (iv) had not been taken into account by **ICOMOS** in its recommendation, but that the State Party in the original nomination had requested it, considered that its application would be justified in this case.

3. **ICOMOS** then explained that in its opinion, compared to the Christian quarter, the distinct character of this particular Jewish settlement was limited to its use, not its architectural features.

4. The Delegation of **Hungary** emphasized the intangible elements of this nomination, which it fully supported.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supporting the nomination, suggested that in the interest of saving time, no discussion take place on possible additional criteria, whose consideration would require a rigorous and lengthy process, not possible in the context of the current debate.

6. The Delegations of **Finland, China, Oman, Greece** supported the nomination.

7. The Delegation of **Belgium**, whilst supporting the Unit(ed) Kingdom's proposal, asked that in the future

ICOMOS examine nominations in relation to all the cultural criteria.

8. The Committee decided to inscribe this property under cultural criteria (ii) and (iii) on the World Heritage List by acclamation (Decision **27 COM 8C.18**).

9. The Observer Delegation of the **Czech Republic** thanked the Committee for the inscription of this property. It also thanked the Delegation of Hungary for having pointed out the intangible values of the property.

Property	Complex of Koguryo Tombs
Id. N°	1091
State Party	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Criteria	

1. In presenting the property of Koguryo Tombs, **ICOMOS** explained that a new recommendation was put forward to the Committee, further to new information received from the State Party which responded to their initial concerns over authenticity and accessibility, and in view of a nomination recently presented by China for a property with similar characteristics.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** requested clarification on the apparent discrepancy between the information given and the recommendation proposed.

3. In reply, **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that its reservations concerning the accessibility of the tombs had been addressed by the State Party, which had provided reasonable justifications in that respect. Some of the tombs, it was explained, were not accessible since they had been closed for over fifty years for conservation purposes. On the other hand, the nomination of it would appear that the tombs on the Chinese side which date from an earlier period than those included in the nomination under examination would make it desirable to examine the selection of the tombs in a holistic way. These two elements brought **ICOMOS** to modify its original draft recommendation, although, it still recommends deferral in order to allow for a comparative study with a view to harmonise its nomination with that presented by China.

4. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its doubt on the proposal to defer the nomination on the grounds that it should be harmonised with the Chinese nomination.

5. The Delegation of **Greece** agreed with the recommendation of **ICOMOS**, but wished to hear from the concerned States Parties whether they would agree to undertake such a process.

6. In this, it was supported by the Delegation of **Oman**.

7. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, expressing satisfaction for the recognition of the outstanding universal values of the property, requested

from ICOMOS to elaborate on what exactly it meant by harmonisation. If it implied a trans-boundary, joint nomination, this might cause some difficulties. A trans-boundary nomination, as it understood, was a recommendation, not a condition.

8. **ICOMOS** then explained that it was not suggesting a trans-boundary nomination, but only some form of coordination. Had the Chinese nomination not been presented, ICOMOS would have in any case recommended deferral to enable the State Party to prepare a comparative study.

9. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its concern about the possibility that a nomination be stopped simply because another State Party has submitted another nomination concerning a similar property. This would establish a dangerous precedent. If ICOMOS believes that it needs a second mission to the property to further evaluate certain aspects of the nomination, however, this would be understandable and acceptable.

10. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that if ICOMOS had done the study of the Tentative Lists, the problem mentioned could have been identified earlier.

11. The Delegation of **Finland** supported the view expressed by the previous speaker, recalling that similar problems are faced in its Region.

12. The Delegation of **United Kingdom**, together with that of the Delegation of Zimbabwe, expressed support for the recommendation as originally drafted by ICOMOS in the working document.

13. The Delegation of **China**, in agreement with the original recommendation by ICOMOS, stated that it saw no difficulties in undertaking a joint, trans-boundary nomination with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Concerning the comparative study, it recalled that Chinese experts could offer a significant contribution, if requested.

14. The Observer Delegation of the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea**, thanking ICOMOS, the Secretariat and the Chinese Delegation for their support, acknowledged the views expressed by some Delegations that a trans-boundary nomination was not considered conditional to go forward with its nomination. It further commented that for the time being the two separate nominations could proceed separately.

15. The Delegation of **Thailand** reiterated that deferral would be acceptable only on the grounds of a second mission, if this was deemed necessary, or to prepare a comparative study.

16. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** envisaged going ahead with the single nomination by Korea. Blocking it to wait

for the Chinese nomination would be against the *Convention*.

17. The **Delegation of the Republic of Korea** observed that in this case the most appropriate decision would be to refer the nomination, rather than defer it. It further suggested that paragraph 3 of the proposed recommendation could address the issue raised in paragraph 4, which could therefore be deleted.

18. In reply to a question posed by the Delegation of India, **ICOMOS** clarified that a second mission would not add anything to the evaluation of the property, since the tombs closed during its first evaluation mission would still be closed for conservation reasons during a second visit.

19. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that the quality of the decisions of the Committee depended on the information provided to it. It asked if a second mission was necessary to evaluate the selection of the tombs.

20. To this question, **ICOMOS** replied that the selection of properties included in the present nomination would be sufficient to provide an evaluation, as long as a comparative study were carried out. At the end of the debate, the Delegation of **China** offered a new recommendation for consideration of the Committee, in an attempt to synthesize and summarize the various positions expressed.

21. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its support for the proposal made by the Delegation of China.

22. The new Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of China was adopted, with an amendment suggested by the Delegation of Egypt to remove the word "nominated" from the title of the nomination (Decision **27 COM 8C.19**).

Property	The Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen
Id. N°	1087
State Party	Germany
Criteria	

1. The Delegation of **Hungary**, having noted that this nomination concerned one building and its context, observed that in its opinion the city of Bremen, part of the Hanseatic League, could well have outstanding universal value that ICOMOS had not been able to ascertain, including under cultural criterion (vi). It further commented, with the support of Greece, that a deferral would be more appropriate in this case, to enable further consideration for the potential and specific value of the property.

2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, supported by the Delegation of Nigeria, expressed its agreement with the recommendation by ICOMOS, as far as the proposed

property is concerned. If an association with the Hanseatic League is to be envisaged, then a new, serial nomination should be prepared and submitted.

3. The Delegation of **Egypt** emphasized that this was becoming a policy issue. If a property could demonstrate outstanding universal value in its own merit, even as part of a broader historical phenomenon, then it could go forward irrespective of a serial nomination. For this reason, the Delegation of Egypt recommended a deferral to prepare a study on the role of Bremen within the context of the Hanseatic trade.

4. The Delegation of **Finland**, commenting on the reasons provided by ICOMOS to justify its recommendation, stressed that an external influence in itself does not necessarily imply that the values of the property are diminished, and expressed its support for deferring this proposal.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that the city of Bremen represented much more than just a Hanseatic city, since it was and still is a "free city" ("Freistadt"): its Town Hall is in fact the symbol of that. It would therefore be necessary to clarify this aspect and specify if it is illustrated in the decoration, the iconography of the sculptures, architectural and other elements. The Delegation of Belgium further pointed out that the term "Dutch renaissance and influence" used by ICOMOS was historically inappropriate. In the XVIth century, the period of the "importation" and "interpretation" of the Italian Renaissance, the present-day Netherlands - "the Netherlands" to which the adjective "Dutch" applies - were part of a wider unit, namely the United Provinces or "Low Countries" which covered more or less the territory of Benelux today. From 1579, the Southern and Northern Netherlands were distinguished, corresponding to the modern "Netherlands". Essentially, it is from the South of the United Provinces - with Antwerp as the major player - that, from the first half of the XVIth century onwards, the diffusion of the Renaissance into the North-East of Europe took place. Its Town Hall, dating from 1564, the widespread printing of books on architecture and ornamentation were the characteristic and exemplary expression of it.

6. The Delegations of **China** and **Oman** took the floor in favor of deferral, on the grounds presented by the Delegations of Hungary and Greece.

7. The Delegation of **India** observed that referral, not deferral, would be more appropriate, and asked how the State Party would react to the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

8. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** expressed its agreement to a deferral of the present nomination, as well as its readiness to continue the fruitful dialogue and cooperation established with ICOMOS.

9. The Delegation of **Egypt**, recalling the potential difficulties deriving from the inscription within a serial site of properties, which are already on the World Heritage List in their individual right, supported the deferral of the nomination, requesting that a comparative study be prepared on Hanseatic towns.

10. The Delegations of **Belgium** and **Finland** clarified that the subject of this comparative study would have to be Hanseatic Town Houses, not cities, a proposition adopted by the Committee (Decision **27 COM 8C.20**).

Property	Rock Shelters of Bhimbetka
Id. N°	925
State Party	India
Criteria	C (iii) (v)

1. Further to its presentation, **ICOMOS** proposed a new Draft Decision, based on new information, to inscribe the property on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (v), with two additional recommendations, concerning the need to prepare a complete survey of the property within one year, as well as to extend its boundary.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its full support to this new proposal.

3. The Delegation of **Mexico**, recognizing the outstanding universal value of this property, requested further information on the proposed inventory and Management Plan.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand**, supported by the Delegations of **Zimbabwe** and **Oman**, suggested to add "if possible" to the deadline requested to the State Party for submitting the survey.

5. The Delegation of **Nigeria** observed that this property was important and the nomination should not be deferred.

6. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, supporting the inscription of the property, emphasized its interesting intangible elements.

7. The Delegation of **Egypt**, after requesting some clarifications on the scope of the inventory, suggested to remove any reference to a deadline in the recommendation, and to request the State Party to extend the buffer zone of the property, not the core area proposed for listing.

8. In reply to a question by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, ICOMOS observed that one year would be a reasonable timeframe for the completion of the survey. The Delegation of India, then, provided some clarifications on the extent of the buffer zone, including 21 villages, whose management provisions within the nomination are meant to protect the core area.

9. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the inscription of this property, stressing the importance of the Management Plan.

10. The Committee adopted the recommendation by ICOMOS with the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Thailand and Egypt, inscribing the property on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (v) (Decision **27 COM 8C.21**).

11. The Delegation of **India** took the floor to express its gratitude to the Committee for inscribing Bhimbetka on the World Heritage List. It further stressed that it was fully aware of the obligations deriving from this inscription, but that it was also entirely committed to the safeguarding of this very important property, involving local community within a poverty reduction and environmental regeneration strategy.

Property	Takht-e Soleyman
Id. N°	1077
State Party	Islamic Republic of Iran
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

1. Following the presentation by ICOMOS and recommendation for inscription on the World Heritage List under the cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (vi), the Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its full support for the inscription of the property, together with the Delegations of Oman, China and Finland.

2. The Committee decided to inscribe this property under criteria (ii) and (iii) on the World Heritage List by acclamation (Decision **27 COM 8C.22**).

3. The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** took the floor to express its gratitude to the Committee and ICOMOS for their support. It further recalled that this event marked a new beginning for its country, one of the first to join the *Convention* and inscribe properties on the World Heritage List, after a long period of relative inactivity.

Property	The White City of Tel-Aviv
Id. N°	1096
State Party	Israel
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criterion (iv).

2. After the presentation by ICOMOS, the Delegation of **Finland** expressed its strong support for this nomination.

3. The Delegations of **Hungary** and **Greece** stressed that the inscription of this property would improve the representativity of the World Heritage List, by introducing an outstanding example of 20th century modern movement architecture.

4. The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the property, whilst emphasizing the lack of this category of property on the List.

5. The Delegation of **China**, supporting the inscription of the property, drew the attention of the State Party concerned to the importance of adhering to the recommendation by ICOMOS concerning the need to avoid high-rise buildings in the immediate vicinity of the nominated property.

6. The Delegation of **Belgium** also supported this nomination. It encouraged the State Party to include the protection of this category of property in its legal scope.

7. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the previous speakers.

8. The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its concern about the “pollution” of contemporary 21st-century buildings within the core nominated area.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested removing from the recommendation the reference to the need to strengthen the legislation to protect the values of the property, in view of the information provided by ICOMOS, as it was not relevant anymore. ICOMOS, however, considered that since the new legislation was still being finalized, the recommendation might be useful to strengthen the national authorities.

10. In response to the comment made by the Delegation of Nigeria, the Observer Delegation of **Israel** confirmed that, after the revision of the boundaries of the property carried out in consultation with ICOMOS, the nominated area reflected only the 20th century modern movement architecture.

11. Lastly, **ICOMOS** added that the State Party had proposed a new name for the property: “White City of Tel Aviv; the Modern Movement”.

12. The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv), with the new name proposed (Decision **27 COM 8C.23**).

13. The Committee also adopted **27 COM 8C.24** encouraging Israel to broaden the scope of its system of legal protection at the national level to include modern heritage.

14. The Observer Delegation of **Israel**, stressing the spiritual element of this property by quoting a text of Architect Erich Mendelsohn from 1940, accepted with honour and responsibility its inscription on the World Heritage List, encouraging all members of the Committee to pay a visit to Tel Aviv and celebrate this important event.

15. The Observer Mission of **Palestine**, whilst expressing its respect for the decision taken by the Committee, made certain remarks relating to the information contained in the ICOMOS evaluation and emanating from the State Party that had nominated the property for inscription: The ICOMOS report mentions that "Mendelsohn worked in Israel from 1934 to 1942". In this context, The Palestinian Observer requested that "*in Israel*" be replaced by "*in Palestine*", as the State of Israel was only created in 1948. He also objected to the subject of the sentence "Zionism dreamt of a new and better world for a new egalitarian society", which would justify Israel's proposal to inscribe the property under criterion (vi), considering that Zionism, as a political movement, could not be cited to justify the outstanding universal value of a property. Moreover, he asserted that, from a historical point of view, Zionism had led to the destruction of Palestinians villages, including his own.

16. In reply to the Observer Mission of Palestine, the **Chairperson** confirmed that its statement would be reported in the Summary Records of the session, and factual mistakes of course corrected.

Property	The Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi
Id. N°	1103
State Party	Kazakhstan
Criteria	C (i)(iii)(iv)

1. Following the presentation by ICOMOS recommending that the Delegation of **Thailand** inquired whether this property, for which ICOMOS proposed to consider cultural criterion (i), would stand a comparison with more famous Timurid monuments in Samarkand or Bukhara.

2. Having noted ICOMOS's reply, confirming the exceptional character of the Khoja Ahmed Yasawi Mausoleum, the delegations of **Hungary** and **Mexico** expressed their strong support for this inscription.

3. The Committee decided to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (iii) and (iv) (Decision **27 COM 8C.25**).

4. The Observer Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked the Committee for the inscription of this property.

Property	Orkhon Valley Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1081
State Party	Mongolia
Criteria	

1. **ICOMOS** and **IUCN** both gave a presentation on the property, which was nominated as a Cultural Landscape. **IUCN**, in particular, explained its recommendation, which was on the grounds that the existing natural values within the property needed to be given more consideration.

2. The Delegations of **India**, **Hungary** and **Belgium** expressed their support for the recommendation made by the Advisory Bodies, especially in view of the additional information provided by **IUCN**.

3. The Delegation of **China**, drawing the Committee's attention to the specificity of this nomadic landscape, suggested inscribing the property on the World Heritage List at the current session.

4. In reply to a comment by the Delegation of Egypt, **ICOMOS** emphasized the great involvement of the local community in the nomination process, observing that if wider values were recognized, as it suggested, this could trigger an even stronger participation.

5. The Delegation of **South Africa**, supported by the Delegation of Egypt, commented that if the issues raised by ICOMOS to propose deferral of the nomination had been addressed immediately by the Advisory Body, at the time of the evaluation, this would have saved time and reduced the work load of the Committee.

6. The Delegation of **India** wondered whether the State Party envisaged complying with the proposed recommendation, i.e. to extend the area of the nomination.

7. The Delegation of **Mongolia** underlined that the nomination concerned the cultural landscape and not the five separate monuments.

8. The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed to adopt the original recommendation, that is to defer the nomination, adding a paragraph to reflect **IUCN** comments.

9. Noting the consensus, the Chairperson declared the nomination deferred (Decision **27 COM 8C.27**).

Property	The Valley of the Pradnik River in the Ojcowski National Park
Id. N°	1085
State Party	Poland
Criteria	

1. **ICOMOS** recommended that the property, though of undoubted national and possibly regional interest, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

2. **IUCN** concurred with this recommendation but drew the Committee's attention to its recommendation that the State Party should consider using other mechanisms to draw attention to the values of this property.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** commented that the property is beautiful and well managed but agreed with the recommendation of **ICOMOS** and the observations of **IUCN**, hoping that it would be possible for the State Party to attract international recognition by other means.

4. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the property appeared not to meet the cultural criteria for outstanding universal value and that the Committee should therefore uphold the recommendation of ICOMOS.

5. The Committee decided not to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.28**).

Property	Citadel, Ancient City and Fortress Buildings of Derbent
Id. N°	1070
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	C (iii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii) and (iv).

2. Following the presentation of the representative of ICOMOS, the Delegation of **Finland** warmly supported the recommendation to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List.

3. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that this property had a continuously documented history between the fifth and nineteenth centuries and fully merited inscription.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** requested clarifications on the boundaries of the buffer zone. Furthermore, it asked ICOMOS if the State Party had given clear responses concerning any threats that might affect this site.

5. **ICOMOS** confirmed that the evaluation did flag some technical concerns, which may need attention in the future. However, these were not felt to compromise the nomination and the buffer zone was deemed to be adequate.

6. The Delegation of **Hungary** warmly supported the nomination and the ICOMOS recommendations.

7. The Delegation of **Oman** said it agreed with the ICOMOS recommendation.

8. The Delegation of **China** said that the outstanding universal value of the nomination was clear and that it fully endorsed the inscription of the property.

9. Noting consensus, the Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.29**).

10. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed, on behalf of its government and the Delegation from the city of Derbent present, its gratitude to the Committee for its decision. It recalled that Derbent remains a city that defines itself as being at the frontier of the cultures and religions of Russia.

Property	Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1099
State Party	South Africa
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination, recommending that it be deferred to allow the State Party to provide an updated Management Plan and to address other issues related to management and staffing.

2. **IUCN** commented that if the Committee decided to support the recommendation of ICOMOS, it would be pleased to evaluate the revised nomination.

3. The Delegation of **Belgium** also recognised the outstanding universal value of the site. It also expressed its disagreement on the reasons given for deferring the inscription. It recalled that the Committee had already inscribed sites for which fewer guarantees had been given than those provided here. Finally, it asked ICOMOS to explain the consequences that there might be regarding management if the site's boundaries were different to those of the park.

4. The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that the reasons for recommending deferral of the property appeared very harsh, in light of the fact that the property's outstanding universal value was well established and asked that the State Party be given the opportunity to address the concerns raised by ICOMOS.

5. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** said that it had no doubts as to the outstanding universal value of the property, nor of the State Party's exemplary efforts in managing and legislating to protect World Heritage properties located within its territory. Continuing, it noted that ICOMOS and IUCN had acknowledged receipt of a revised management plan, which meant that at least one of the reasons for deferring the nomination had now been addressed. The Committee was therefore asked to consider inscribing the property on the World Heritage List.

6. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported these comments and the proposal to inscribe the property.

7. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to note that the revised management plan had very recently been accepted.

8. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its support for inscribing the property under cultural criteria (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v) with the recommendations of ICOMOS attached.

9. The Delegation of **China** supported this.

10. **ICOMOS** clarified that it did not intend to suggest that inscription could not occur until SANparks owned the majority of the lands around the property and hoped that a timetable for settling the issue could be established.

11. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Delegation of **South Africa** said that, as noted by both ICOMOS and IUCN, a revised management plan had been submitted very recently. The outstanding issues over staffing levels were being addressed. The State Party was actively addressing the issues raised in connection with mining activity in the buffer zone and assured the Committee that agreements had now been signed with the majority of owners and that these would be presented to Parliament in December 2003.

12. The Committee decided to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.30**).

13. In a statement on behalf of the State Party, the Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Committee for having inscribed the property on the World Heritage List and expressed the State Party's continuing commitment to protect this and all other World Heritage properties.

Property	Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region
Id. N°	1073
State Party	Sudan
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (i) (ii) (iii) (iv).

2. Following the presentation by ICOMOS of the nomination of Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region, Sudan, the **Chairperson** noted that there was a clear recommendation to inscribe the property.

3. The Delegations of **Oman, Nigeria, and Hungary, Zimbabwe** and **Egypt** expressed their support for the nomination.

4. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** further suggested that the property be inscribed under cultural criterion (vi).

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List. However, it considered that the ICOMOS evaluation report was too succinct. It asked that the Draft Decision invite the State Party to draw up the management plan with the aid of the Centre, and not the other way round.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the intervention made by the Delegation of Belgium. It insisted on the active support of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the process of drawing up an effective management plan for this site, whose universal value deserves that a considerable financial investment be considered.

7. **ICOMOS** clarified that it considered this would be a well-merited application of criterion (vi) but noted that the

State Party had not requested it in the context of the nomination. On the questions raised in respect of the length of the evaluation, ICOMOS said that it had been short because the nomination itself, though well documented, had been succinct.

8. Noting consensus in the Committee, the Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.31**).

9. The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** thanked the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for this important inscription. It considered the latter as a great step on the way to preservation Africa's heritage.

Property	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew
Id. N°	1084
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, United Kingdom, and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). IUCN observed that it fully concurred with the ICOMOS evaluation and recommendation.

2. The recommendation was warmly supported by the Delegations of **Egypt, Hungary, Saint Lucia** and **Finland** before the Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.32**).

3. On behalf of the State Party, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its appreciation to the Committee for inscribing the property on the World Heritage List. The Curator of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, similarly expressed his delight and gratitude, noting that Kew was proud of its status as the World's premier Botanic Garden and committed itself to upholding the World Heritage values now recognized by the Committee. He extended an invitation to the Committee to visit the gardens, their landscapes, plants and buildings.

C.2 Deferred nominations Nominations différées

Property	The Old City of Mostar
Id. N°	946
State Party	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Criteria	

1. Following presentation (of this previously deferred nomination) by ICOMOS, the **Chairperson** recommended to further defer assessment of it until the reconstruction of the property had been completed.

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** commented upon certain of ICOMOS' remarks. Even if it shared the opinion that the reconstruction of Mostar, which must be considered more as a "reinvention", had not been a good example from a technical and historical point of view, it was keen to stress its disagreement on the comparison with Warsaw (Poland), whose inscription had been considered as exceptional due to its role as a memorial in relation to an event in history. For the Delegation, the two cases possess some similarities, which should necessarily lead the Committee to revise its position regarding the question of identical reconstruction. It underlined that the Committee should should, in the future, recognise the value of this type of reconstruction in a city that carries in it the "memorial value" of a 20th century war. Finally it recommended that the Committee, whilst deciding to defer the inscription of the site, clarify its positioning on this type of case.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** underlined that it knew this site well and believed it to be very important. It supported the intervention of the Delegation of Lebanon by confirming that the inscription of Warsaw had been an exceptional decision on the part of the Committee. It nevertheless found the ICOMOS recommendation "wise" and proposed that the Committee give itself a little time before deciding on the inscription of the site.

4. The Delegation of **Mexico** said that while it had listened carefully to the comments made by the Delegations of Lebanon and Hungary, it had reservations about the current reconstruction work and was mindful to accept ICOMOS' recommendation.

5. The Delegation of **Nigeria** commented that the suggestion seemed to be to defer assessment of the nomination until the situation was clearer, not to defer inscription.

6. The Delegation of **Belgium** underlined that on reading the ICOMOS evaluation, the Committee should arrive at a negative conclusion concerning the inscription of this site. It shared the opinion of the Delegation of Mexico.

7. The representative of **ICOMOS** explained that the views expressed in connection with Warsaw were not those of ICOMOS but of the decision of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee meeting in 1980. It was never possible to assess reconstruction work until the form it was to take was clearly set out. Continuing, ICOMOS accepted that the wording of the recommendation was ambiguous and should perhaps be redrafted to make clear that it was not yet possible to assess the nomination.

8. The Delegation of **Lebanon** pointed out that it understood ICOMOS' position and gave its agreement to defer the inscription of the site. It insisted that, unlike the decision to inscribe Warsaw in 1980, the Committee should start to ask itself "philosophical" questions about

the protection of cases similar to those of Warsaw and Mostar.

9. The **Chairperson** concluded that there was now consensus on deferral of this nomination (Decision **27 COM 8C.33**).

Property	James Island and Related Sites
Id. N°	761 Rev
State Party	Gambia
Criteria	C (iii) (vi)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this previously deferred nomination, and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii) and (vi).

2. The Delegations of **Hungary, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Portugal, Saint Lucia, South Africa** and **China** warmly supported the recommendation to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

3. The Delegations of **Nigeria, Portugal** and **Saint Lucia** noted the property as an important example of the interactions between Europe, Africa and the Caribbean.

4. The Delegation of **South Africa** further noted that the nomination was a good example of the coming to fruition of the Cairns Decision on the credibility of the World Heritage List.

5. The Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.34**).

6. On behalf of the State Party, the Observer Delegation of **Gambia** expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee, noting that the property was a living testimony to a range of historical interactions, including the slave trade, between Africa and Europe.

Property	The Sacri Monti of Piedmont and Lombardy
Id. N°	1068
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this previously deferred nomination, and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (ii) and (iv).

2. The Delegations of **Hungary, South Africa, Portugal** and **Argentina** warmly supported the inscription.

3. The Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.35**).

4. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed its gratitude, on behalf of Italy, the Piedmont region and the Lombardy region, to the Committee and to ICOMOS. It also declared that it had taken good note of ICOMOS'

recommendations encouraging the Italian authorities to work with Switzerland with a view extending the property.

Property	Wooden Churches of Southern Little Poland
Id. N°	1053
State Party	Poland
Criteria	C (iii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Wooden Churches of Southern Little Poland and remarked that a good management plan was presented and recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii) and (iv).

2. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the nomination and congratulated Poland on the management plan for the site. It also supported **ICOMOS'** recommendation to enlarge the site in the future so as to include the churches of neighbouring countries.

3. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the intervention made by the Delegation of Belgium.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the inscription had been deferred at Budapest because there was no management plan and in order to do a comparative study. These questions being resolved, the site can today be inscribed.

5. The Delegation of **Portugal** was delighted to see that the problems discussed in Budapest had been settled.

6. Noting consensus, the Chairperson declared the property inscribed on the World Heritage List (Decision **27 COM 8C.36**).

7. Furthermore, the Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 8C.37** concerning management mechanisms for serial properties in general and for *Sacri Monti* of Piedmont and Lombardy (Italy) and the Wooden Churches of Southern Little Poland (Poland) specifically.

8. The Observer Delegation of **Poland** thanked the Committee and **ICOMOS** and announced that the State Party had already entered into discussions with Slovakia in order to enlarge the site into a transboundary site. It indicated that Poland would be honoured to share its know-how with the neighbouring country.

Property	Matobo Hills
Id. N°	306 Rev
State Party	Zimbabwe
Criteria	C (iii) (v) (vi)

1. **ICOMOS** presented this nomination, and recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii), (v) and (vi).

2. The Delegation of **Argentina** brought to the attention of the Committee that a management plan for the site was under preparation. Recalling the *Operational Guidelines*, paragraph 44 (v), the Delegation invited the State Party to indicate when the management plan would be available.

3. The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed with the Delegation of Argentina and invited the State Party to comment on the issues raised by **ICOMOS** during the presentation.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked **ICOMOS** to clarify the recommendation made on “integrating intangible values into management and interpretation”.

5. **ICOMOS** replied that the property has a strong association with a particular belief system of the area. When inscribing the property as a cultural landscape these special values have to be managed.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that a Western style management plan could not be used to manage intangible values. It noted that it was necessary to find mechanisms which take into account this type of intangible value. The Delegation proposed that the Committee inscribe the site and give the State Party one or two years to set up a policy with the support of the States Parties and financial and technical support from the Advisory Bodies.

7. Noting that the proposal made by the Delegation of Lebanon was different from the Draft Decision, the **Chairperson** proposed to the Delegation of Zimbabwe to answer the questions raised by the Delegations of Argentina and Lebanon.

8. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** replied that thanks were due to all stakeholders who participated in the nomination process (spiritual leaders, farmers and people interested in commercial activities). Responding to the question by the Delegation of Lebanon, the Delegation committed itself to have all the elements in place for the management plan by the 28th session of the Committee.

9. Responding to the Delegation of Lebanon, **ICOMOS** replied that it was not a Western style management plan, but a question of a process that has to be relevant and evolving, by integrating issues related to the local context.

10. The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the inscription of the property.

11. Highlighting similarities with the nomination of the Rock Shelters of Bhimbetka in India, the Delegation of Mexico requested what specific steps should be taken concerning the management of rock paintings.

12. **ICOMOS** responded that long-term programmes as well as the State Party's commitment was required.

13. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported inscription of the property.

14. The Delegation of **China** supported inscription and requested an updated management plan to be submitted for the 28th session of the Committee.

15. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** pointed out that the property should be inscribed under condition that the State Party would prepare the management plan in its cultural and natural context by the 28th session of the Committee.

16. The property was inscribed under the condition that a management plan be submitted to the 28th session (Decision **27 COM 8C.38**).

17. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Committee on behalf of the people of Zimbabwe and the whole of Africa as it represents the long cultural history of this region.

C3. Proposals for Extensions of Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Imperial Tombs of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (extension to include the Ming Dynasty Xiaoling Tomb and the 13 tombs north of Beijing)
Id. N°	1004 Bis
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the proposal for extension of the property, and recommended it under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) (iv) and (vi).

2. The Delegations of **Hungary, Mexico, Thailand, Oman** and **Saint Lucia** supported the extension of the property under cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

3. The Committee approved the extension of the property under the existing cultural criteria (Decision **27 COM 8C.39**).

Property	Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District of Panamá
Id. N°	790 Bis
State Party	Panama
Criteria	C (ii) (iv) (vi)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the proposal for extension of the property and recommended it under criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).

2. The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the extension of the property.

3. The extension was approved by the Committee, adopting the revised name of the property proposed "Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District of Panamá" (Decision **27 COM 8C.40**).

4. The Observer Delegation of **Panama** thanked the Committee and remarked that the extension of Panamá Viejo on the World Heritage List would enhance the value of the whole property.

Property	Renaissance Monumental Ensembles of Úbeda and Baeza
Id. N°	522 Rev
State Party	Spain
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

1. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination and indicated that the State Party had recently supplied new information concerning redefinition of the core and buffer zones. This resulted in a revised recommendation to inscribe the property under criteria (ii) and (iv).

2. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that the site had already been nominated twice and that each time it had been deferred or not recommended. It sought clarification from ICOMOS on the question of the site's outstanding universal value.

3. The Delegation of **Mexico** pointed out that Úbeda and Baeza had been a model for many towns in South America and that the plans of the Renaissance urban planner Andrea Vandelvira had been used all around South America.

4. The Delegation of **Hungary** congratulated ICOMOS on its recommendation and underlined the intangible heritage dimension existing in the site nominated.

5. The Delegation of **Argentina** also supported the inscription and pointed out the intangible values of these towns and that for many centuries Christians, Moslems and Jews lived in peaceful coexistence.

6. **ICOMOS** stated that the universal value of the property was related to an Italian Renaissance urban model which was favored in Spain by monarch absolutism, and that this adapted model was then exported to South America.

7. The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the integrated management prepared by the two towns, and supported the inscription by recalling that the Portuguese town of Guimaraes was also inscribed because of its model function.

8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the view of the Delegation of Lebanon and wondered how a smaller core zone would fully cover the area of outstanding value.

9. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the intervention of the Delegation of Mexico.

10. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegations of Mexico, Argentina and Portugal.

11. **ICOMOS** underlined that the revised nomination was different to the first submission because the protected core zone had been reduced. **ICOMOS** also pointed out that the revised nomination was different to the second submission because it included the Renaissance palaces together with the urban structure surrounding them.

12. The Delegations of **Lebanon** and the **United Kingdom** agreed with the inscription (Decision **27 COM 8C.42**).

13. The Observer Delegation of **Spain** thanked all the people involved in the nomination process and expressed its commitment to the preservation of this new World Heritage property.

7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES EXAMINED BY THE COMMITTEE

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/7B and 7B.Corr
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7A
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7C
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7D
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7E*

NATURAL HERITAGE

Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of a letter, received on 5 May 2003, from both the Secretary General of the National Commission for UNESCO of Côte d'Ivoire and the head of the National Committee for the *World Heritage Convention* in Côte d'Ivoire, forwarding a Memorandum which highlights the critical situation facing the three World Natural Heritage properties Comoé and Tai National Parks and Mount Nimba Forest Reserve following the civil unrest which started on 19 September 2002.

The **Secretariat** further brought to the attention of the Committee that the Memorandum indicated a significant progress in protecting Tai National Park, such as (i) the adoption in February 2002 of a legal text related to creation, management and funding of National Parks and Natural Reserves; (ii) the creation of the Office of National Parks and Reserves, a semi-public institution, which is financially more autonomous; (iii) the creation of a

Foundation for a sustainable funding of National Parks and Reserves and the establishment of a management plan.

The Committee was however informed that the security is still uncertain, that attacks on population has caused massive movement of population to cross through the Park, and that there were numerous testimonies about illegal poaching on the western part of the Park.

The Committee was further informed that Tai National Park was not occupied by the rebel forces and that with the progressive return to peace in the country normal activities are resuming in Tai National Park, there are signs of positive evolution of the Park situation. In view of the above-mentioned developments, the State Party does no longer wish to have Tai National Park inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger as previously said.

2. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that a decision had already been taken by the Committee at its 26th session in Budapest, that all draft decisions should be submitted to it in writing (Decision **26 COM 21.2**).

3. The Delegation of Mexico agreed with the intervention made by the Delegation of Belgium.

4. The Chairperson explained that information was received at the very last moment and asked the Committee for permission that a revised Draft Decision be presented on the screen.

5. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed to the Committee its confusion following the different modifications that had been made to Draft Decision **27 COM 7B.2** submitted for their appreciation. It noted that the first document circulated, *WHC-03/27.COM/7B*, did not envisage the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, whereas the second document *WHC-03/27.COM/7B.Corr*, did envisage it, very clearly. It said it would like to understand why the third Draft Decision no longer envisages it this time.

6. The **Chairperson** clarified that this is an exceptional case as the State Party kept changing its position.

7. The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked for the reasons for all these changes in the draft decisions.

8. The Delegation of **Belgium** pointed out that the new Draft Decision projected on the screen was only in English, and that it seemed necessary that the French-speaking members of the Committee should receive the French version. It also asked why this French version had not been circulated at the same time as the projection of the English version.

9. The **Secretariat** assured the Delegation of Belgium that although the version on the screen appeared in English, it could provide the Committee with a hard copy version in both English and French. The debate was

postponed to allow photocopying of the French version of the third revised Draft Decision.

10. The Delegation of **Belgium** said it would like the reference to the Budapest Draft Decision mentioned in paragraph 1 of Draft Decision **27 COM 7B.2** to be mentioned for more clarity. Moreover, it proposed to change in paragraph 2 of said Draft Decision "*Welcomes with satisfaction*" into "*Takes note*".

11. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, regarding the evaluation mission to Taï National Park, expressed its concern for the safety of the IUCN experts.

12. The Delegation of **Thailand** wished clarification on paragraph 4 from the Secretariat or the IUCN, ie whether it would be realistic to fix the deadline for the submission of the mission report on 1 February 2004.

13. The **Secretariat** responded that this date has been chosen in order to have the information available in time before the 28th session.

14. **IUCN** responded to the concern of the Delegation of the United Kingdom that a mission will be fielded as soon as the security situation is re-established. IUCN assured the Committee that similar missions have been to properties in similar situations. IUCN will undertake the mission as soon as there is opportunity to do so. In answer to the question of submitting a report before 1 February 2004, IUCN mentioned that this was preferable if the State Party is able to comply.

15. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** further expressing concern, suggested to add to paragraph 4 "if possible" 1 February 2004. The Delegation agreed with the text in paragraph 5.

16. The Delegation of **Thailand** agreed with the Delegation of the United Kingdom proposal.

17. The Committee adopted the Decision **27 COM 7B.2** as amended.

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that in the same Memorandum referred to in the discussion on Taï, the State Party reported that Comoé National Park has been occupied by the rebel forces since 19 September 2002. Before the civil unrest, the State Party had achieved progress in the conservation of Comoé National Park through a "Programme cadre de Gestion des Aires Protégées (PCGAP)" financed by the European Union. However, following civil unrest and the occupation by rebel forces, the offices used by the personnel of Comoé Park at Bouma were completely damaged, all the computers and other communication equipment such as radios were stolen, equipment for surveillance and for field camping were stolen, the bridges inside the Park were

seriously damaged making the Park inaccessible, all eight patrol cars for wardens were taken by rebels, and the implementation of the management plan had to be suspended.

2. The Committee was further informed by the Centre of additional information received by the Secretariat through a letter dated 26 June 2003 in which the State Party confirmed that the threat to the property is continuing and the State Party requests the Committee to inscribe Comoé National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon**, on reading the information provided by the Secretariat, supported the adoption of Draft Decision **27 COM 7B.3** aiming to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, with "a little difficulty". Although the discussion on the Taï site had been postponed, the Delegation of Lebanon was keen to point out that the evaluation mission which had been mentioned in this discussion should be carried out before the 28th session was held. If it was not, the Committee would also have to consider the inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

3. Noting the unanimity on the proposal from the Delegation of **Lebanon**, the Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7B.3** adopted.

W National Park of Niger (Niger)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that in addition to the information already available before the Committee concerning W National Park, the State Party in a letter dated 25 April 2003 has invited the Centre to take part in an Environmental Impact Assessment study for W National Park and that an additional report was received on 25 June 2003 from the Bureau of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971) through IUCN concerning the new contemplation by the State Party to revive a project for the extraction of phosphates in the core area of W National Park. The Centre has been informed that this is not new as mining on the property was proposed in the past but the Niger's Ministry of Environment and Water Resources was able then to demonstrate that this mining project was not economically advisable. Recently, the Authority for Integrated Development of Liptako Gourma ("Autorité de Développement Intégré de la Région du Liptako Gourma"-ALG) - (a joint organization between Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger) has revived the issue of phosphate mining in the park. The report of the Bureau of the Convention on Wetlands recommended that there is need to clearly address the issue through a full Environmental Impact Assessment along with a detailed cost-benefits analysis in order to definitely remove these recurrent threats to W National Park. Ramsar has proposed to undertake a Joint Advisory Mission including all relevant national institutions from Niger, Benin and Burkina Faso and all international partners to assess the need and identify the major elements that should be part of

the full Environmental Impact Assessment before any decision concerning the mining project and the dam construction can be considered. The mission is expected to take place in October 2003 after the rainy season.

2. A representative of the **Ecological Science Division of UNESCO** informed the Committee that the W National Park of Niger was part of the central area of the transboundary Biosphere Reserve of the W Region which involves Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger. He added that the Dyondyonga hydroelectric dam construction project on the Mekrou was examined at the meeting of the Technical Monitoring Committee of the ECOPAS (Ecosystème protégées en Afrique Sahélienne) Regional Programme. In the opinion of the experts, this project would lead to the flooding of an area of approximately 150 kilometres², in the very centre of the Park, in one of the most biodiverse and archeologically rich areas. Finally, he informed the Committee that the UNESCO MAB (Man and the Biosphere) Programme has decided to participate in the co-financing with the European Union of the study aimed at finding alternatives to the Mékrou dam in order to safeguard the integrity of the site.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed that the risks of the phosphate mining reported by the Secretariat should be mentioned in Draft Decision **27 COM 7B.6**, and said that it wished to understand the reasons why this important information did not feature in the initial Draft Decision.

4. The **Secretariat** explained that due to the lateness of information reaching the Centre, information on mining was not included in the Draft Decision.

5. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested that an environmental impact assessment and a social impact assessment of the park be carried out, as soon as possible and according to international standards, and be submitted to the Centre.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** again asked that the risks of phosphate mining be mentioned in the final decision, if the Committee considered that the danger was actually real.

7. The **Chairperson** asked if the Delegation of Lebanon wished to draw up a draft paragraph, or if this aspect could be included in an existing paragraph.

8. The Delegation of **Lebanon** estimated that, as it was not an expert on the subject, it could not therefore propose a draft paragraph.

9. The Delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the remarks of the Delegation of Lebanon.

10. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** enquired from IUCN if the environmental impact assessment has already been undertaken for W National Park.

11. **IUCN** informed the Committee that the environmental impact assessment has not yet been undertaken. IUCN expressed its concern about the quality of such a study and recommended that the State Party should submit a request for International Assistance to ensure a proper study. IUCN would agree to support the Technical Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment study if requested by the State Party.

12. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed that research should be done properly and agreed with IUCN that Niger requests Technical Assistance.

13. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, referring to the mining project, requested that this be included in the Draft Decision and that an Environmental Impact Assessment be undertaken as soon as possible.

14. The Delegation of **Nigeria** remarked that the environmental impact assessment should consider both the dam and the mining projects.

15. The **Chairperson** confirmed to the Delegation of the United Kingdom and the Delegation of Saint Lucia that their comments were already integrated in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision and proposed that the Draft Decision include the amendment made by the Delegation of Lebanon in paragraph 5 of the same Draft Decision.

16. Noting the consensus of the Committee, the Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7B.6** adopted as amended.

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that an expert had visited the property from 20 to 30 June 2003 to analyze the situation with regard to the oil exploration. A meeting had been held in the capital on 26 June 2003 during which the activities of the Australian Woodside Company had been discussed, to determine the conservation strategy. The Secretariat added that therefore paragraph 5 could be deleted from the Draft Decision.

2. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed that the phrase "involve the Centre" be removed from paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision.

3. **IUCN** confirmed that in its opinion involvement by the World Heritage Centre in the decision-making role of the State Party was not appropriate. The Secretariat concurred with the decision to delete paragraph 5.

4. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.7**, as amended.

East Rennell (Solomon Islands)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation Report for the property, reminding the Committee that there had been continued civil unrest in the State Party.
2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** inquired as to why the Draft Decision proposed to extend the property at a time when the State Party appeared to show little interest in reporting on the condition of the property. It enquired whether the Committee would consider placing the property on the List of WH in Danger. The Delegates of Thailand and Hungary concurred with the proposal from the United Kingdom.
3. The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to confirm whether it would consider placing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger prior to sending a mission to the property.
4. In response, the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested to know from the Secretariat what would happen following a possible mission to the property, emphasising that without clear objectives in reactive monitoring, the exercise was open to question. It added that two possible objectives of the mission might be to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, or alternatively to delete the property from the World Heritage List altogether.
5. Responding to points raised by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the **Secretariat** recalled the decision of the Committee on inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 1998 which recommended that a mission be sent to the property within 3 years. It cautioned the Committee that owing to civil unrest in the State Party, it had been impossible to send the mission. The Secretariat noted that the situation was now improving and that some communication had been re-established. It added that the purpose of the proposed mission would be to assess the preparation of the Resource Management Plan and the draft national World Heritage Protection Bill. It also mentioned travel advice from New Zealand that access was difficult but nonetheless possible. In conclusion, it reiterated that the mission recommended by the Committee in 1998, would be fundamental to identify threats that the Secretariat was not currently aware of.
6. The Delegation of **Thailand** observed that the purpose of putting a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not to punish it, but rather to widen the support for its protection. He expressed the view that the money might be squandered if a mission were to be sent to the property, remarking that the State Party appeared to display a lack of interest in its World Heritage property.
7. The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested that this site be inscribed on the "list of forgotten sites", adding that we "knew nothing" about it. It noted that it was very important to have new information to alert or "awaken" the Committee in view of the threats to the site, which could lead to an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** drew attention to the fact that no information was available on the property, and expressed concern as to why consideration should be given to extending the property given the lack of basic facts from the State Party.
9. **IUCN** responded that a mission needed to be sent to the property and that it supported the proposal for renomination. It expressed a word of caution concerning the List of World Heritage in Danger in this particular case, noting that the property was the first property on the World Heritage List to be entirely managed by traditional owners for whom the idea of reporting to international bodies could best be characterised as "very abstract".
10. The Delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that other proposals could be considered other than the one presented by the United Kingdom. It suggested that it would be costly to send a mission, and it might be possible to request the State Party to send more information concerning the state of conservation of the property. The Chairperson reminded the distinguished delegate that there had been little to no response from the State Party since the inscription of the property.
11. The Delegation of **Belgium** seconded the United Kingdom proposal in the light of the comments from IUCN. The Delegations of Portugal, Finland and Hungary supported the United Kingdom proposal and recommended that the mission to the property was "certainly needed". The Delegation of St Lucia however wondered whether, if there was so little contact with the State Party, the mission could actually take place.
12. The **Secretariat** explained that the communication between UNESCO Office in Samoa and the State Party was improving. It referred to news from the Pacific that Australia would be sending a police force to the Solomon Islands to control the law and order situation. It further added that the State Party would be receiving International Assistance for peace from other regions.
13. The Delegation of **South Africa** reiterated that with better communications it might be possible to get information through other channels, and that the Regional Office in Samoa would be helpful in getting a state of conservation report.
14. **IUCN** responded that at the time of inscription the Committee had requested to send a mission in order to assess the traditional management systems in place, and reiterated the need to carry out a mission taking into account the decision of the Committee.
15. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** expressed its support to the State Party. It stated that the Australian government would be helping the State Party via its High

Commission in the country, as well as through the Asia-Pacific Focal Point for World Heritage. It supported the proposal of IUCN to send a mission and offered the assistance of Australia.

16. The Delegation of **Belgium** insisted on the necessity of sending a mission to visit the property inscribed on the List.

17. The **Secretariat** surmised that the need for more information seemed to have been accepted by the Committee. It added that sending a mission was only one way of getting this information, and that it would not need to be too costly. It referred to a mission sent to Democratic Republic of the Congo in collaboration with a UNESCO Regional office, which had not been very costly. It therefore proposed to send a mission in the most cost-effective manner possible in consultation with IUCN.

18. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.12**, as amended.

Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of the proposal to send a mission to visit the transboundary property, highlighting that the border fence running between the two State Parties corresponded to the future border after the enlargement of the European Union. The Secretariat added that the State Party representatives, who welcomed the mission, were in the room and may wish to comment.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Poland** underlined that its country was willing to provide information to the Committee continuously and confirmed that a mission would be invited to the site as soon as possible for an evaluation of the situation. The Delegation asked for the French version of the Draft Decision to be harmonized with the English version and in particular that the term "*commit*" be replaced by: "*encourage the State Party*".

3. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.14**.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received new information on 29 May 2003 from the Ministry of Environment and Water in response to the issues identified by the mission and the decision of the last Committee. This information concerned the development of a management mechanism, the draft version of the Management Plan, which has been prepared and formal public hearing that will be held in September 2003. The Management Plan was submitted to Minister in March 2003 and will be submitted for final approval to the Council of Ministers. The final version is expected by the end of 2003.

2. It further informed the Committee that an extension of the boundary of the property was also expected which would increase the size of the property to some 43 332 40 hectares to include all of the National Park in the nomination.

3. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.15**.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that no formal response had been received from the State Party concerning the state of conservation of the property. On 20 May 2003, an e-mail was received from the Director for International Cooperation regarding the status of the seal population in the lake, the planned gas pipeline, and a number of other issues. It added that the Vice Minister for Natural Resources had confirmed this to be official information and noted that the Secretariat had also received a large number of letters from Russian NGOs and scientists concerning the property. Another area of concern relates to the number of forest fires in the area clearly visible from satellite images.

2. **IUCN** indicated that it would present a slightly longer statement concerning this property, given the complexity of the situation.

3. **IUCN** recalled that the Committee at its 26th session decided to defer the question of the inclusion of Lake Baikal on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its 27th session. This decision followed the recommendations of the UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission conducted in 2001 and the subsequent discussions of the Committee. At Budapest, the Committee also called for a high-level meeting to be held between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN before the end of 2002. **IUCN** considered that such a meeting should review the issues of concern to the Committee, agree on what should be done to minimize adverse impacts to the integrity of the property, and help the State Party to develop a workplan for the implementation of these actions.

4. **IUCN** also considered such a meeting to be an essential part of the process of finding solutions to the issues affecting the integrity of this property. But unfortunately, it has not yet been possible to organize this meeting. **IUCN** noted that the conservation and development issues at Lake Baikal are complex. **IUCN** still had serious concerns about the state of conservation of Lake Baikal, particularly in relation to pollution impacts, principally from the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill. It is also concerned about the limited progress with the implementation of the Federal Law: "On the Protection of Lake Baikal".

5. In recent months **IUCN** received numerous letters and reports from scientists and NGOs that raise serious concerns over the proposed oil and gas pipeline between

Russia and China, which is seen as a potential major threat to the property. All of these letters have requested that Lake Baikal be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Regarding the pipeline, IUCN has been informed that an earlier proposal for the pipeline to cross the World Heritage property was rejected. However, a revised proposal includes a number of options for routes, which would cross through parts of the property. IUCN believed that the State Party should ensure that any transportation system for oil and gas avoids the property altogether. Furthermore, no route should be established through the catchment area which drains into the lake without first undertaking a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure the highest international standards are applied to pollution control and risk assessment.

6. IUCN recommended that the Committee,
 - (i) reiterates its request to the State Party to convene the high level meeting already proposed at its 26th session, and call on it to do so as soon as possible;
 - (ii) urges the State Party to ensure that the proposed transportation route for oil and gas avoids the WH property; and to ensure that no route is selected through the watershed of Lake Baikal without first undertaking a comprehensive EIA to guarantee the highest standards of design and operation;
 - (iii) requests the State Party to provide a report to the World Heritage Centre on the outcomes of any EIA and related decisions on the proposed oil and gas transportation route by 1 February 2004 (or sooner if appropriate);
 - (iv) on the basis of the above, requests IUCN to make recommendations to the 28th session of the WH Committee, including whether the property meets the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
 - (v) urges the State Party to increase efforts to protect the integrity of this unique property and mitigate the key threats outlined by the IUCN / UNESCO mission report (2001), including by guaranteeing sufficient financial resources over a long term period; and
 - (vi) encourages IUCN, the World Heritage Centre, NGOs, and international donors to seek appropriate ways to support the efforts of the Russian authorities in protecting and conserving Lake Baikal.
7. The Delegation of **Thailand** invited the Delegation of the Russian Federation to respond to the questions concerning the delay in convening the high-level meeting.
8. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recalled that the area inscribed corresponded to some 98,000 km², with between 100 000 – 150 000 people living in the area. In examining other national parks and nature reserves on

the World Heritage List, it reminded the Committee that the Baikal area was not a national park in the strict sense. It highlighted furthermore that it would be impossible to convert the area into a national park. It elaborated that numerous livelihoods were dependent on the area for fishing, hunting, infrastructure and other activities.

9. The Delegation apologized for the delay in providing a report and noted that it was not possible to organise the high-level meeting as requested by the Committee at its last session. In response to this delay, it proposed to hold the high-level meeting in September 2003 either in Moscow or in the Baikal region itself. It hoped that through this process of dialogue the outstanding issues could be resolved. It wished to further elaborate three points: on the question of fire risks, it explained that 2003 had been a very hot year, similar to 1993, which had had no rains, and that such factors were recurrent and beyond the control of the State Party. It noted that this could not be a reason for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It conceded, however, that other problems might be “more serious”. On the question of pollution, it commented that levels had not been increasing, and were now at a lower level than in 1996 when the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.
10. Regarding the pipeline, it repeated that no project had yet been adopted or approved. It emphasised that the government had already turned down a pipeline proposal located some 30km from the World Heritage area. It explained that consideration of a new project would be completed in August 2003, and reviewed by the end of September 2003. It declared that it was confident that no pipeline would ever pass through the territory of the World Heritage property, and therefore urged the Committee not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
11. The **Chairperson** requested the State Party to provide the Committee with an explanation as to circumstances why the report had not been submitted and why the high-level meeting had not been organized.
12. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that there had been organisational difficulties in scheduling this meeting as several authorities are involved in the management of the property. It promised to organise a meeting in September 2003.
13. The Delegation of **Finland** observed that on the subject of the fires in the boreal forests in the area, it noted such fires were not necessarily a negative feature, as they were connected with the normal renewal process of the ecosystem. It noted that the active management of similar boreal forests in Finland had included the use of fires.
14. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented that the case of Lake Baikal was perhaps “the most serious state of conservation report being considered”, even if the issues were extremely complex. It remarked that the

Delegation of the Russian Federation had presented a lot of information orally. It expressed its regret that the Committee had not been provided information from the State Party within the timeframe requested by the last Committee, to establish the clear facts. The Committee had examined the question of Danger listing for this property at each session since 2001, with the overall impression since that time being one of "continuing deterioration".

15. The Delegation of the United Kingdom further stressed that "collaboration must happen". It stated: "the United Kingdom believes that this is a very clear case of listing as in Danger". This should not be seen as a negative approach but as part of a mechanism to help the State Party and to safeguard the property. It noted that it had listened carefully to the presentation of IUCN, and that with reluctance would not press for Danger listing. It further mentioned the absolute need for the State Party to increase collaboration to allow the 28th session of the Committee to get a clearer picture of what was happening. In conclusion, it confirmed that it supported the IUCN recommendation without any weakening of its tone or gravity.

16. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the intervention made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It explained that, in the case of Lake Baikal, the credibility of the *Convention*, the Committee and the List were particularly at risk. It noted that, in this context, numerous private individuals were questioning the Committee's "inaction". The Delegation observed that the site deserved to be inscribed on the List of Heritage in Danger, but it stated that it accepted the recommendation made by IUCN. However, it did request that the phrase: "decide in accordance with the comments of IUCN to defer the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger to its 28th session", which appeared in the Budapest Decision, be added to the Draft Decision.

17. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked for two clarifications: 1. Did the State Party provide the information requested by the Committee at Budapest ? 2. Has the state of conservation of the property improved or deteriorated compared to the previous year ? The answer to the two questions must be the starting point for the Draft Decision.

18. **IUCN** observed that regarding the state of conservation of the property since 2002, the overall situation had not been improving, and that it was in fact continuing to deteriorate. It confirmed, however, that the report recently received from the State Party did, in general, address many of the critical issues of concern.

19. The Delegation of **Hungary** underlined that the Committee understood the difficult situation of the State Party; however, it asked the State Party also to understand that the Committee had to assume its responsibilities. It insisted on the necessity for a high-level mission which

could go to Moscow and also to the site. Finally, it suggested that the Draft Decision be completed with what had already been said at Budapest.

20. The Delegation of **Greece** commented that missions should be directed to inform the competent authorities about the possibility of Danger listing.

21. The **Secretariat** confirmed that following the UNESCO-IUCN mission in 2001, a number of meetings between the State Party and UNESCO took place mainly with the UNESCO Moscow Office. However, the high-level meeting foreseen did not take place and the late response of 20 May 2003 made it impossible to review the issues carefully in time for the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee.

22. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that the Committee had already decided at two previous sessions to defer the inscription of the site on the List of Heritage in Danger. It explained that the Committee could envisage removing the site from the World Heritage List if the State Party continued to refuse an inscription on the In Danger List.

23. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** proposed that a mission be undertaken by the Chairperson of the Committee in order to demonstrate clearly the urgency of the situation and in order to debate the matter with the highest authorities of the State Party. It supported the very eloquent intervention of the Delegation of the United Kingdom on this point.

24. The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of Morocco for the suggestion.

25. The Observer from **Greenpeace Russia** noted that it would be reading a statement to the Committee on behalf of a number of Russian NGOs including Greenpeace, the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Professor Yablokov, IUCN Councillor and other conservation organisations. It reminded the Committee that since 1996, the situation of Baikal had not improved as confirmed by a number of documents, and the Committee made recommendations to the State Party when the property was inscribed but these have not been fulfilled. He further recalled that the 2001 mission to the property had advised that the property be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the situation of the property has not improved since its inscription in 1996. He noted that all the same concerns were still apparent such as the pulp and paper mill, with the addition of an oil pipeline from Russia to China. He emphasised that the special Baikal law was not yet effective. He noted the procedure for Danger listing and the objective was ultimately to help the Russian Federation to save Lake Baikal. In conclusion, he wished to remind China of its common obligation towards the property as indicated under Article 6 of the *Convention* and that all properties on the World Heritage List are the responsibility of the international community. He finally

referred to the fact that the year 2003 is the UN year for freshwater and that the protection of the largest freshwater source would be crucial.

26. The **Chairperson** summarized that the Draft Decision could be amended to reiterate the Budapest decision and the comments by Lebanon and Hungary.

27. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested that the Draft Decision include the IUCN recommendations read out earlier to the Committee.

28. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the intervention made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

29. **IUCN** confirmed that it would be able to provide the text of its statement.

30. The **Chairperson** said that it should be prepared for incorporation into the final decisions to be presented at the adoption.

31. The Delegation of **Belgium** suggested reinforcing the wording of the French version of the Draft Decision in particular concerning the measures requested of the State Party, which seem less strict than for other sites where the situation is less serious.

32. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that the Committee could indeed significantly strengthen the decision to convey the “regrets” and “concern” of the Committee given the severity of the situation.

33. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7B.19** adopted as amended.

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of new information received by e-mail from the Director of International Co-operation of the Russian Federation on 20 May 2003 on various issues regarding the property including on salmon poaching, gold mining, pipeline construction and other conservation issues (hunting, highway, boundaries). The e-mail stated that a “special mission...seems unnecessary”.

2. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** agreed with the proposal from the Secretariat suggesting a mission be organised, however for a date sometime in the middle of next year as the property was not easily accessible. It also requested to change in the Draft Decision the date for the submission of the mission report to the Committee to its 29th session.

3. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee for its reaction regarding a request for a report to be submitted by the 29th session of the Committee.

4. The Delegations of **Finland** and **Thailand** accepted the proposal in this particular case.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked IUCN to confirm that the dates of the mission proposed were realistic and that the situation would not get worse over the course of another year.

6. The **Chairperson** enquired whether the Delegation of Belgium wished to include a reference to serious degradation in the property.

7. **IUCN** clarified that some of the key threats had been controlled, but the situation was still of concern. It added that some of the issues concerned areas outside the boundaries of the property, but that the mission was deemed necessary to review the situation. IUCN responded to the proposal of a mission by the State Party saying that it would be possible to report on a mission even one month before the 28th session of the Committee.

8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** shared the concerns of the Delegation of Belgium regarding the dates of the mission, and suggested it was for the State Party to advise the Committee on when the mission should take place.

9. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stipulated that May 2004 would be a good time, as August-September 2003 was a holiday period, which would be followed by the winter. It added that there would possibly still be time to organise the mission in time for the 28th session of the Committee.

10. The **Chairperson** confirmed this option with IUCN. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested the insertion of a phrase “if possible” concerning the mission to make it more flexible.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that the decisions were more severe for certain countries than for others, and that consequently, it was not favorable to the addition of the words “if possible” in this case.

12. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** underlined the concerns and suggested to delete the phrase “if possible”, including an explanation on why such a report might not be available by the next session of the Committee.

13. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.20**, as amended.

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of a workshop on transboundary issues being organised by the UNESCO Regional Office in Montevideo in collaboration with Argentina and Brazil in 2003.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** stated that all Brazilians were pleased that the illegal colon road had been closed with the help of UNESCO and that an invitation letter to the workshop will be forthcoming.

3. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the Draft Decision concerning the property. It invited the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to send a mission to review the situation in order to increase efforts towards a coordinated strategy between this World Heritage property in Brazil and the property in Argentina. It further supported a ban on helicopters flying over the property which, impact the conservation of the property. It added that a study had been carried out on the impact of the noise pollution on the property by a research team in Buenos Aires.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** suggested changing paragraph 4 in the same way as for the previous site.

5. **IUCN** confirmed the reference made by the Delegation of Argentina to uncontrolled helicopter overflights at the property, and endorsed the need for a mission to re-examine both the road and helicopter threats.

6. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7B.23** adopted, as amended.

MIXED HERITAGE

Kakadu National Park (Australia)

1. The **Secretariat** recalled the decision of the 26th session of the World Heritage Committee and informed the Committee that it had been in regular contact with the Australian authorities since that time. It noted that the March 2003 Australian Senate report on the uranium mining in Australia had been delayed until the end of June 2003. It also added that various reports received from NGOs concerning the appointment of an NGO representative to the Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee (ARRTC) and general comments about the uranium mines had been forwarded to the State Party and IUCN for comment.

2. The Secretariat pointed out that it had not received any reports of incidents at either the Ranger or Jabiluka properties. It pointed out however that it had received a video from the Senior Traditional owner of Jabiluka concerning cultural heritage issues. The Traditional owner had requested in that video that discussion on cultural heritage issues be deferred for decision till the 28th session of the Committee in 2004.

3. **IUCN** confirmed that there had been no reports of polluting incidents as discussed during the 26th session of the Committee in Budapest. It regretted however that the promise of NGO representation in the ARRTC which should have the broad confidence of the NGO community as a whole had not been fulfilled, despite the written commitment of the State Party.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its concern that the State Party had neither responded nor provided any information regarding the description of adverse impacts listed in the reports of NGOs submitted to it by the World Heritage Centre.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted the statement by the Delegation of Thailand and the short comment by IUCN. It remarked that it was cautious regarding the bullet point list of fears presented by one NGO, and warned of possible undue credibility accorded to unsubstantiated claims itemising threats.

6. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** responded that the Jabiluka mine was a great political debate in Australia, and was sure that the NGOs wished it to continue. He stated that the mining company ERA would achieve compliance with international standards. It further explained that the mining company had committed to comply with the International Standard ISO 14001 by the end of July 2003 and hoped to be certified in 2005. Regarding the issue of NGO representation, it stated that NGOs were urged to provide a minimum of two nominees but had only proposed a single nomination. It further added that the NGOs concerns would be submitted to an independent inquiry. It explained that the Government aimed to keep its long-term commitment towards stabilisation of the mining area before the next monsoon season, and informed the Committee that it would be making a further formal statement in the future on the matter of long-term stabilization of the property.

7. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** urged the State Party to confirm the NGO representation on the ARRTC as soon as possible.

8. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** responded that this matter was the concern of the six eminent scientists on the Scientific Committee rather than the State Party. It recalled that in the Australian report, two NGO nominations were asked. It stated one nomination received had not matched the qualifications expected of the position and presented a polarized and partisan attitude.

9. The **Chairperson** regretfully observed that contrary to the view of the State Party it was up to the NGOs to decide amongst themselves on the appointment of their chosen representative.

10. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that the response of the State Party was not convincing and proposed a date to ensure the representation of the NGOs.

11. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** seconded the proposal from Belgium, adding that it was not for the scientists to decide on the NGO representative on the ARRTC.

12. The Delegation of **Belgium** suggested that a deadline be included in Paragraph 2.

13. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** further expressed its view that NGOs should work in a constructive way to provide nominations of a representative to the independent Scientific Committee (the Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee), which would then make a selection. The State Party could only advise or relay the decision of the ARRTC in this regard. It emphasised further that it was not up to the NGOs to decide what was a qualified background.

14. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.28**.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Pichu (Peru)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the Committee with new information following a WH Centre visit to the World Bank in Washington in June 2003 regarding a US\$ 3.5 million 'Learning and Innovation Loan' targeting waste management and planning issues around the property. The Secretariat reported that during the mission, staff at the World Bank had invited the WH Centre to participate in a joint mission in September 2003 to Machu Pichu.

2. At the request of the Chairperson, the Observer Delegation of **Peru** confirmed the provision of a 1,000-page comprehensive State of Conservation report regarding both the natural and cultural heritage values of the property. It emphasised that the number of pages had not been designed "for effect", but rather that it demonstrated the commitment of the Peruvian authorities towards the Committee and its recommendations. It noted that in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision, Peru was urged to abide by its international commitments. However, it suggested that with the completion of the comprehensive report this condition could be considered to have been fulfilled.

3. In summary, the Observer Delegation of Peru described the report, which included an updated management plan; systematic information relating to the citadel and Inca palace; a land use plan; as well as an allocation of roles for the different administrative units in place. A specific urban development plan had also been developed for Aguas Calientes with a sum of US\$ 370,000 invested to produce a complete geological report, involving multiple institutes of climatology, geophysical research, and many different universities.

4. In conclusion, the Observer Delegation of Peru confirmed that the report would directly contribute to the decision-making process and re-development of the settlement of Aguas Calientes. A further proposal focused on the creation of a permanent observation station at the property. It recognised that it had unfortunately not been able to provide the report on time, but hoped that a phrase could be included within the decision of the Committee commending the "tremendous efforts of the authorities involved".

5. **IUCN** addressed its comments to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision noting that IUCN recognised the progress achieved, and doubted the value of a forthcoming mission to the property which had been visited by the Advisory Bodies two years ago. ICOMOS concurred with the statement of IUCN, but cautioned that it would be important that the new administrative structures established be fully implemented.

6. The Delegation of Thailand responded to the comments by IUCN and ICOMOS by proposing to change paragraph 8 to "further encourage" the State Party.

7. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that it was necessary to give the Advisory Bodies the time necessary to analyse the content of the documents. It also supported the cancellation of the mission.

8. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the suggestions made by Thailand and Belgium.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the State Party for its work and supported the proposal to allow it more time to address the threats. It proposed that the reference to danger listing, as suggested by Thailand, be omitted.

10. The Delegation of **Portugal** concurred with the Advisory Bodies and the United Kingdom. The Delegation of Argentina and Mexico endorsed the proposal of the United Kingdom and suggested giving more time to the State Party.

11. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.30**, as amended

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Lamu Old Town (Kenya)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee on the meeting held between the Director General of UNESCO and the Kenyan Minister of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services on 5 June 2003. During this meeting, the Director General underlined the importance of preserving the historical aspect of Lamu Island and requested the Kenya Minister to send a representative to the current World Heritage Committee in order to facilitate dialogue between the Committee and the Government. The Minister informed the Director General that the newly elected Kenyan Government was committed to address the concerns raised over the physical development on Lamu World Heritage property. The Minister responded to the Director General his availability to cooperate with the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission that would be proposed to visit Lamu. The Secretariat further informed the Committee that the Centre received a memorandum from 'Friends of Lamu' expressing their concern about the developing pressure on the World Heritage property of Lamu.

2. At the request of the Chairperson, the Observer Delegation of **Kenya** informed the Committee that the Government of Kenya is willing to receive a mission of ICOMOS and the Centre. Furthermore he informed the Committee that a mission composed of National Museums of Kenya and other government officials visited the property from 8 to 12 June 2003 and recommended (i) the nullification of all the beach plots allocated on the sand dunes, which are water catchments areas for Lamu Old Town, (ii) the repossession of the Old Customs House which was allocated to a developer who had begun developing an apartment complex., and that the Government of Kenya expressed during this visit the commitment to rebuild the demolished building and Town Wall, strictly following the Lamu architecture. It further informed the Committee that the Government of Japan through the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has provided funds for the conservation of Lamu Old Town. It requested the Director of the World Heritage Centre to assist in the follow-up of the funding and in the implementation of the project.

4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of Kenya for her information and asked the Committee if it could agree on the Draft Decision.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked for the rectification of paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision. It said it would like all the paragraphs mentioning the missions to be undertaken to be drafted in the same way.

6. The Chairperson, having taken into account the remark from the Delegation of Belgium noted the Committee's consensus and declared Decision **27 COM 7B.31** adopted.

Royal Hill of Ambohimanga (Madagascar)

1. Further to the presentation by the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Nigeria** requested complementary clarification on some information provided by the Secretariat regarding the property and the Draft Decisions.

2. The **Secretariat** clarified that the State Party submitted a request for emergency assistance, which was approved by the Chairperson on 5 June 2003.

3. The Observer Delegation of **Madagascar** thanked la Chairperson and the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their positive contribution for the Ambohimanga site. It said it would like the Committee to change paragraph 3 in which the State Party is invited to ask for emergency assistance. Finally, it would like the funds allocated to be made available to its country as soon as possible in order to be able to commence the emergency work.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the proposal of the Observer Delegation of Madagascar) and proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.

5. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to make sure the payment of the emergency assistance was made as quickly as possible.

6. The Chairperson further proposed to delete the sentence referring to the emergency assistance in paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

7. The Chairperson noted the Committee's consensus and declared Decision **27 COM 7B.32** adopted as amended.

Robben Island (South Africa)

1. Further to the presentation by the Secretariat, the Delegation of *South Africa* expressed appreciation of the visit of the previous Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, and the Secretariat to Robben Island. The Delegation informed the Committee that the State Party took a proactive initiative by sending a mission to Robben Island in February 2003 to assess the state of conservation of the property, of which a report will be submitted to the Centre. A revised conservation management plan has also been drafted and approved by the Robben Island Council. The Delegation proposed an amendment in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, to include ICCROM in the proposed mission. The State Party has been in the process of requesting technical assistance from ICCROM regarding restoration of various buildings on the Island, in particular the prison buildings. The ICCROM assistance is also meant to contribute to the in situ training of Robben Island staff, enhancing their capacity to manage the property. The Delegation suggested that the mission be undertaken before or after the World Parks Congress in Durban in September 2003.

2. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that Robben Island is an example where conservation problems of 20th century heritage can be seen. ICOMOS is willing to undertake a mission to Robben Island.

3. **ICCROM** expressed appreciation to the Delegation of South Africa for its confidence towards their contribution, and further declared that ICCROM is ready to cooperate with South Africa and are willing to undertake the mission.

5. The **Chairperson** asked South Africa for the written amendment to the Draft Decision specifying the date of the mission and the involvement of ICCROM.

6. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.34**, as amended.

Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco)

1. Further to the presentation by the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Oman** requested the State Party to express its view on the proposed decision.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** pointed out that the efforts of its government for the safeguarding of the site had been strengthened over the last year. It underlined that in this context, the inscription of the site on the In Danger List was not necessary. It stated that its country was undertaking to organize a meeting in October 2003, in order to define the details relating to the finalization and implementation of the management plan for the site and to determine a calendar for the realisation of these recommendations. The report of this meeting will be transmitted to the Centre.

3. In view of the statement made by the State Party, the Delegation of **Thailand**, proposed that paragraph 5 (Option A) of the Draft Decision not be retained. This was supported by the Delegations of Nigeria, Hungary, Finland and Oman.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked that the report requested of the State Party deal with three questions: 1) What are the threats affecting the property ? 2) What are the measures necessary to ensure the safeguarding of the outstanding universal value of the property ? 3) What is the calendar planned for their implementation ? It pointed out that this applied to all the reports requested of the States Parties; consequently, it was necessary to harmonize all the draft decisions.

5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.41** (Option B), as amended.

Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon)

1. After the Secretariat's presentation, the Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Committee and the Centre for having responded to the appeal of the State Party by drawing up the report concerning the state of conservation of the site. It also underlined all the problems that risk endangering the site in the long run. It pointed out that the mission of the Centre had triggered a general mobilization at national level with the aim of having the property classified as a National Reserve.

2. The Delegation of Lebanon asked the Committee to change paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision inviting the State Party to set up an inter-ministerial Committee stressing that such a procedure is not usual in Lebanon and would risk taking a lot of time. The setting up of a coordination mechanism between all the parties concerned, for the drawing up and implementation of the management plan for the site, would be a more suitable proposal.

3. In response to the Delegation of Hungary, which asked for information concerning the Project mentioned in the report, the **Secretariat** communicated the information

obtained during the mission to the site. This Project, concerning five Lebanese sites, relates to tourist development in Lebanon. It will be financed by the Japanese government in the form of a donation. A Japanese team in charge of the Project recently visited Lebanon, and in particular the Qadisha valley. The terms of reference of this mission have not yet been communicated to the Centre. The Secretariat pointed out that it will monitor the development of this activity closely.

4. The Observer Representative of the **Maronite Patriarchate** thanked the Centre for having organized the mission to the site. It underlined that about 90% of the World Heritage site is the property of the Maronite Patriarchate and that, consequently, the latter should be involved in the drafting of the documents related to the safeguarding of this property. He pointed out that it would be necessary to take into account the spiritual aspects of this property when implementing the actions on the site particularly where the drawing up of the Tourist Development Project was concerned. He referred to the existence of a fund available that would allow the Lebanese authorities concerned to begin drawing up the management plan for the site immediately, in coordination with the Centre.

5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.103** as amended.

Medina of Fez (Morocco)

1. After the Secretariat's presentation, the Observer Delegation of **Morocco** confirmed the information presented in the report, pointing out that no autorisation had been granted by the authorities responsible for the protection of the World Heritage in Fez for the concrete slabbing of the Oued. It asked the Committee to send a mission to the site, in order to assist the State Party in the application of the rules relating to the safeguarding of the integrity and authenticity of this property.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed to integrate a new paragraph in the Draft Decision asking the State Party to return to the place its initial appearance.

3. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.104**, as amended.

Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties, Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing, Summer Palace, an Imperial Garden in Beijing (China)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of the property to the Committee including the presentation of the Imperial City core and buffer zoning mechanisms. A map shown to the Committee described the new buffer zone of the Imperial City as submitted by the Beijing Municipality.

2. The Delegation of **China** welcomed the recommendations addressed to the State Party in the Draft Decision, and ensured the Committee of its close and continued co-operation with the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to improve protection of the historical fabric in Beijing. A progress report would be submitted to the Committee as requested.

3. The Delegation of **Belgium** pointed out that the expression "where appropriate" in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the Draft Decision must be removed. Furthermore, the terminology in this paragraph did not seem appropriate and the word "renovation" must be replaced by "rehabilitation". As far as the boundaries of the zone proposed by the city council are concerned, the Delegation of Belgium expressed its non-comprehension at the exclusion of the zone situated bottom left in the plan of the Forbidden City. Finally, the Delegation asked that the evaluation of traditional architecture within the buffer zone be included in the report.

4. The **Chairperson**, having pointed out that the last request of the Delegation of Belgium required the drafting of a paragraph, asked the latter to write an additional paragraph for inclusion in the final decision. The Chairperson then asked the State Party to respond to the question asked on the exclusion of a "small block" of the buffer zone around the monument, whilst pointing out that this "small block" was of a non-negligible size.

5. The Chairperson then proposed to submit the other amendment proposals from the Delegation of Belgium to the approval of the Committee, while the Delegation of China was given more time to answer the question on the delimitation of the buffer zone.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the intervention made by the Delegation of Belgium and proposed to replace the expression "similar" in paragraph 5 by "and other rehabilitation projects".

7. The Delegation of **China** clarified the delineation of the Imperial City. It explained that the limit as set by the blue line on the map submitted to the Committee was based on the historical records defining the Imperial City at the time of the Ming Dynasty.

8. After thanking the Delegation of China for the clarifications given, the Delegation of **Belgium** declared that it was unable to issue a judgment on the adequacy of the limitation of the buffer zone, but had been convinced by the historic argument.

9. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.43** as amended.

Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of the property, informing the Committee on the findings and conclusions of the UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions which were undertaken in October 2002 and April 2003 as follows:

- (i) there is a need to co-ordinate the different management authorities;
- (ii) the skyline of the city has been damaged by the construction of high buildings;
- (iii) these constructions negatively impact upon the natural landscape of the property;
- (iv) the conservation management plan has not yet been completed;
- (v) demolition of traditional buildings decreases the value of the urban fabric of the old city;
- (vi) the conservation process for World Heritage needs to be strengthened.

2. The Delegation of China expressed its appreciation for the excellent work of the reactive monitoring missions to Lhasa. It expressed its contentment to learn that the UNESCO-ICOMOS missions found that the new 35 meter-tall monumental memorial was in fact smaller than the international media published it to be. The Delegation assured the Committee that all constructive recommendations of the missions had been accepted, and that necessary steps were being taken to ensure implementation of these recommendations. The Delegation of China drew the attention of the Committee to the lack of clear principles guiding construction of buildings within and beyond the World Heritage buffer zones. It underscored the challenge of achieving a balance between the development of the old city of Lhasa and the preservation of its cultural heritage. It expressed its willingness to work with the international community on matters of heritage conservation.

3. The Delegation of China did not agree on the use of the term 'demolition' in the Draft Decision, because of the international controversy on the issue of 'demolition' and 'restoration' of cultural heritage. It added furthermore that all 'renovation' in Old Lhasa was decided and approved based upon scientific advice and taking into consideration the deteriorated conditions of the historic buildings that were eventually removed. The Delegation of China finally assured the Committee that it would take active measures to achieve the work undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the mission report.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked the Secretariat if a written report had been provided to the members of the Committee as an information document.

5. The **Secretariat** explained that the report was available for consultation by the members of the World Heritage Committee, but that it had not been distributed to them individually as a working document.

6. The **Chairperson** clarified the situation further, recalling that the Secretariat had made an oral presentation of the conclusions of the mission, conclusions which could also be found in the Draft Decision. She confirmed that the report was available, but had not been distributed to the members of the Committee.

7. The Delegation of **Thailand** noted that the Secretariat had referred in its presentation to the monumental memorial as being not in harmony with the environment of the property. It requested clarification from the State Party on the style or materials used for the monument, in order to better evaluate the threat to the urban landscape of the property.

8. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, regretted the absence of the mission report, highlighted the necessity to address the three main issues, namely construction of high buildings, the destruction of vernacular architecture, and the use of concrete for the renovation of buildings. It suggested that the final decision asks that the ICOMOS report be submitted at the next session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004.

9. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its disagreement with the use of the term "renovation" in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision. It referred to the different accepted meanings of the term "renovation", which is not a synonym for "restoration". It illustrated this with a quote that said "renovation is the childhood illness of development", and denounced the renovation which was removing old urban fabrics and going against the internationally recognized principles of conservation. The Delegation of Lebanon therefore proposed the deletion of the term "renovation" from paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

10. The Delegation of **Mexico** requested further clarification on the difference between restoration and renovation.

11. The Delegation of Lebanon proposed to replace "renovation" by "rehabilitation".

12. The Delegation of Finland agreed to the change.

13. The Delegation of Belgium asked that the French version also replace "rénovation" by "réhabilitation".

14. Responding to the Delegation of Thailand's request for clarification on the style and materials of the monument, the Delegation of **China** recalled that the monumental memorial was originally situated in the middle of the square, and that it was moved to the far end of the square – and its height lowered, following the recommendations of the first expert mission.

15. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its deep regret to see that the efforts deployed by the State Party and those of the Advisory Bodies do not feature in any document

available to the members of the Committee. It said it would like the mission report to be made available to the Committee in future.

16. The **ICOMOS** expert who undertook the two missions to the World Heritage property recognized the great improvement resulting from the State Party's relocation of the monumental memorial. Without questioning the artistic value of the monumental memorial, he expressed his personal opinion on the quality of the fabric used for the square and the monumental memorial, which left something to desire. He also highlighted the need to improve the topographic frame of the square in relation with its direct environment.

17. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its desire to know whether or not the State Party was agreeable to the amendment in terminology proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon in paragraph 6. It proposed that the subparagraph of paragraph 3 starting with 'Demolition of historic traditional buildings'

18. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its disagreement with the proposed idea that there could be buildings within the World Heritage zone that could be considered more or less appropriate.

19. The Delegation of **Thailand** requested clarification on the exact comprehension by the Delegation of the United Kingdom on the use of the phrase 'inappropriate structures'.

20. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the proposal of the Hungarian Delegation. Nevertheless, it expressed reservations on the possibility given by this proposal to demolish important monuments. It therefore suggested that the Committee state that it is against the demolitions, even when they involve an improvement of existing structures. The Delegation of Belgium again deplored the absence of any mission report available to the members of the Committee.

21. Sharing the opinion of the Delegation of Belgium, the **Chairperson** nevertheless reminded the Committee of the necessity to take a decision, either by adopting the Draft Decision, or by postponing the debate to the year 2004.

22. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed that the Delegations of the United Kingdom, Hungary and Belgium meet and draw up a draft for the final decision.

23. The **Chairperson** submitted the idea to the Committee's approval.

24. The Delegation of **Hungary** stated that it would have liked the State Party to react on the proposal.

25. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Delegations of the United Kingdom, Hungary and Belgium draft a common proposal, and that the State Party be invited to

react on the new Draft Decision when the Decisions were being reviewed at the end of the session. She reminded the three Delegations that the draft proposal should also include the suggestion made by the Delegation of Lebanon.

26. Later in the week, the Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.45** as amended.

Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India)

1. Further to the presentation of the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Thailand**, drawing the Committee's attention to the outstanding issues at the time of inscription of this property at the 26th session, asked the State Party for clarification on the interventions made by the State Party and concerned stakeholders at that time to conserve the property.

2. The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond to the question raised by the Delegation of Thailand.

3. Noting the heritage value of a religious property, the Delegation of **India** informed the Committee that the developmental process of a comprehensive Management Plan had been commenced and an inception report had been completed, in close co-ordination with the all concerned stakeholders. The Delegation of India assured the Committee that it would report to it at its 28th session on the progress of the enhancement of the Management Plan. The State Party further suggested that paragraph 3 include a reference to the commencement of the development of the Management Plan.

4. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, noting that issues concerning tourism and pilgrimage pressures facing the property were justified, suggested the deadline for the completion of the Management Plan be included in the decision.

5. The Delegation of Belgium expressed its surprise at the content of paragraph 5, in which the the intention to enlarge the buffer zone tampon was clearly expressed, noting that the site had been inscribed not long before. It asked ICOMOS for explanations on the buffer zone defined the previous year and on its adequacy.

6. **ICOMOS** stated it would not be appropriate to answer the question raised by the Delegation of Belgium.

7. **ICCROM** stated that there were at least two other properties, which also had the same problem and that they are learning lessons from it.

8. **ICOMOS** drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, although it had initially recommended the nomination be deferred due to an inappropriate buffer zone upon nomination.

9. The Delegation of **Hungary** underlined that the buffer zone did not pose any problem, but that there were other values that it would be important to protect.

10. The Delegation of **India** reiterated that it had been actively developing a comprehensive Management Plan of the property, including defining an appropriate buffer zone, in close collaboration with all stakeholders, such as tourism industry, local inhabitants and religious groups. The State Party further stated that it was confident that a comprehensive and realistic plan would be completed and submitted by the 28th session of the Committee.

11. The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party agreed to add a reference to the deadline of completion of a Management Plan.

12. The Delegation of **India** agreed to inclusion of the deadline into the Decision.

13. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, referring to the similarity to Hampi World Heritage property in India, with numerous stakeholders, welcomed the efforts by the State Party to develop a Management Plan and it further stressed the importance of completing the Management Plan by the 28th session.

14. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the proposal made by the Delegation of Hungary was agreed upon by the State Party.

15. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested that Decision include reference to the protective core and buffer zones which were important and effective for the conservation of the values of the property.

16. The Delegation of **India** suggested that paragraph 3 should read as follows; "Noting the State Party initiated the process of development of a Management Plan, it is expected to be ready by the 28th session of the Committee."

17. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed that paragraph 3 be retained as drafted, drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that a functioning comprehensive Management Plan was still absent. It further suggested that appreciation to the State Party for commencing the elaboration of such work be incorporated into paragraph 7.

18. The Delegation of **Belgium** remarked that the State Party was still referring to the previous Draft Decision and was not taking into account paragraphs 6 and 7. Furthermore, it asked the Secretariat why paragraphs 5 and 6 had been included. It pointed out that the State Party cannot be asked, only invited, to modify the buffer zone.

19. Responding to the question raised by the Delegation of Belgium, noting the new information received by the World Heritage Centre, the **Secretariat** drew the

Committee's attention to the fact that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List with recognition of the associated heritage values of the surrounding areas of the Mahabodhi Temple which are intrinsically linked to the enlightenment of Buddha which are not within the core nor the buffer zone of the existing World Heritage property.

20. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.46** as amended.

Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India)

1. The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the World Heritage Committee to document *WHC-03/27.COM/7B.Corr* paragraph 105 concerning the recent information on major landfill in the Yamuna River between the Taj Mahal and Agra Fort World Heritage properties. According to this information, the implementation of a US\$ 35 million large scale tourism development project entitled "Taj Heritage Corridor Project" was underway, whereby an area of a length of 1.6 kilometers along the Yamuna River had been land-filled with 1.5 metres of soil for an amount of approximately U.S.dollars 7 million. According to expert information, as the Taj Mahal had been designed taking the hydraulic pressure from the Yamuna River into account, it was feared that the significant landfill could negatively affect the structural stability of the monument.

2. The Delegation of **Thailand** requested the Delegation of India to provide further information.

3. The Delegation of **India** informed the Committee that as soon as it was aware of the activity, the Government of India had immediately halted the construction work, which had been commenced by the State Government of Uttar Pradesh. Since 1984, the Supreme Court of India has been monitoring activities near the Taj Mahal, and the current project near the Taj Mahal World Heritage property had been brought to the attention of the Supreme Court only recently. A report on the impact of the land fill was under preparation, ordered by the Supreme Court and being undertaken by the Central Power Water Resource Centre. The Government of India and the Supreme Court was examining and monitoring the activity very closely. Moreover, the State Government of Uttar Pradesh had assured the Government of India that all the work had been stopped.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked if the construction work was continuing.

5. The Delegation of **India** responded that the construction work had been completely stopped.

6. The Delegation of **Belgium** asserted that this information must appear in the Draft Decision. Drawing a parallel with the case of the city of Vienna (Austria) and with the aim of being fair, it asked that the same paragraph

of the *Operational Guidelines* be taken up in the Draft Decision.

7. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that paragraph 22 of the *Operational Guidelines*, used in the case of Vienna was only applicable when threats to the property arise at the time of its inscription. It therefore recommended that paragraph 56 be referred to instead of 22 for the case of the Taj Mahal and Agra Fort.

8. On the basis of the new information presented by the Delegation of India, the Delegation of **Thailand** suggested to include a new paragraph in the Draft Decisions to commend the State Party on the steps taken to stop the project from continuing.

9. The **Chairperson** requested if the Committee would agree on the proposals made by the Delegations of the United Kingdom, Thailand and Belgium.

10. The Delegation of **India** underscored that it had been extremely concerned with the construction project and that the Delegate himself, together with the Minister of Culture and Tourism, had undertaken a visit to the property as soon as the information on the construction had been received. It was suggested that "after the report is received from the experts" be added to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision.

11. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, although measures had been taken to stop the construction work, the final decision of the Supreme Court was still pending. The Committee should therefore only commend the State Party after the final decision by the Supreme Court to stop this project altogether.

12. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the Observer Delegation of Canada and noted that the State Party could not be congratulated yet as the landfill problem had not been solved. The effects on the World Heritage properties must be examined during a UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission before the next session of the Committee to enable the Committee to take a decision as to whether the property was endangered or not, together with a report on the decision of the Supreme Court.

13. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.105** as amended.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of the property to the Committee. It recalled that, following decision at the 26th session of the Committee, a Second High Level Mission was sent to the Kathmandu Valley in February 2003 to examine the deterioration of the authenticity and integrity of the property. The report of

this Mission was presented to the Committee in information document *WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7C*.

2. **The former Chairperson of the Committee and leader of the Second High Level Mission, Dr Tamás Fejerdy**, informed the Committee that all the participants of the Second High Level Mission were present in the room and that they could be called upon for clarifications. He thanked the Nepalese authorities and administration for their support in the Second High Level Mission, as well as the Secretariat. He highlighted that the Mission observed unauthorized work going on and recognized a lack of co-operation between the central and local authorities while the Mission was in Kathmandu, despite the fact that it was not a surprise mission. He recalled that the Kathmandu Valley property was divided into seven Monument Zones, highlighting on the varied state of conservation of urban, rural and monumental areas. He presented the three options proposed in the Draft Decision and expressed his personal preference for Option C.

3. The Delegation of **Finland**, first recalled that it was a member of the First High Level Mission. It asked for clarification on the use of the phrase 'historical vernacular heritage' in paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, considering that it was not the official phraseology of the Committee. The Delegation of Finland expressed its support to Option A. However, it underscored the need for a clear renomination of the different Monument zones of the Kathmandu Valley as a serial nomination, with new redefined protective zones. It also offered to participate in future missions.

4. The Delegation of **Portugal** considered that Option A was too radical in view of the efforts accomplished by the Nepalese authorities. It expressed its preference for Option B, which it considered as a serious warning, and proposed that the Committee decide at its 28th session on the measures to be taken to ensure that illegal activities in the central and buffer zones are brought to an end.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported Option A, highlighting the fact the urban landscape, which was one of the components of the World Heritage property at the time of inscription combined with the cultural monuments, was largely destroyed. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that the destruction of the urban landscape constituted a case for the deletion of the World Heritage property from the World Heritage List due to loss of the values of the property. It supported a new nomination of the Monument Zones as a new World Heritage property with new sets of associated values and criteria.

6. The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the Committee had been hesitating to place Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger for over ten years, but that the State Party had always opposed this. It considered that the choice of placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger would have very little effect on

the preservation of the site, since the latter had lost much of its value, and this act would seem more like an observation than a prevention of any possible risks. It rejected Option B for its lack of usefulness, as well as Option C for the complexity of its implementation. The Delegation of Lebanon expressed its support for Option A. It noted the failure of the Committee on this dossier, but considered that it was necessary to start again on a fresh basis and that Option A precisely provided a new start for the Kathmandu Valley .

7. The Delegation of **Egypt** drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, which did not mention the values of the property. It invited the Committee to make a clear distinction between the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and deletion from the World Heritage List as a whole. It believed that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would better alert the international community on the needs of the property in terms of preservation. It recommended that a second mission examine whether the property suffered from a loss of authenticity and integrity, or a loss of values. The Delegation of Egypt believed that, in case the property had lost its authenticity but not its value as a whole, the Committee should adopt Option B.

8. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported Option A, noting that the Second High Level Mission recognized effective demolition of authenticity and integrity of the property, and that this could only impact negatively upon the values of the property.

9. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegations of Finland and the United Kingdom.

10. The Delegation of **Belgium** also supported the position of the Delegations of Finland and the United Kingdom.

11. The Delegation of **Thailand**, highlighting the fact that, contrary to the social urban fabric, the cultural monuments were in a perfect condition, proposed that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, requesting the State Party to define a new core and buffer zone. Therefore, it supported Option B.

12. The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** supported the Delegations of Egypt and Thailand, stating that unless the Committee was absolutely sure that the value of the World Heritage property was completely lost, it should be careful about deletion of the property. It pointed out that the Mission Report was not clear in this regard, referring to the fact that the Head of the Second High Level Mission himself supported Option C. It also mentioned that Option A signalled the complete failure of the Committee.

13. The Delegation of **Finland** once more expressed its preference for Option A as a concrete and positive solution, pointing out that Option B maintained the old

structures of the nomination as a Valley. It also agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia to consider loss of authenticity and values of the property as intrinsically linked.

14. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its willingness to accept Option B despite its initial stance stating preference for Option C. It further stated that Option A was too radical, although it contained some positive opportunities for the future.

15. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that the site had originally been inscribed not only for its monuments, but also for the values of its traditional urban fabric. It used the results of the second high-level mission to recall the total loss of the urban fabric values. The Delegation of Lebanon therefore recommended a redefinition of the structures of the site which would no longer refer to the Kathmandu Valley and which would allow the nomination system to be changed.

16. **The Chairperson** announced the closure of the list of speakers for this Agenda Item.

17. The Delegation of **China** supported Option C.

18. The Delegation of **Thailand** once again expressed his support for Option B, since cultural monuments comprising the Kathmandu Valley were in a perfect state of conservation and again suggested that the State Party redefine the property's core and buffer zones to be approved by the Committee. It recalled that this had been adopted for Mount Nimba (in Guinea).

19. The Delegation of **India** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Thailand. It stated that the State Party was perfectly aware of the preservation needs and Option B would be an encouragement to the State Party to continue its efforts in that direction.

20. The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out to the different meanings of the terms of 'authenticity', 'values', and 'integrity' and suggested that the Committee be stricter in its discussion and implementation of international law such as the *World Heritage Convention*. It expressed its concern over Option A, considering that the State Party may be against this option and that it could mean the definitive loss of Kathmandu as a World Heritage property. The Delegation of Egypt suggested that the State Party be questioned on its preferred Option.

21. **ICOMOS** underlined the importance of historic buildings within their traditional urban fabric of the property, which is not recognized by Option A. It supported Option B as the normal procedure to assist a State Party in safeguarding an endangered property.

22. As the State Party concerned, the Observer Delegation of **Nepal**, expressed its preference for Option C, and also mentioned that option B could be considered

as acceptable. However, it expressed its strong disagreement with Option A, which did not do justice to its continued efforts for the safeguarding of the property.

23. In response to the comments of the Delegation of Egypt, **ICCROM** explained that authenticity was a measure of the value related to each property. As authenticity and value were related, a loss of authenticity automatically induced a loss of value.

24. The Delegation of **Oman** supported Option B.

25. The Delegation of **Hungary** provided the Committee with additional information on the type of monuments in the property, which were always ensembles. Therefore, it believed that even though the environment of the monuments had been negatively affected, the value of the monuments still remained as ensembles.

26. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** recalled that it had conducted the first high-level mission on the ground. It expressed its strong preoccupation faced with the deterioration of the site and observed that the decision taken at the 24th session of the Committee at Cairns had not had the results hoped for. The Delegation noted the loss of the values of the property, and expressed its disagreement with Option B, which showed too much indulgence with the State Party concerned. In its opinion, by choosing Option A, the Committee would be taking genuine responsibility for the fate of the site, and would show that it had a vision for the worthy future of its mission. It concluded by advising the members of the Committee to keep in mind that the decision that they were about to take would be a reference for the future.

27. **The Chairperson** expressed her reluctance to put the issue to the vote, as there was no consensus on the Option to adopt.

28. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested a compromise with deletion of 'and B' from paragraph 5, if the property was to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also requested a report to assess whether or not the values of the property were lost.

29. The Delegation of **Finland** supported the compromise solution suggested by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

30. **The Chairperson** proposed to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and request a report on the remaining outstanding universal value of the property.

31. Following the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation of **Thailand** asked for clarification on the author of the expected report.

32. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, recalling normal practice of the Committee, suggested that the

report be provided by the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, and international experts, with the possibility for another high level mission.

33. The Delegation of **Egypt** requested that the World Heritage Centre should organize a mission.

34. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that the usual practice of the Committee was to send a mission organized by the Centre - to facilitate the conducting of the mission and the contacts – and to involve the Advisory Bodies to give a scientific opinion. The objectives of the mission would be to evaluate, on the one hand, the outstanding universal value of the Katmandu Valley as a whole, and on the other hand, to evaluate the outstanding universal value of its monuments individually.

35. The Chairperson noted the Committee agreement on the compromise solution and declared Decision **27 COM 7B.52** adopted as amended.

Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the situation with regard to the oil exploration in this transboundary property, that a mission was suggested and that Lithuania has already agreed to this proposal.

2. The Delegation of **Finland** requested IUCN to provide its comments.

3. The representative of **IUCN** underlined that the two State Parties have to cooperate and to agree on the process before any oil exploration could begin. Only based on such cooperation, could a joint mission could be undertaken. He recalled the discussions during the 26th session of the Committee and the potential threats to the property.

4. **ICOMOS** emphasized that since its inscription in 2000 as a cultural landscape property a commitment to transborder collaboration was requested. She stressed the need for the Environmental Impact Assessment process according to international standards.

5. The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that, as this was a transboundary site, it was also necessary to hear the Lithuanian State Party.

6. The **Chairperson** pointed out that neither the Delgation of the Russian Federation nor that of Lithuania had yet been heard.

7. The Delegation of **Lebanon** reformulated its request to hear both States Parties.

8. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** remarked that the authorities of the Russian Federation are open to a dialogue with Lithuania and there was close cooperation between the two countries, as seen in a joint working

group between the Ministry of Environment (Lithuania) and the Ministry of Natural Resources (Russian Federation). It further stated that the oil exploration was taking place outside the World Heritage area and that licences were given ten years ago. The property was inscribed as a cultural property in 2000 and the Committee knew about the oil exploration project for which a study had been carried out. It informed the Committee that the exploration will begin in December 2003 and that emergency plans exist.

9. The **Chairperson** recalled the request for an Environmental Impact Assessment.

10. The Observer Delegation of **Lithuania** underlined that its authorities tried comply with all decisions by the Committee. However, it had to contradict the previous statement given by the Delegation of Russian Federation as the Lithuanian authorities did not receive the EIA report or any further information on this project. It therefore asked for an international mission to the property to review the situation. It further questioned who was actually responsible for Curonian Spit as the Ministry of Natural Resource of Russian Federation did not seem to be in charge of the property.

11. The Delegation of **Finland** reminded the Committee that the Curonian Spit is situated within the Baltic Sea, where other existing and potential World Heritage properties are located. Therefore any environmental problems or oils spills would have far reaching implications for neighbouring countries. It urged cooperation between the State Parties as well as with the Baltic countries. The Delegation of Finland supported the joint IUCN-ICOMOS-UNESCO mission to the property and proposed a minor amendment to the Draft Decision.

12. The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Finland to prepare a draft amendment.

13. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its serious concern about the state of conservation of the property and encouraged cooperation between the two State Parties. It further recommended that the Environmental Impact Assessment report to be forwarded to the Centre for review by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies.

14. The Delegation of **Nigeria** underlined that this is a transboundary property and that a serious cooperation process is required to solve the problems.

15. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reminded the Committee of the Article 6 paragraph 3 of the *Convention* concerning the responsibility of States Parties not to take any deliberate measures, which might damage directly or indirectly World Heritage properties. It also stated that the EIA required is of interest to all the Baltic States.

16. The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Finland to make a reference to this in the proposal for the amended Draft Decision.

17. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked IUCN if it was possible to have some clarification concerning oil exploration. It then asked if paragraph 3 could be accepted by the Committee. It also said it would like the Committee to express its very strong concerns regarding the state of the site.

18. **IUCN** was in agreement with paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision and that no exploration could start before the proper EIA process was followed. It further underlined that IUCN is an advisory body that deals with technical issues and that the proposed mission could not resolve political problems between the States Parties. It also informed the Committee that at its Congress in Amman (2000) recommendations were made concerning extraction policies.

19. The **Chairperson** urged the Committee to consider the Draft Decision and requested the Delegation of Finland to propose the amendment.

20. The Delegation of **Finland** proposed to add in paragraph 3 “including a joint Russian and Lithuanian EIA process” after “before all the necessary research has been carried out”.

21. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** remarked that there is no oil exploration within the boundaries of the property. Construction would only start by the end of 2003 and nothing could be seen now, therefore the mission would not be necessary.

22. The Delegation of **Lebanon** underlined that a mission is of no true use if it consists only of ascertaining the damage caused.

23. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon.

24. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the opinion of the Delegation of the United Kingdom and proposed to add to the Draft Decision that the Committee expressed its strong preoccupations regarding the state of the site and concerning the application of Article 6.3 of the *Convention*.

25. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** once again stated that the mission was not necessary, as there is only a platform to see.

26. The **Chairperson** summarized that while the majority of the Committee was in favour of the Draft Decision with the amendment by Finland and reference to Article 6.3 of the *Convention*, she would request a vote if the Delegation of Russia opposed to it.

27. **ICOMOS** underlined that a joint mission would be beneficial for all parties involved, once the Environmental Impact Assessment is completed.

28. The Delegation of **Thailand** did not support the mission to the property, as the advisor bodies have to assess the Environmental Impact Assessment.

29. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that a mission be sent to the property in order to play a catalytic role in facilitating cooperation between the States Parties.

30. **IUCN** reiterated its earlier intervention and suggested that it is the Secretariat to facilitate this political process, as IUCN is an advisory body to provide technical advice.

31. The Delegations of **Saint Lucia** and **Finland** agreed with IUCN and stated that the Environmental Impact Assessment needed to be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies.

32. The **Chairperson** requested that the amendment be made to request the Centre to conduct a mission to enhance cooperation between the State Parties.

33. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** sought clarification as to whether this mission was to visit the property or the oil exploration platform, which is 30 kilometers outside the World Heritage property.

34. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** clarified that the objective of the mission is to ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment is being carried out and assessed and to enhance proper collaboration between the two State Parties.

35. The Delegation of **Russian Federation** then invited a UNESCO mission.

36. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.70** as amended.

Lumbini, Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)

1. The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the World Heritage Committee to document *WHC-03/27.COM/7B.Corr* paragraph 53 concerning the state of conservation of Lumbini, Birthplace of the Lord Buddha World Heritage property, Nepal and in particular of the Maya Devi Temple. The Secretariat recalled that, following the inscription on the World Heritage List, archaeological excavation had been undertaken on-site, disclosing remains from the sixth century. The State Party had been requested to ensure the adequate protection and presentation of the property.

2. Following the request of the World Heritage Committee at its 26th session, the State Party submitted a report on the final construction and restoration of the Maya

Devi Temple on 1 July 2003. Due to the shortness of time, the Secretariat had not yet been able to share this information with the Advisory Bodies and indicated that the report did not contain details of the management mechanisms as requested by the Committee.

3. The Delegation of **Belgium** underlined the importance of coherence in the Draft Decisions. The first paragraph used the term "having examined", although this examination was limited to a short presentation. The Delegation underlined that it would be difficult to continue to do proper work in such conditions.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the remarks of the Delegation of Belgium and noted with concern the construction of a new temple next to the site inscribed. The Delegation expressed its indignation at the fact that the State Party had not consulted the Committee before the work began. It asked the Secretariat to examine the impact of the construction on the core zone and on the buffer zone and to draft a report, allowing the Committee to take the necessary decisions. The Delegation of Lebanon underlined that the Committee was not a rubber-stamping chamber.

5. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its agreement with the Delegations of Belgium and Lebanon. It said that an important amount of new information had been received shortly before the Committee session and therefore suggested introducing a deadline for the submission of new information.

6. The **Chairperson** commented that it was unacceptable to receive reports at the last minute.

7. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the comments made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and the Chairperson.

8. The Delegation of **Finland** also expressed its support.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested 1 June as a possible deadline for the submission of new information and requested the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to comment.

10. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that such a date already existed and was scheduled 6 weeks before the Committee session. He requested the Committee for a clear mandate to reject everything which would not be submitted before or on this date.

11. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented that there could always be exceptions and expressed its fear that emergencies could be missed. It stressed that a mechanism had to be found.

12. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed to modify the Draft Decision as follows:

Paragraph 1 should mention the decision of the Committee at its 26th session, any new information should be introduced and the terme "noted" should be replaced by "regretted" in paragraph 2.

13. **ICOMOS** indicated that the construction of the new temple had now been completed and that interventions should have been done earlier. Although reports could be made, the new building had to be accepted.

14. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested that the deadline for submission of new information should be earlier than 6 weeks to enable the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to prepare the documents. In exceptional cases, late information should be accepted.

15. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed to fix the deadline at 1st February. Moreover, it asserted, unlike ICOMOS, that the construction should not be accepted. It said that the Committee must examine if the new construction affected the outstanding universal value of the property and then take the necessary decisions.

16. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated its refusal to accept the new construction as a *fait accompli* and suggested enlarging the core zone and the buffer zone, deleting the site from the World Heritage List or modifying the site.

17. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its support for the deadline of 1 February and that it should be strictly upheld. Seven weeks would not be sufficient for the Advisory Bodies to examine all new information before the Committee session.

18. The **Chairperson** suggested examining the Draft Decision.

19. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support for the elaboration of a report.

20. The Delegation of **Belgium** reiterated its proposal to change the two first paragraphs of the Draft Decision as follows:

The first paragraph must refer to the decision of the Committee at its 26th session, the second paragraph must integrate the new information submitted after the deadline and in the third paragraph the expression "*notes*" should be replaced by "*regrets*".

21. The **Secretariat** requested the Committee to propose a clear definition of exceptional cases for which the deadline 1 February would be ignored. It underlined the importance of reporting and acting rapidly in cases of natural disasters.

22. The Delegation of **Finland** commented that natural disasters should be treated as exceptional cases, however it should be avoided that other cases are also considered as urgent.

23. The Delegation of **Thailand** indicated that disasters also happened before the deadline and that in exceptional cases, the Secretariat would be in a position to consider whether or not this was an emergency.

24. The **Secretariat** explained that it often received information on public or private work at the last minute and that constructions could be halted when the foundations are laid but not later when the building was completed.

25. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted two cases: on the one hand, the respecting of the date of 1st February as a deadline for the submission of reports, on the other hand, emergency cases.

26. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the comment made by the Delegation of Belgium.

27. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.53** as amended.

Seokguram Grotto and Bulguksa Temple (Republic of Korea)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of the property to the Committee. It informed the Committee of a report received following the drafting of the Decision for this property, informing the Centre that the plans for the construction of a museum at the Seokguram Grotto World Heritage property had been abandoned. Consequently, the Secretariat has redrafted the Decision, which is now presented in working document *WHC-03/27.COM 7B.Corr*

2. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed to supplement the information provided in the report received by the World Heritage Centre. The project of building a museum to host a replica of the Seokguram Grotto was intended to enable better understanding and appreciation of the property by the visitors. For along time, there has been limited access to the property through a glass, which is not considered as a satisfying solution. The plan to build such a museum was however abandoned, due to experts expressing their disagreement with the construction of such a construction in the vicinity of the property. The Delegation also referred to an expression used in the report submitted to the World Heritage Centre defining the project as a “tourism development project”, phrasing which the Delegation considered inconsistent with the exact purpose of the project.

3. The Chairperson declared Decision **27 COM 7B.54** adopted.

Historic Centre of Shakhrisayabz (Uzbekistan)

1. The **Secretariat** drew the attention of the World Heritage Committee to document *WHC-03/27.COM/7B* paragraph 56 concerning the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisayabz, Uzbekistan.

2. The Secretariat indicated that the State Party had submitted an International Assistance request for the elaboration of a long-term comprehensive conservation and management plan, and that this request was currently being processed in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

3. The Secretariat therefore suggested that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision be amended as follows:

“4. Requests the State Party, in close co-operation with the Secretariat to accelerate its efforts towards the elaboration of a long-term comprehensive conservation and management plan for the historic centre of Shakhrisayabz and its main buildings, especially for the conservation of the Ak Sarai Palace.”

4. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.56** as amended.

Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of Vienna and informed the Committee that considerable efforts have been made by the State Party to revise the Wien-Mitte Project. It showed in a powerpoint slide the remaining City Tower, not part of the Wien-Mitte Project, which is being built.

2. **ICOMOS** supported the decision taken by the Mayor of Vienna in mid-March to cancel the project. ICOMOS further underlined that construction projects in the future should not be higher than the Hilton hotel building. After commending the improvement of the cooperation between the State and Municipal Authorities, the representative of ICOMOS also pointed out that the further developments would have to be followed very closely.

3. The Observer Delegation of **Austria** confirmed that the existing project had been stopped and cancelled officially. Furthermore, the State Party reported that an international jury that included a member of ICOMOS had been created to study new projects, one of which had already been approved, and the results of this competition would be known next October. The State Party also clarified the situation around the "City Tower" that it was not part of the Wien-Mitte Project and that it is being built within the outermost limit of the buffer zone without compromising the visual integrity of the Historic Centre.

4. The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party, regretted however, that the City Tower is already under construction.

5. The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed to amend paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision to congratulate the State Party, as it is not very common that the State Party follows the recommendations of the Committee so promptly as was in this case. It also suggested the deletion of paragraph 4 as it believed that the "City Tower" is being built outside the buffer zone. The Chairperson clarified that the Tower was situated within the outermost limit of the buffer zone.

6. The Delegation of **China** appreciated the efforts by the city authorities and suggested that the Committee should commend the way the Austrian authorities had cooperated.

7. The Delegation of **Hungary** shared this opinion and was against the deletion of paragraph 4 as proposed by the Delegation of Argentina, as this paragraph was not diminishing the efforts by the authorities. At the same time this paragraph was expressing the Committee's concern about the construction of the City Tower.

8. The Delegation of **Oman** supported the intervention of the Argentine Delegation to amend paragraph 3.

9. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the State Party for its collaboration with the Committee as expressed in paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision. It also congratulated the Committee for having taken firm decisions, which should be renewed in the future. As for paragraph 4, the Delegation noted that it would be necessary to maintain and modify it, expressing the regret that a high-rise building is being built in spite of the recommendations of the Committee, and that it was important to remain vigilant as regards the Wien-Mitte project.

10. The **Chairperson** summarized the proposal made by the Delegation of Argentina to amend paragraph 3 and to delete paragraph 4 and by others to retain the word "regrets".

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** drew the attention to the following points: 1. Paragraph 3 can remain as it is, but it would be necessary to refer to the consensus in order to improve the quality of the project and integrate "takes note of". 2. The word "*regrets*" should be added to paragraph 4. 3. The Delegation also pointed out that it would be necessary to use the information provided by ICOMOS, to refer to a specific height of building in order to avoid other such cases in future.

12. The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed that paragraph 3 should be amended to include congratulations to the State Party, supported the integration of the building codes into the decision and that paragraph 4 should read "Regrets...".

13. The Delegations of **Portugal** and the **United Kingdom** supported this proposal.

14. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** further suggested to end paragraph 4 after "...is being built"

15. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.57** as amended.

16. The Observer Delegation of **Austria** thanked the Committee for the constructive debate and its decision.

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

1. The **Secretariat** recalled that three missions had taken place, including the one headed by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, and that all missions confirmed that the property was under serious threats. The mission report (*WHC-03/27.COM/INF.7D*) had been provided to the State Party and the Secretariat has received no objections from the authorities to include this property in the List of World Heritage in Danger as proposed by the international mission.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the Draft Decision to include the property in the World Heritage List in Danger.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the Committee should indicate why the property is being inscribed in the World Heritage List in Danger, as in this case it could be because of an earthquake, the lack of a management plan or both.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that after reading the report, it seemed to it that the earthquake was certainly strong, but that the effects of a lack of management had aggravated the situation in the city of Bakou. It also underlined that it was regrettable that projects conducted by the World Bank lead to threats to the site. The Delegation summed up by proposing to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to its numerous problems.

5. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its surprise that the Draft Decision did not include a paragraph expressing the regrets of the Committee faced with this natural catastrophe.

6. The **Secretariat** agreed that the State Party should have informed the Committee about the earthquake which happened just before the inscription. The property could have been put immediately on the List of World Heritage in Danger and could already have been given International Assistance in 2000.

7. The Delegation of **Belgium** replied that this would be part of paragraph 1 and proposed modifications to paragraph 3, namely to "observe" that the state of conservation has got worse and to "express" its strongest preoccupations in relation to the situation".

8. The **Chairperson** requested that the Delegation of Belgium prepares the text accordingly.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the State Party had given its consent to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

10. The **Secretariat** answered that the State Party had been provided with the full report and that no objections had been received from the authorities.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked that the reports that the Committee has to assess at its 28th session mention whether the outstanding universal values of a site that justified its inscription still exist.

12. The Chairperson agreed to this amended as proposed.

13. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.59** as amended, thus inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that an invitation by the State Party for a mission to the property had been received on 9 June 2003.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.62**.

Acropolis, Athens (Greece)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the State Party provided new information dated 2 July 2003, which referred to the decision adopted by the Committee in 2002, concerning a decree the State Party adopted to ban all construction works in the area for one year. The State Party had also proposed a new Draft Decision, which was distributed.

2. The Delegation of **Greece** informed the Committee about the measures taken to stop all construction work and explained that the proposed new Draft Decision would take this into account.

3. The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the State Party and the Secretariat for the information provided. It asked if it was necessary to add to paragraph 2 the request for a visual impact study.

4. The Delegation of **China** thanked the State Party for the information provided and supported the revised Draft Decision.

5. The **Delegation of Belgium** underlined that the Budapest Decision **26 COM 21 (b) 49** must be compared with those proposed by Greece. It observed that Greece's new Draft Decision says nothing and that we do not know what the information received on 2 July 2003 consisted of.

It underlined that the Committee can refer only to the information given in the report in order to be able to take a decision. The Delegation wondered if the Committee wished to reject what was requested at Budapest.

6. The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that this new information had only been received two days ago, and it requested that the content of the letter be summarised.

7. The **Secretariat** reported to the Committee that by letter of 2 July 2003 the State Party informed it about a ban that had been decreed for issuing new permits and all construction works within the boundary of the World Heritage property for one year.

8. The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the ban should be permanent, and not only for one year.

9. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with Belgium and underscored that a new decision could not be taken since the new information became available only very recently. The Draft Decision included in the working document had to be considered instead.

10. The Delegations of **Finland** and **Portugal** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon.

11. The Delegation of **Egypt** also agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon and proposed that the Draft Decision should include the usual requirement concerning the submission of a report by the State Party and that the ban should be permanent.

12. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the remark made by the Delegation of Egypt and remarked that it would be necessary to include in the Draft Decision a request to the State Party not to take any irreversible measures. The Delegation suggested to the Rapporteur to refer to the Budapest Decision **26 COM 21 (b) 49** and to take from it all that is not mentioned in the letter of 2 July 2003.

13. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.67** as amended.

Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne (Ireland)

1. The state of conservation of this World Heritage property, which was foreseen for noting, was discussed following a request by the Delegation of South Africa.

2. The Delegation of **South Africa** underscored that, as was the case with East Rennell (Salomon Islands), the Committee had to decide about what to do when a State Party does not submit the requested information.

3. The **Secretariat** pointed out that it had requested information from the State Party concerning the project of

an incinerator since June 2002, in addition to letters, by telephone without any results.

4. The Delegation of **Lebanon** remarked that this was an emergency case that seemed quite serious. It noted that the information showed that there were real threats and that this required a mission to the site organized by the Secretariat and the Advisory Body. It proposed that it be suggested to the State Party not to take any irreversible measures before the arrival of the mission.

5. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon. It suggested formulating, on the basis of what would be done for this site, a general rule, that could apply to all cases where there is an absence of response from the State Party.

6. The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that this was an ideal case to request an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

7. The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed with this proposal.

8. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.68** as amended

Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that an UNESCO/ICOMOS mission had taken place in early June 2003 and that new information was provided on the construction of a 26 floor building in the Kipsala area, which is located in the buffer-zone on the river shore opposite the historic centre. Following the mission, the Riga City Development Department in cooperation with the Architects Union of Latvia organized a workshop "Future development of the Kipsala area" and reviewed the building regulations and the detailed plan for the area. The results were displayed in the Riga City Council and open for public discussion until 25 July 2003. Subsequently, a new proposal for paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision was elaborated by the State Party and ICOMOS and distributed.

2. The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with this revised Draft Decision.

3. **ICOMOS** remarked that the construction of skyscrapers had become a frequent problem, as was the cases for the Tower of London (United Kingdom) and Cologne Cathedral (Germany).

4. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the new Draft Decision.

5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.79** as amended.

6. The Delegation of **Finland** was then given the floor to inform the Committee about two new buildings at the Market Place of Riga that are pastiche and in historicist architectural style. It suggested that the Committee should deal with these cases and should establish some criteria for new constructions within protected historical city centres, as this is a question of principle.

7. The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegation of Finland and proposed that a discussion on this theme could be organized in form of a symposium.

8. The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its support for the idea of a forum to deal with approaches to interventions in historic city centres. It deemed it very important to formulate on this occasion proposals not only on the architectural aspect, but also on the urbanistic and social aspects.

9. The **Chairperson** agreed and remarked that the Director of the World Heritage Centre is also interested.

10. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the idea and proposed that two items should be central in the debate: (1) what is to be prohibited in historical towns, (2) how to integrate life and work in living cities and (3) what kind of guidelines could be followed.

11. The **Chairperson** intervened that the debate should not take place during this agenda item and pointed out that it could be considered for a future session as a thematic debate.

12. The Delegation of **Belgium** wished to add a sentence to the Draft Decision reflecting its concern on the subject of the architectural quality of new buildings in cities.

13. The Committee adopted General Decision **27 COM 7B.107**.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that there had been a delay in the implementation of the management plan due to local elections and that a meeting with the Polish authorities took place in UNESCO on 17 April 2003. Furthermore, the funding from the State Party of Israel was received for the management project and a contract was currently being prepared.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Poland** expressed its satisfaction with the Draft Decision, which seemed to it very wise as it reflected the very complex problems of the site, whilst making the distinction between the memorial site of Auschwitz and the modern city. It underlined that, since Helsinki in 2001, the points of dissension had been dealt with by the Polish government and that cooperation with the parties involved had been undertaken in a climate of serenity which represented a starting point for the establishment of a management plan that is very important

for the site. The Delegation thanked the State of Israel for the study on the conformity of the buffer zones in relation to the site.

3. The Delegations of the **United Kingdom, Hungary and South Africa** supported the Draft Decision, which was adopted.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.71**.

Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania)

1. The **Secretariat** stated that the relocation of the theme park "Dracula land" was a success story for the *Convention* and provided information concerning a meeting foreseen by the Mihai Eminescu Trust in conjunction with the World Bank to include all the stakeholders of the property by the end of 2003.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.73**.

3. The Observer from the **Mihai Eminescu Trust** pointed out that cooperation was progressing well. He invited the Chairperson and the Committee to join him at the meeting of the actors involved on the ground.

Old Town of Avila and its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of the recent demolition of traditional buildings at the town square.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Spain** agreed with the Draft Decision and with paragraph 7 to provide a detailed report.

3. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.78**.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the State Party had submitted the draft zoning of the Historic Peninsula of Istanbul to the Centre for comments.

2. Consequently, the Draft Decision has been revised including a paragraph to thank the State Party for this submission.

3. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.79** as amended.

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a World Heritage Centre mission took place to attend a regional seminar in Crimea, Ukraine in May 2003. Centre staff could only briefly review the problems at the property in Kiev with the national authorities.

2. The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** informed the Committee that the Ukrainian government accepted the decision. It stated that an enlarged interministerial meeting had taken place at the end of June 2003 whose minutes would be submitted to the Secretariat immediately after the session of the Committee. The Delegation also stated that the municipality was in charge of controlling all the operations underway around Saint-Sophia, that the planned swimming pool had been cancelled and that the State department for the protection of monuments was working on the delimitation of the protection zone for the sites. The Delegation underlined that measures to ensure protection had been taken and that the Ukrainian government was open to any form of collaboration with the World Heritage Centre.

3. The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked what the concern of the preservation of the cathedral was.

4. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the Draft Decision.

5. The **Secretariat** answered to the Delegation of Nigeria that, as it was indicated on the power-point slide, the concerns regarding this property were in particular the destabilisation of the ground and cracks on the Bell Tower following construction projects.

6. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested adding to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision the request to the State Party to submit a detailed "technical" report on the completed project.

7. The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to her recent visit to Ukraine where she met the Minister of Urban Planning. The Minister had assured her that the underground swimming pool construction had been stopped.

8. The Delegation of **Hungary** referring to Thailand's comments, proposed to add to the Draft Decision after "project" the wording "and of the status of the historic monuments of the property".

9. The Delegation of Thailand agreed to mention the monuments and proposed to add "technical" report.

10. The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** stated that it agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Thailand. It added that the overall reconstruction plan for the site existed and that at present this was the first part of a programme intended to be implemented until 2010.

11. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.80** as amended.

Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás (Brazil)

1. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.86** without debate.

Park, Fortresses and group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a mission had taken place and that neither the authenticity nor the integrity of the property had been compromised by the works carried out on the fortress.
2. The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked the mission for its many suggestions concerning the improvement of the management plan and proposed to add to paragraph 4, after "...site;", the sentence "which as the mission concluded did not compromise the integrity of the property".
3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked if ICOMOS wanted to add this sentence to the Draft Decision.
4. **ICOMOS** agreed.
5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.89** as amended.

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic).

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the law indicated in the report of the Secretariat had been approved.
2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.90**.

Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)

1. No new information was received.
2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.92**.

Historic Centre of Puebla (México)

1. The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation of the historic centre of Puebla. The State Party informed the Committee that the plans for parking constructions had not been approved, that the three demolished buildings were in the outermost part of the buffer zone and that the Council of Historic Monuments had not recommended the parking projects. The State Party recalled that the property is a living and continuously evolving city, and that the national authorities should be encouraged in their moderating role concerning the local authorities.
2. The Delegation of **Thailand** proposed to change in the last line of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, the term "implications" into something more objective.
3. The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed to delete paragraph 2 and amend paragraph 4 by saying that several working groups are already active.

4. The Delegation of **Thailand** proposed to keep paragraph 2, which was supported by the Delegation of Hungary.

5. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.94** as amended.

Historic Centre of Lima (Peru)

1. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that an ICOMOS mission had taken place in March-April 2003, and that a report was made available on 13 June 2003. This report refers to the document that was adopted in July 2002, which recommended coordination of projects and actions between the National Institute of Culture and the Lima Municipality.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.99**.

7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES NOTED BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee adopted Decisions on the following properties without discussion:

NATURAL HERITAGE/PATRIMOINE NATUREL

AFRICA / AFRIQUE:

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon) (**27 COM 7B.1**) ;
Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya) (**27 COM 7B. 4**);
Greater St Lucia Wetland Park (South Africa) (**27 COM 7B. 6**)

ARAB STATES : n/a

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC:

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (**27 COM 7B. 8**);
Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (**27 COM 7B. 9**);
Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (**27 COM 7B. 10**);
Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (**27 COM 7B. 11**);
Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (**27 COM 7B. 13**);

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA:

Nahanni National Park (Canada) (**27 COM 7B. 16**);
Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (**27 COM 7B. 17**);
Aeolian Islands (Italy) (**27 COM 7B. 18**)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN:

Talamanca Range - La Amistad Reserves/La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica and Panama) (**27 COM 7B. 24**);
Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (**27 COM 7B. 25**); Sian Ka'an (Mexico) (**27 COM 7B. 26**).

MIXED HERITAGE:

AFRICA :

Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) (Mali) (27 COM 7B. 27);

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC:

Mount Emei Scenic Area, including Leshan Giant Buddha Scenic Area (China) (27 COM 7B. 29)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: n/a.

CULTURAL HERITAGE / PATRIMOINE

CULTUREL

AFRICA:

Island of Gorée (Senegal) (27 COM 7B. 33);

ARAB STATES:

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (27 COM 7B. 35);

Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (27 COM 7B.36);

Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt) (27 COM 7B. 37);

Byblos (Lebanon) (27 COM 7B. 38);

Tyre (Lebanon) (27 COM 7B. 39);

Ancient *Ksour* of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (27 COM 7B. 40)

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC:

Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (27 COM 7B. 42);

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (27 COM 7B. 44);

Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (27 COM 7B. 47);

Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran) (27 COM 7B. 48);

Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (27 COM 7B. 49);

Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (27 COM 7B. 50);

Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (27 COM 7B. 51);

Seokguram Grotto and Bulguksa Temple (Republic of Korea) (27 COM 7B. 54);

State Historical and Cultural Park "Ancient Merv" (Turkmenistan) (27 COM 7B. 55)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA:

Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (27 COM 7B. 58);

Historic District of Québec (Canada) (27 COM 7B. 60);

Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (27 COM 7B. 61);

Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (27 COM 7B. 63);

Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany) (27 COM 7B. 64);

Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany) (27 COM 7B. 65);

Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz (Germany) (27 COM 7B. 66);

Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (27 COM 7B. 72);

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (27 COM 7B. 74);

Spissky Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia) (27 COM 7B. 75);

Old town of Salamanca (Spain) (27 COM 7B. 76);

Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain) (27 COM 7B. 77);

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (27 COM 7B. 82);

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (27 COM 7B. 83)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN:

Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis: San Ignacio Mini, Santa Ana, Nuestra Señora de Loreto and Santa Maria Mayor (Argentina), Ruins of Sao Miguel das Missoes (Brazil) (Argentina/Brazil) (27 COM 7B. 84);

Brasilia (Brazil) (27 COM 7B. 85);

Historic Town of Ouro Preto (Brazil) (27 COM 7B. 87);

Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (27 COM 7B. 88);

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (27 COM 7B. 90);

Joya de Ceren Archaeological Site (El Salvador) (27 COM 7B. 91);

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (27 COM 7B. 93);

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama:

Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (27 COM 7B. 96);

Chavin (Archaeological Site) (Peru) (27 COM 7B. 97);

City of Cuzco (Peru) (27 COM 7B. 98);

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (27 COM 7B. 100);

Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (27 COM 7B. 101).

11 EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND BUDGET FOR 2004-2005 (continued)

1. The **Secretariat** continued the item by presenting the three budget tables to be approved and the Chairperson then proceeded to open the floor for the three parts of the Draft Decision elaborated and proposed by the Budget Working Group.

2. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the first part of the Draft Decision, as did the Delegation of Thailand, suggesting that the expression "flagship status" should be replaced with "universality". The Chairperson explained that the word "flagship" should be retained as it had specific significance for UNESCO.

3. The **Delegation of Egypt** supported Parts 1 and 2 which, it said, did not require discussion, Part 1 being simply an introduction and Part 2 a restatement of facts. The Chairperson proposed, and it was unanimously accepted, to adopt Decision 27 COM 11.1.

4. The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its concern over the small figure provided to Europe & North America, including Eastern Europe, under Regional Programmes. The **Secretariat** explained that the Periodic

Reporting for Europe was to be presented in 2006, hence the relatively small sum presented in the 2004-2005 budget. The Delegation of **Hungary** urged the Committee to take note of its concern and that it be not forgotten for at the time of elaboration of the next 2006-2007 budget. The **Chairperson** proposed and it was unanimously accepted to adopt Decision **27 COM 11.2**.

5. **IUCN** made a joint statement on behalf of **ICOMOS** that whilst recognizing the difficult financial situation in which the budget was proposed, there was regret that the budget for Reactive Monitoring remained static in relation to the previous biennium and pointed out that no budget has been foreseen under World Heritage Fund for Periodic Reporting. Therefore, it requested that a sufficient amount be provided under Reactive and Periodic Reporting for Advisory Bodies.

6. The Delegation of **Hungary** suggested that the voluntary donations referred to in paragraph 11.3.2 could come from the difference between States Parties current and forthcoming contributions. It further suggested that these donations should be channeled to endangered properties. The Secretariat specified that a budget line specific to properties in Danger had been provided under budget line 2.2.4.

7. The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that Advisory Bodies should have sufficient funding in order to be able to carry out missions given them by the Centre. It also added that it was difficult to find funding for evaluation missions. The Delegation of the United Kingdom proposed a new sub-paragraph 11.3.3.(v) to read "*Funds to ensure that the Advisory Bodies have sufficient resources to enable them to fulfill their obligations under the Convention*" and this proposal was supported by the Delegation of Finland which also stressed the need to reinforce the staff at the World Heritage Centre.

8. The Delegation of **Egypt** further proposed to change the wording under 11.3.3 from "Encourages" to "Commissions" to which the Delegation of the United Kingdom and the Chairperson objected and the proposal was dropped.

9. The Committee unanimously adopted Decision **27 COM 11.3** as amended.

14 EVALUATION OF THE CAIRNS DECISION (continued)

1. The **Chairperson** reopened the agenda item and asked the coordinator of the working group on the Cairns Decision, Dr. Tamás Fejérdy (Hungary), to make a brief report on the work of the working group.

2. The **Coordinator of the Working group (Hungary)** explained that the working group had met for only one hour, which had not been enough time for such a complex subject. However, he noted that the group had a very clear

mandate -- which was not to open the substance of the item, but to deal with the procedure -- how to approach this problem. The working group session had heard quite divergent views: there had been a proposal to postpone further discussion until 2006, and there had also been a proposal to deal with the issue at the 28th session of the Committee in China. At the end of the session, the group had still not arrived at any consensus on this topic, but the coordinator proposed to make a summary of the proposals:

(i) The first point would be to rely on the Draft Decision as it stood in the working document (WHC-03/27COM/14). However, after the experiences of the last two days reviewing nominations, many State Parties were reluctant to cancel the ceiling of 30, suggesting that perhaps it should be retained.

(ii) The second point would be to ask the Secretariat to provide detailed statistical data in order to provide a solid basis for further deliberation. He noted that the work already done by the working group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List under Prof. Prof. Olabiyi B.J. Yai, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Benin.²

(iii) But the Coordinator asked how the Committee could deal with this item between Committee sessions? From the working group discussion, there were many constructive proposals of different States Parties to improve their representativity of the World Heritage List. The coordinator concluded by proposing that, despite not having the final evaluation made the Advisory Bodies, States Parties be encouraged to submit proposals by the end of the year to the Centre, with different options. With statistical data and other preparative items by the Centre, the Committee could be prepared for next session in Suzou. It was also important, he added, that the Committee have at its next session appropriate time for this discussion.

² Note by the Secretariat:

The statistics cited were apparently those presented to the 23rd session of the Bureau (1999) and to the 12th General Assembly (1999) and would have been made available to the working group. These documents were:

1. Number of nominations proposed and inscribed by category (1978-1998) (WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.6 I), and
2. Distribution of World Heritage Properties in States Parties (WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.6 II).

The report of the working group, WHC-2000/CONF.202/10, was presented to the 24th session of the Bureau (June 2000), but it did not contain statistics.

The initial numerical analysis by ICOMOS ("Analysis of the World Heritage List by Category of Monument and Period") was presented to the Committee in 2000 as Annex III of the Report of the Working Group on the Representativity of the World Heritage List (WHC.2000/CONF.204/INF.08)

(<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2000/whc-00-conf204-inf8e.pdf>).

3. The **Chairperson** summarized the Coordinator's summary: the Committee retained the Decision in the document, but is reluctant to cancel the overall ceiling and would like between the sessions for the Secretariat to prepare the necessary statistics and put at the disposal of States Parties the previous work done including the report of the previous working group headed by Prof. Yai of Benin. The Coordinator is proposing to adopt a mechanism whereby all States Parties can react on this issue by sending written amendments by the end of December 2003. He is also proposing that a reasonable amount of time be given to this item in the next session of the Committee to be able to focus discussion on the item.

4. The coordinator of the working group (Hungary) agreed that it was an accurate summary of his summary. "Reasonable", however, was a flexible word, and he suggested that perhaps "enough" time would be better. He thought that the Committee might need as much as one to 1-1/2 days to discuss the issue.

5. The Delegation of **China** stated that the Cairns evaluation concerned a very important substantive issue. It deserved full debate and thorough discussion. To postpone debate meant postponing an assessment of the effectiveness of the measures adopted three years before on an experimental basis. Whatever the view of this audience on these measures, debate was urgently needed on this substantive political question. The item should therefore be included in the next Committee session. In the meantime, to adequately prepare and facilitate the discussion at the next Committee session, an intersessional working group should be established already at this session, given the importance of this strategic issue. It said that it had no objection to deleting the artificial limit of 30 properties per year.

6. The Delegation of **United Kingdom** stated that it did not agree concerning establishing an intersessional working group. The necessary documentation was not yet available to have a sensible discussion. It agreed wholeheartedly with the proposal made by Hungary that written comments should be provided, but the Committee also required the thematic studies requested from the Advisory Bodies. The absence of these reports had proved a constant source of concern to the Committee over the previous 12-18 months.

7. The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed with the delegate of China who had said that the 30 limit was artificial; it also agreed with previous speakers that an intersessional working group could be established. Furthermore, it agreed that the Advisory Bodies should present their thematic reports. It urged that the Committee not go to China and have an open discussion without a working group -- not an intersessional group but a group established at the beginning of the session in China. Two, three or four days later there could then be a short

discussion, instead of saying "give enough time", because we don't know what is "enough".

8. The Delegation of **Greece** said that it appreciated the experience of the week's working group just concluded, even though it was very short. It definitely supported an intersessional working group, but it asked whether the Advisory Bodies could offer their material a bit earlier to the working group so that there would be better results at the session in China.

9. The Delegation of **Lebanon** was first of all of the opinion that it would be pointless to form an intersessional working group if the documents were not obtained. It added that if there was nothing to enable it to make a judgment, it would be better to have all the elements to render these debates less political and more technical and therefore to make them less impassioned. It then indicated that the acceptable limit was 30 sites for inscription, in the light of the volume of work of this session. It insisted on the fact that the Committee was not a rubber stamping chamber, that many experts worked and that processing more than thirty nomination dossiers would not allow for quality work. It concluded by saying that it was necessary to let some time go by, the World Heritage sites having existed long before us, they will still be there after us.

10. The Delegation of **India** supported all of the suggestions of the Delegation of China.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its astonishment at the fact that certain States Parties were going back on the decision taken by the Committee. It added on behalf of the States Parties who meticulously prepared each session, that it would be impossible for them to examine more nominations than those submitted to the Committee at this session. Finally, it said it would like this debate to deal with representivity and not with the forming of an inter-sessional working group, which could only operate once all the statistics and studies had been obtained.

12. The observations of the Delegation of **Thailand** were on two main points: First, it did not think that the intersessional working group would serve the Committee's purpose, that it would be effective, or be of much help if it were done on the basis being discussed in this session. As a result, it disagreed with the proposal. Secondly, on the questioning of fixing the ceiling at a specific number, any number would be an arbitrary choice. But the Committee must take into consideration the workload before the Committee, the work involved in the World Heritage Centre, secondly the Advisory Bodies, the capability of doing that processing, visiting the properties, writing up and the question also involves financial support. So the Committee should be not fixing any number. But to give up the ceiling entirely was also questionable. So the Committee should rely on the effective work to be done by the Centre and by the Advisory Bodies. In this respect,

taking into consideration the resources involved in assessing and reporting to the Committee for consideration at each Committee session, the Delegation asked the Director of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to assist the Committee by providing figures on approximately how many of them it could handle, taking into consideration the expenses involved in all aspects of processing the nominations.

13. The **Chairperson** explained that the information was contained in the working document (*WHC-03/27.COM/10*) already presented to the Committee. She believed further that it was on that basis that the Centre on the first page of the document in the Draft Decision proposed a figure above 30.

14. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the figures presented were not actually a proposal but rather an assessment of the maximum capacity of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, prepared with the assistance of the Advisory Bodies. He reminded the Committee that the uppermost limit proposed was 20 for natural properties and 40 for cultural properties.

15. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked if that included the nominations of mixed sites or not.

16. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that mixed sites were included in this figure.

17. The Delegation of **Argentina**, stated that while there was nothing wrong with an intersessional working group, it could only be held under three conditions:

(i) that all the necessary documents be available for discussion;

(ii) that because of the importance of the question, everyone needed to participate and therefore the intersessional working group must be open; and

(iii) that the representatives from less-developed countries, who have a substantial interest in the Decision, should have financial assistance to be able to participate.

18. The **Chairperson** replied by observing that she thought that Hungary's proposal was intended to include all States Parties, and not just the members of the Committee, which was why the Coordinator had proposed that all reactions be submitted in writing. She asked the Hungarian delegation whether this was correct.

19. The Delegation of **Hungary** responded by making two points: First, any proposed ceiling would be artificial. But it should also be realistic. If the Committee concludes that 60 is the total number it should review, then it must keep ceiling of new nominations between 30 and 40, considering the extensions, deferred and referred nominations. The Delegation's second point concerned the

working group. Considering the point raised by Argentina, and the large number of countries expected to participate, such a working group would not in fact be a working group, but an Extraordinary Meeting.

20. The Delegation of **Mexico** supported entirely the Delegation of **Lebanon**. The documents must be read thoroughly. There should also be a ceiling so that the Committee could work properly. It also agreed with **Belgium**. While it had already agreed to wait, it would be perfectly happy to have a working group, as long as the necessary documents were available. As **Argentina** had noted, the working group could only be open ended.

21. The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that the Committee had spent quite some time on this issue and that it was time to come to a decision. But, agreeing with the delegate of **Belgium**, it thought that the Committee had already agreed on this issue. The Delegation wholly supported the submission of written comments to the Secretariat before the end of December. By doing so the Committee will be better able to come to a more concrete decision. It was increasingly apparent that the question of 30 properties a year was not actually about representativity, but more about lack of capacity -- the workload for the Centre, Committee members, and Advisory Bodies.

22. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** indicated that the debate had been going on for more than 20 minutes and that, since this was a fundamental and considerable question, it requested permission to circulate a document. It reasserted that the *Convention* was a formidable instrument of international cooperation and peace, knowledge of other peoples, and of their cultural wealth. But the *Convention* should not limit that instrument of peace and mortify it, for it was necessary to return to the substance of things. At Cairns, an imbalance was observed and it was not a matter of taking into account the requests of over-represented countries, but those of under-represented countries. It said that it wished to start putting into place concrete measures such as twinning, transboundary sites, etc. immediately and to reflect on other measures. It urged the participants to continue the work and to accelerate it instead of being reticent about the ceiling on the number of nominations. It wished to know the date when the statistics will be available so that the working group can examine them and so that next year, in **China**, the Centre can circulate a month in advance the documents containing a concrete and effective evaluation in order to allow a return to balance. It said that the document circulated included 11 concrete proposals committing its country to helping the under-represented countries. It concluded by saying that the re-balancing should not be a struggle between under- and over-represented countries.

23. The Observer Delegation of **Germany**, reflecting on the discussion to that point, thought that the majority of speakers supported the proposal of the formation of a

working group at the beginning of the next session. It would accept and support this course. Recalling the statements of earlier delegations on the importance of this issue, he urged that the basic documents be made available to all States Parties of the *Convention*, and not only to Committee members, in ample time before the next session. In addition, however, he reminded the Committee that many Federal states need considerable time to reach a decision on the appropriate course of action. Therefore, the documents should be available 3-4 months before the next session in order to adequately examine the matter in detail. While acknowledging the complexity of the issues, the Delegation thought that much of the statistical data that should be available to the World Heritage Centre could be made available to the Committee in ample time before the session.

24. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** supported the Draft Decision in the working document with two additions and one change. The two additions would be to support the United Kingdom proposal concerning the working group, that it could not function until the documentation had been distributed. Secondly, recalling the Hungarian proposal for written submissions, it saw this as an opportunity for States Parties to have time to consider the issue carefully before submitting their views. In the meantime, especially considering the 75 nominations in the pipeline right now, in addition perhaps to 10 further deferrals and another 5-10 extensions, the Observer Delegation of Canada thought that the Committee should have a ceiling. The Delegation agreed with the delegate from Hungary that 60 would be too high a number considering the additional deferrals, referrals and extensions. The Delegation thought that the Committee should consider a figure more like 40-45. With the Committee's current ceiling of 30, it had received 45 nomination files. Of these, only 40 were discussed, and still it took up a substantial portion of the Committee's week.

25. The Observer Delegation of **France** expressed its concern at seeing the ceiling removed. It indicated that this session had had more than 40 nomination dossiers and that if that were to increase in the future, neither the Committee nor the Centre would be able to cope with that workload, without counting that the next UNESCO (32C/5) programme and budget did not provide for any job creations at the Centre. It wished to recall that Article VII of the *Convention* assimilated the protection of heritage with the implementation of cooperation and assistance and that consequently, there would be a balance to be maintained between new inscriptions, monitoring and strategic reflection. It concluded by saying that this *Convention* was one of the great successes of UNESCO and that it must not be endangered in this way.

26. **IUCN** strongly supported the statements made by the Belgium, Thailand and Canada, and particularly those concerning the relationship between the Cairns Decision and the overload of the Advisory Bodies, the Centre, and

the time of the Committee discussion. The document that the Committee had in front of it recommends that approximately 20 minutes should have been spent discussing each nomination. However, an hour was spent discussing at least two of the properties presented, properties that were absolutely clear in the documentation. Secondly, the IUCN spokesperson thought that the rationale of the Cairns Decision in relation to the number of properties should be still maintained because it was linked to the *Operational Guidelines*. If the *Operational Guidelines* is approved, and if the deadlines and criteria for completeness are strictly followed, IUCN believes that it is most unlikely that the number of properties approved for evaluation every year will be over 30. Furthermore, IUCN believes that concerning the maximum number of 20 property evaluations it said it could examine, this figure represented absolutely the maximum number of properties, including deferred nominations and extensions. So as a result, there is fact not much room for new properties. Of course, this figure is tightly linked to budget and time resources: at some point, if we go over this limit in the future, the Committee may be forced into a position of having to determine which properties should be evaluated and which should not be evaluated. And this is going to be hard decision for the Committee. In conclusion the IUCN spokesperson reminded the Committee that its own first draft of its analysis of the Tentative List was distributed in Budapest (document *WHC-02/CONF.202/9*), and it already provided some indication of the under-represented biomes. A more detailed revised version of this document was in preparation, but all States Parties should have the draft already distributed.³

27. **ICOMOS**, noting that ICOMOS was already evaluating 35 nominations for 2004 including deferrals and extensions, said that the present ceiling of 30 was already only a "virtual" ceiling. He assured the Committee that its own analysis of the List and Tentative Lists would be submitted to the Secretariat at the beginning of January, without compromising its quality. That should allow sufficient time to distribute it to all States Parties.

28. The **Chairperson** summarized the debate from all the interventions. It was her understanding that no one objected to the decision presented in the draft document. The only problem with the decision was that there was no consensus on the overall ceiling. Consensus was also evident on the fact that it was not possible to review the Cairns Decision without all the documents, statistics requested by India, Belgium and others. Furthermore, as the Delegation of Hungary had noted, it was also important to have the reports of work done before, representing an important element of the Committee's institutional memory. The working group on Representivity of the World Heritage List, initiated at the Committee's session in Morocco, worked for a year on this issue. The Committee should not jump into the future

³ On the web at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2002/whc-02-conf202-9e.pdf>

without at least having a look at what has been done before. Thirdly, there was consensus on the need for a working group to examine the documentation. However, while all speakers agreed that the working group cannot work before the documentation is ready, several speakers wished the working group to be established now and start working now; and other speakers wanted the working group to start work at the beginning of the 28th session of the Committee in China.

29. The **Chairperson** noted that there had been no objection to the proposal by Hungary to ask all State Parties to comment in writing on this issue. Furthermore, the establishment of any working group must take into consideration the financial implications: is there a budget for such an activity?

30. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** called the attention of the Committee to the time necessary to translate and distribute the Advisory Body analyses. It did not seem possible that there would be enough time for an intersessional working group.

40. The **Chairperson** replied that by moving step by step this would be answered. Concerning the document currently in front of the Committee (*WHC-03/27.COM/14*), the Chairperson understood that everyone is in agreement with the Draft Decision. The only question to resolve was the ceiling, which she agreed was currently only a "virtual" ceiling. The Chairperson proposed that the Committee adopt a ceiling of 40. The Committee then adopted paragraphs one, two and three of the Draft Decision without objection. Several States spoke concerning the ceiling in paragraph four.

41. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the proposal of the Chairperson to have the ceiling as 40.

42. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked if this concerned all the nominations examined by the Committee.

43. The **Chairperson** indicated that this was not the case.

44. The Delegation of **Belgium** asserted that this was totally unrealistic.

45. The **Chairperson** indicated that ICOMOS already had 35 nominations to examine for 2004 and that, consequently, there was no going back.

46. The Delegation of Lebanon wished to know if the figure of the 35 included the deferred nominations.

47. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** intervened to clarify the numbers being discussed. He reminded the Committee that the limits being discussed were those for 2005, not the limit for 2004, which had already passed. He noted that in fact, the number of new nominations to be examined by the Committee in 2004 had already surpassed the 30 limit that the Committee

established in Cairns, thus reiterating the "virtual" nature of this limit. The Director suggested that by establishing a higher limit, the Committee might prevent the limit from being virtual. But if there were a larger number of new nominations, such as 45, the number might still be "virtual" even with a ceiling of 40. Finally, he reminded the Committee that it was only the number of new nominations that was under discussion.

48. The Delegation of **Belgium** underlined that it was necessary to be realistic and to take as a reference the total number of nominations examined at the 27th session: the Committee could not have examined one more.

49. The Delegation of **South Africa**, wholly supported the proposal made by Belgium. But he asked whether, having accepted 35, the Centre or ICOMOS had already breached the decision, which was taken in Cairns by the Committee?

50. The **Chairperson** explained that under the terms of the Cairns Decision the Committee could review the ceiling. So decision was not being breached in any way.

51. The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that the Committee had fixed the limit at 30 nominations and that during this session, the Committee had examined 36. It therefore asserted that it wished to keep this ceiling of 30, otherwise the risk would be of saying 40 and getting 45 dossiers to examine, which would be humanly impossible. Another possibility would be to decide not to read anything more and to arrive at the Committee just to applaud. It concluded by asking that the Committee be left to work.

52. The **Director of the Centre** explained that the reason that the decision contains a proposal to eliminate the ceiling was linked to a technical problem. Currently, if the Centre receives more than 30 new and complete nominations, it does not have a tool or criteria by which to select the 30 nomination, which should be passed to the Advisory Bodies. In 2003, the Extraordinary Committee was able to take a decision on several nominations that went over the limit. But in 2004, there would be no Extraordinary Committee. So the Centre's estimate was that the ceiling was unmanageable, and it was proposed to delete the limit.

53. The Delegation of **Nigeria**, expressing its discomfort about the artificial ceiling, proposed that if there were more than 30 nominations, that they should be staggered, according to the Committee's financial capability.

54. The Delegation of **Thailand** supported the figure of 40, particularly taking into account the Director's assurance that the human and financial resources would enable the Centre to handle 40. Nevertheless, he wished to be sure that the number "40" referred to new nominations, excluding deferral and referral cases, because the number of deferral or referral nominations which may come back

to the Committee is unknown. Consequently, it was practical to fix the number at 40, if it excluded referred and deferred nominations.

55. The Delegation of **Oman** also supported the ceiling of 40 properties.

56. **The Delegation of Belgium** asked the Centre to specify how many nominations will be evaluated in 2004 and 2005, including those deferred at this session.

57. **The Director of the Centre** pointed out that the calculation could only be done for 2004, as 2005 was not yet available. The total of the nominations approved (36) and those deferred by this session can be made, giving total of about 45. However, it would be necessary to take account of transboundary and emergency nominations, if there are any.

58. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the proposed limit of 40.

59. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** also supported 40, noting that it was not possible to find an ideal number at the present time.

60. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** said that it was not an accountant and was finding it difficult to get into this debate, whilst respecting the points of view of the members of the Committee. It expressed the fact that it was not because the increase in resources was impossible at the moment that we had not to work comfortably. It proposed that the States Parties give themselves the means to change for the better and not for the worse and the possibility of working without having to do overtime.

61. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** asked if Chairperson's proposal cancelled the discussion.

62. **The Chairperson**, noting no opposition to the proposed amendment of paragraph four of the Draft Decision to change the limit to 40, declared the limit adopted. There being no objections to paragraph five of the Draft Decision, it also was adopted. The Chairperson also observed that there was consensus on the request that all States Parties should submit comments in writing by the end of 2003 on this issue and declared the point adopted.

63. Concerning the timetable for a possible working group, **the Director of the World Heritage Centre** intervened to inform the Committee concerning the feasibility of an intersessional working group. He indicated that the Centre should be able to translate the ICOMOS analysis and distribute it to the working group within a month of its delivery in January. He added that financial support for less-developed States Parties to be able to participate in such a meeting was also possible since the Committee had just approved a reserve of some

US\$ 50,000 in addition to an additional US\$ 90,000 from the regular program to support such activities.

64. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, while appreciating the advice of the Director, stressed that there was insufficient time for many States Parties to consider such a report carefully, considering the many consultations that would be required. Those countries with Federal structures would require even more time. "The reality is," the Delegation said, "that we cannot do anything before the next session with papers not distributed until February at the earliest."

65. The Delegation of **Thailand** agreed with the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It was not practical to meet before the 28th session of the Committee.

66. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the delegations of the United Kingdom and Thailand.

67. **The Chairperson**, noting also the agreement of Lebanon, then proposed that a working group be created at the beginning of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in China. All documents necessary for this work would be prepared and distributed a few months before the session in China.

68. The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that the composition of the working group be the same as that which met in the current session so that they might consider the documents in advance of the meeting, thus spending less time during the 28th session in order to reach a conclusion..

69. **The Chairperson** recalled that as the composition of the 28th session of the Committee was not yet known, it might be that some members of the current working group would not be members of the Committee in China. But it should not be a problem on the first day in China to immediately create a working group. While such a group could include the same countries who were in it during the 27th session and were still in the Committee a year later, the Chairperson reminded the Committee that the working group's composition would be open to observers, as the Committee always worked, and as proposed by Argentina.

70. The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed, but simply wished to make sure that the working group members were aware of the documents before they come to China.

71. **The Chairperson** agreed that it should not be a problem.

72. The Delegation of **Thailand** requested that the question of appointing a working group be left until the Committee met in China, rather than appointing it at the current session

73. The **Chairperson** explained that the composition of the working group would only be decided in China. The current discussion was only to reach consensus that a working group should be set up in China on the first day to give it time to work.

74. The Observer Delegation of **Morocco** made a proposal in order to bring this debate to a conclusion: a "Committee of Wise men", made up of personalities with long experience of the *Convention*, could be set up.

75. The Delegation of **Mexico**, noting that an hour had already been spent on the point, asked that a new discussion not be opened on whether to appoint a *Committee des Sages*.

76. The Delegation of **Argentina**, supported the point of order raised by Mexico. The question was too important to leave to a restricted committee.

77. The **Chairperson** thanked the speakers, announced that discussion was closed on the subject, and that the decision as proposed, to establish a working group at the opening of the 28th session was adopted.

78. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 14** as amended.

18 PREPARATION FOR THE 14TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

18A NEW VOTING MECHANISM AND REVISION TO THE PROCEDURES FOR THE ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/18A

1. The **Chairperson** opened the item for discussion following the structure of the working document (*WHC-03/27.COM/18A*).

2. On Section I (Procedures for the elections of the Officers of the General Assembly), the Delegation of **Belgium** stated that no decision was required from the Committee. The Secretariat should implement the Resolution adopted by the 13th General Assembly on this matter.

3. The **Secretariat** remarked that the objective of the Draft Decision was not only to implement the General Assembly Resolution, but also to put in place a procedure for the presentation of candidatures for Officers of the General Assembly.

4. The **Chairperson** explained that on previous occasions not all States Parties were informed of the proposed candidate for Chairperson of the General

Assembly. She stressed that having information on the candidates before the election had positive effects.

5. The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested that the Committee should take note of this Decision and that it should be implemented.

6. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed that paragraph 2 of the Decision be modified so as to include an explanation of the procedure.

7. The Chairperson agreed with this proposal and the Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 18 A.1**.

8. On Section II (Procedures for the presentation of candidatures to the World Heritage Committee) the **Chairperson** stated that this Decision was very clear and should not require much discussion.

9. The Delegation of **Belgium** commented that it was an excellent initiative and suggested that a last paragraph be added to the Decision so that this procedure be included in the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly. This would allow all States Parties to become familiar with the procedures.

10. The **Chairperson** agreed with this suggestion.

11. The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed that the words "and regional representativity" be added after the word "transparency" in paragraph 1 of the Decision.

12. The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** asked the Secretariat to inform them of the deadlines existing in the *Rules of Procedure* of other UNESCO organs regarding the date when the list of candidatures should be finalised.

13. The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the deadline present in the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Conference for the election of the members of the Executive Board was also of 48 hours (Rule 3, Appendix 2 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Conference).

14. The Chairperson then declared Decision **27 COM 18A.2** adopted.

15. On Section III (Election to the World Heritage Committee of a State Party not having any properties on the World Heritage List, Reserved Seat), the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for clarification on the Draft Decision. It asked whether allocating another reserved seat of the Committee to a State Party without properties on the World Heritage List would mean that two members of the Committee would be State Parties without properties on the World Heritage List. Would this Decision overrule the Decision taken by the Committee in Cairns in 2000?

16. The Delegation of **Lebanon** stated that the Draft Decision presented in the working document only repeated

the Decision taken at Cairns, i.e. allocating one seat of the Committee to a State Party without properties on the World Heritage List.

17. The Delegation of **Thailand** asked whether the Committee would consider deleting the last sentence of Rule 13.1 which reads "Unsuccessful candidates in the reserved ballot would be eligible to stand in open ballot".

18. The **Chairperson** pointed out that being elected to the Committee as a candidate for the reserved seat could be even more difficult than running as a "normal" candidate.

19. The **Secretariat** then commented on some of the remarks made by the Delegations. On the comment made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom regarding the Cairns Decision, it stated that when the Secretariat prepared the Draft Decision **27 COM 18A.3**, it took into consideration the deliberations of the working group on the equitable representation in the World Heritage Committee (1999-2000) and the Resolution of the 13th General Assembly in 2001. If the Committee were to adopt this Draft Decision then the number of allocated reserved seats would accumulate and become two.

20. On the point made by the Delegation of **Thailand**, the Secretariat stated that a discussion on the revision of the current *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly would be necessary, and that only the General Assembly would be able to revise these.

21. The **Chairperson** reinforced the last remark of the Secretariat and asked whether the Committee wished to make any recommendations to the General Assembly on the revision of its *Rules of Procedure*. No comments were made following this suggestion.

22. The Chairperson then declared Decision **27 COM 18A.3** adopted.

23. On Section IV (New voting mechanism and revision to the procedures for the election of the members of the World Heritage Committee), the **Chairperson** commented that previous consultation amongst countries prior to the General Assembly (see paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision) was not always possible, in particular for smaller countries. She stated that the current system for the election of Committee members allowed for geographical representation.

24. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** remarked that the system proposed in the working document, although intended to improve the geographical distribution of the Committee, might obtain the reverse effect. Keeping the current system would be a better solution.

25. The Delegation of **South Africa** stressed that when discussing this matter the representativity of the Committee should be considered.

26. The Delegation of **Belgium** considered this issue a very important and delicate matter. The results of the different working groups that have already discussed these issues should also be taken into consideration. It continued by saying that it had been acknowledged that there was not enough rotation among Committee members and that the regional representativity of the Committee had to be improved. The voluntary reduction in the term of office of Committee members (from 6 to 4 years) had been created by the General Assembly to improve this situation.

27. The Delegation of **Belgium** expressed its intention to complete its term of office as Committee member at the forthcoming session of the General Conference (i.e. thus voluntarily reducing its mandate from six to four years). This would mean that the 14th General Assembly of States Parties would have to elect eight new Committee members rather than seven.

28. On the revision to the procedures for the election of members of the World Heritage Committee, the Delegation of **Belgium** agreed with the comments made by the United Kingdom leaving the current procedures in place.

29. The **Chairperson** then proposed that no changes be made to the current *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee regarding the new voting mechanism and the procedures for the election of the members of the Committee.

30. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 18A.4**.

31. When the Decisions were adopted, it was decided that the list of candidatures received for the elections will be updated until 48 hours before the opening of the session of the General Assembly.

18B REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE TO BE PRESENTED TO THE 32ND GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO (29 September - 17 October 2003)

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/18B

1. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether the working document *WHC-03/27.COM/18B* could be noted by the Committee.

2. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 18 B.**, noting the relevant document.

12 INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/12
WHC-03/27.COM/12.Corr.
WHC-03/27.COM/12.Corr.1*

Meeting of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 4 July 2003

1. The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee met to discuss the International Assistance requests prior to the resumption of the Plenary session. The Chairperson then opened the floor for debates on request N° 1 from Hungary for the organisation of a workshop for the managers of World Heritage Sites in Central and Eastern Europe. The request was supported by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Argentina who observed that in future, whenever a training component was included in a request, ICCROM should be consulted for advice. The request was approved.

2. The **Chairperson** then opened the floor for discussion of request N° 2 from Kenya for the Second International Experts Meeting on Great Rift Valley. IUCN, the Delegation of the United Kingdom, with the support from the Delegation of South Africa, and the Chairperson questioned the inclusion in the request's budget of UNESCO Staff costs. The Secretariat explained that these were only mission costs that had been budgeted as the Great Rift Valley project was carried out jointly with UNESCO's Science Sector. IUCN stated that the budget needed to be reviewed to eliminate any superfluous spending.

3. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported request N° 2 but was of the opinion that it was not to be considered Preparatory Assistance. IUCN, on the contrary, supported the request as a Preparatory Assistance request. The **Secretariat** indicated that in some cases requests are multi-category and for practical purposes they are shown only under one category. The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the view expressed by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. The latter added that the request presented with only objectives 3 and 4 could be considered as a Preparatory Assistance request. The Secretariat agreed to delete objectives 1 and 2.

4. The Delegation of **Oman** stated that, speaking on behalf of the Arab group of nine countries involved in the request N° 2 project, it would be opportune to postpone examination of the request until the 28th session of the Committee. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** recommended approval of the request and pointed out that both the United Nations Foundation and the World Bank had shown support for the project. The **Secretariat** remarked that the request could be envisaged in a stepped manner if the nine Arab group countries did not feel ready to start now with the project. The stepped implementation of the request was also suggested by the Delegation of Nigeria. The Delegation of **Oman** requested that it be allowed to consult with the other Arab group countries before a position could be reached and expressed in plenary session.

5. The **Chairperson** decided to defer approval of the request until it is re-drafted and re-budgeted bearing in mind that it should be implemented in a stepped manner.

6. The **Chairperson** then opened the debate on request N° 3 from India for the elaboration of a management plan for Hampi (inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger). This request was supported by the Delegation of Oman. The Delegation of Argentina questioned the fact that the 27th Committee was asked to approve an amount of US\$ 43,750 included in the request's budget in advance on the 2004-2005 World Heritage budget. The Secretariat explained that due to its phased nature, this request was structured in two periods and added that, while it was not customary to submit to the Committee requests for future financial periods, this was necessary in some cases. ICCROM agreed in this particular instance with the phased approach for this request. The request was approved.

7. The **Chairperson** turned to request N° 4 from Yemen for follow-up actions for the implementation of safeguarding measures for the Historic Town of Zabid (inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger) and noting that consensus had been reached, declared that it was approved.

8. **ICCROM** then presented request N° 5 from Kazakhstan for a sub-regional workshop for the preparation of Periodic Reports on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and the state of conservation of World Heritage Cultural properties in Central Asia. The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked whether the requested amounts were determined from the number of participants to a workshop or vice-versa. The **Secretariat** clarified this point and that the funds granted under International Assistance were usually seed-money to be supplemented with contributions from States Parties. The request was then unanimously approved.

9. The **Secretariat** then presented request N° 6 from Oman for capacity building for the staff and rangers to manage the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (AOS) which was supported by IUCN. The Delegation of **China** also supported the request but observed that the relation of previous International Assistance granted for this property was presented in a manner that made it appear larger than in reality and, therefore, should be re-drafted.

10. The **Secretariat** then presented request N° 7 from Uzbekistan for a sub-regional workshop for the elaboration of a specific programme for the first 3 years of the Central Asian Earth 2002-2012 Programme combined with an on-the-job practical training activity at Khiva World Heritage property. **ICCROM** supported the request and asked explanations on the UNESCO staff costs in the budget. The **Secretariat** mentioned that in general terms the World Heritage Centre's mission budget was limited and hence it was necessary in some instances to find funding from other sources.

11. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that the request's objectives appeared to be of a mixed nature and that there could be some overlapping with those stated in request N°5. **ICOMOS** disagreed with this opinion. The **Chairperson** proposed and it was accepted to approve the request subject to checking that there was no overlapping with request N° 5.

12. **ICCROM** presented request N° 8 from Bangladesh for conservation training and organization of a workshop to elaborate a management plan for the Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur World Heritage property and remarked that it required reformulation. The Bureau agreed and the request was approved under the condition that it be correctly reformulated.

13. The **Secretariat** presented then request N° 9 from Iraq and explained that this request concerned technical assistance for the preparation of an emergency action plan for the ancient city of Ashur, that the Committee had just inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. **ICOMOS** supported the request but questioned the inclusion of equipment to be purchased, as since the end of the war in Iraq foreign exchange had been re-established. The **Secretariat** explained that it thought that the provision of equipment foreseen by the request should be maintained since equipment was even more necessary after the war. The request was unanimously approved.

14. The Delegation of **Argentina** observed that the examination of International Assistance requests needed more time in the future and requested information from the Secretariat on the available balances of International Assistance and further observed that the unbalanced distribution between cultural and natural properties should be redressed.

15. The **Chairperson** concluded the meeting mentioning that a serious evaluation of International Assistance was necessary.

Resumption of the World Heritage Committee Session

16. The morning's Bureau recommendations were submitted to the Committee's plenary session for formal adoption.

17. The Decision **27 COM 12.1** concerning request N° 1 (Hungary - Organisation of a workshop for the managers of World Heritage Sites in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe) was adopted by the Committee.

18. The Draft Decision for request N° 2 (Kenya - Second International Experts Meeting on Great Rift Valley) was extensively debated. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported by the Delegations of **Oman, Lebanon, Portugal** and **Mexico** as well as the Observer Delegation of **Palestine Territories** argued that time was necessary to study this

project and that the request's examination should be postponed until the next Committee session in China.

19. The Delegations of **Nigeria, United Kingdom** and **Hungary** and the **IUCN** supported the request and advocated a phased approach for the implementation of the project.

20. The Delegation of **China** supported by the Delegation of **Zimbabwe** suggested that this matter should be resolved in a consensus building approach. The Delegation of **Thailand** suggested that the matter could be settled amongst the stakeholders parties in the project. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Delegation of China to adopt a consensus building approach but remarked that a phased project implementation approach may be difficult if countries involved did not interact. The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** stated that Kenya was strongly committed to this dialogue initiating project and pleaded for its immediate adoption. The Observer Delegation of Israel supported the request.

21. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported by the Delegation of **South Africa** and **ICOMOS** suggested that the nominations of the properties included in the Great Rift Valley be made individually by interested countries in a first step with trans-boundary integration at a later stage.

22. The **Secretariat** explained that it had recommended this request for approval as it conformed to the strategy set out by the Committee but that the project could be implemented in a phased approach.

23. The **Chairperson** observed that no consensus on this request had been obtained and proposed that it be postponed for examination until the next Committee meeting in China. This proposal was supported by the Delegation of Thailand and with the Delegation of Nigeria placing on record its disagreement. The Chairperson's proposal was adopted (see Decision **27 COM 12.2**).

24. Upon the recommendation of the Bureau, the Committee adopted Decisions **27 COM 12.3; 27 COM 12.4; 27 COM 12.5; 27 COM 12.6; 27 COM 12.7; 27 COM 12.8; and 27 COM 12.9.**

10 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/4
WHC-03/27.COM/10*

1. The Chairperson opened the agenda item for discussion.

2. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the objective should be to seek to finalize the revised

Operational Guidelines. It said that if the Committee were not careful the revisions would become out of date. It therefore suggested a procedure to take forward this important piece of work. It suggested that Committee members have the chance to provide written comments by 15 October 2003. The Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies would then consider whether or not the comments complied with the policy decisions of the Committee. The Secretariat would then finalize the revisions by 1 February to allow sufficient time for them to take effect by the 28th session of the Committee in Suzhou, China.

3. The Delegations of **Hungary, Portugal, Argentina, Finland** and **Saint Lucia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

4. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, emphasizing the importance of each of the stages in this proposal. It also noted that certain elements of the revised draft *Operational Guidelines* were already in use – for example, the procedures concerning the receipt by the Advisory Bodies of supplementary information during the process of evaluation of the evaluation proposals and the draft nominations.

5. The Observer Delegation of **Canada** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom and also noted that the draft revised *Guidelines* were already being used.

6. The representative of **IUCN** warmly welcomed the proposal to finalize the revised *Guidelines* prior to the 28th session of the Committee in Suzhou.

7. The Delegation of **Belgium** emphasized the need to move towards implementing the revised *Guidelines* as soon as possible.

8. The **Chairperson** welcomed the consensus of the Committee and asked the Secretariat to prepare the Decision of the Committee accordingly.

9. When the Decisions were adopted, it was decided that the revised *Operational Guidelines* would come into force on 1st March 2004.

10. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 10**.

22 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 28TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/22

1. The item was briefly opened to decide on the venue and date of the 28th session of the Committee.

2. The **Secretariat** presented Draft Decisions **27 COM 22.1** and **27 COM 22.2** to the Committee.

3. The **Chairperson** suggested that when determining the dates of the 28th session of the Committee certain flexibility be given to the host State Party.

4. The Committee decided that the venue of the 28th session of the Committee would be Suzhou, China, and adopted Decision **27 COM 22.2** by acclamation.

5. The **Chairperson** noted that the consultations between the Chinese and South African authorities had taken place to co-ordinate their respective invitations to host Committee sessions and thanked them for their co-operation and understanding.

6. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented that the dates proposed for the 28th session of the Committee in the Draft Decision extend for almost a fortnight and such a long period should be duly considered by the Committee.

7. The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, in particular with regard to the co-ordination between the duration of the 28th session and the number of agenda items to be discussed. It was emphasized that leeway should be given to the national authorities when deciding on the dates for the 28th session of the Committee.

8. The Delegation of **South Africa** recalled that it had expressed its intention to host the 28th session of the Committee (June 2004) in Helsinki (25th extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee). However, the Government of South Africa fully supported the invitation extended by the Chinese authorities to host the 28th session of the Committee in 2004. The Delegation of South Africa then offered to host the 29th session of the Committee (June 2005). This would be the first time the World Heritage Committee would be held in Sub-Saharan Africa and would provide an opportunity to showcase World Heritage in Africa.

9. The Delegation of **China** thanked the Chairperson and the members of the Committee for their understanding and conveyed its heartfelt gratitude to the Government of South Africa.

10. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** accepted the Agenda as proposed, but expressed concern about the proposed extended duration of the 28th session of the Committee in Decision **27 COM 22.2**. Having been the first State Party to raise the question about the length of the meeting, it acknowledged that the standard meeting time might not be appropriate. Its understanding was that the Committee would meet within the time period which had been suggested (29 June to 10 July 2004). As the quantity of work would not permit long presentations, it was suggested that presentations (with translations, etc) take place during lunch times or, if sensible hours are worked, in the early evenings.

11. The Delegation of **Belgium** supported the remarks made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It noted that Item 12 should be included in the part of the agenda devoted to administration and the budget, partnerships not only concerning questions of communication, but also programme elements. The Delegation of Belgium recalled that requests concerning the authorization of the emblem, in particular requests concerning major events, should feature in the part devoted to communication, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at Budapest (**26 COM 8.1**).

12. The Delegation of Belgium also remarked that Item 5 should be changed to "Report of the Centre on the activities and the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee". Concerning the Periodic Reports for the Latin America region, the Delegation of Belgium underlined that this was a subject of of general interest not just concerning the credibility of the List and that it would have to be placed under general questions and that this item would have to be linked to a regional programme as had been the case for the other regions. Finally, the Delegation noted that Items 8B and 8C should be swapped round in order to begin by examining capacity building and then study the Cairns Decision.

13. The Delegation of **Argentina** referred to the inclusion of subtitles in the provisional agenda. In the view of this delegation, such subtitles could lead to confusion; consequently, it proposed their deletion. As an example he referred to the "partnership initiative" as not only an issue for Communication but also for Conservation.

14. The Delegation of **Argentina**, following the Delegation of Belgium, considered the Periodic Reporting exercise for Latin America and Caribbean not only as an issue on the Credibility of the List but also as a Conservation, Capacity building and Communication problem.

15. It also highlighted that international assistance requests are essentially made for purposes of conservation, capacity-building and preparations of nominations to the World Heritage List. Therefore, such issues could not be reduced to simple administrative matters, as their inclusion under the subtitle suggested.

16. Furthermore, it indicated that the partnership issue needed to be dealt with a more attentive way than as a simple progress report. He suggested discussing this matter during an entire afternoon concluding the discussions with some presentations, as it is done in the International Oceanographic Commission.

17. Regarding the length of the meeting, the Delegation of Argentina agreed with the Committee and it proposed a period of at least four days to discuss state of conservation and nominations.

18. The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the comment of Belgium concerning the necessary inversion of Items 8B and 8A.

19. Noting that the Committee agreed to this, the **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Argentina to delete the subtitles.

20. The **Chairperson** highlighted that the Committee had to be credible and should not give contradictory instructions to the Secretariat, as it had requested the Secretariat to prepare an agenda with the four headings (four "Cs"). The Chairperson requested the Committee to take a decision whether the agenda should follow these four headings or whether it should keep the subtitles and change the place of the items, if they were considered not to be in the right place.

21. The Delegation of **Argentina** highlighted that there was no contradiction. The Committee had requested the Secretariat to follow the four headings, so that the agenda items would follow exactly the ideas of these four headings, without having subtitles that do not correspond to the context. It insisted, once more, to delete the subtitles.

22. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it was agreeable to delete the subtitles.

23. The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the importance of the subtitles in organising the timetable of the session as one could not work under one main heading for three days without having sub-parts. However, it agreed with the Delegation of Argentina that the four headings do not need to be on the agenda as one unit.

24. The **Chairperson** expressed the hope that not the entire Committee would take the floor to discuss the subtitles. The problem noted by the Delegation of Argentina was that some items fitted under more than one subtitle.

25. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the items themselves had to be discussed. It acknowledged the importance of the four headings and suggested to have a vote.

26. The **Chairperson** did not agree to the proposal of having a vote and suggested to delete the subtitles, requesting the Secretariat to redraft the agenda following the four headings without having strict subtitles. She asked the Committee whether it agreed and then asked for a decision to be adopted.

27. The Chairperson then suggested to discuss the length of the meeting very rapidly and requested the Secretariat to present the dates proposed by the Chinese authorities.

28. The **Director of World Heritage Centre** recalled that the 28th session Committee had originally been planned to start on Tuesday and had been moved back to Monday (29 June to 10 July 2004).

29. The Director of the Centre indicated that the next Committee session should last eight to nine days and suggested to have a one-day break after the fourth working day. The session should therefore start on the Sunday 28 June 2004 or Monday 29 June 2004, depending on the Chinese authorities and continue until Tuesday or Wednesday of the following week. He highlighted that this timeframe is the minimum possible.

30. The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee to allow adequate time for preparing and reporting, as neither the Rapporteur nor the Secretariat could prepare the Draft Decisions over night.

31. The Delegation of **Belgium** indicated that this meeting had begun and finished with the same observation. It recalled that, in the past, the Committee used to leave a full day to the Secretariat and the Rapporteur to finalize the report. It recommended going back to that system.

32. The **Chairperson** proposed to use this session's method consisting of opening an item on the agenda, creating a working group and concluding at the end. She sought the approval of the Committee on the points raised by the Delegation of Belgium.

33. The Chairperson noted that everyone agreed on this. Before concluding the session, the Chairperson requested that dates be proposed for the 28th session of the Committee.

34. The **Director of the Centre** responded that the Committee should start on Monday 29 June 2004, allowing the weekend for travelling and last until Wednesday of the following week, 8 July 2004. The Chinese authorities had expressed the wish to hold the Committee session earlier in June 2004 before the rainy season, however the choice of late June, early July was due to the already determined school calendar in many countries.

35. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that early June would put a lot of pressure on the Secretariat, as the working documents would have to be prepared much earlier.

36. The Committee adopted the dates for its 28th session (Decision **27 COM 22.2**)⁴ by applause.

⁴ Following discussion with the Chinese authorities, it was agreed to change the dates to 28 June-7 July 2004.

13 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY

*Documents: WHC-03/27.COM/13
WHC-03/27.COM/INF.13*

1. The **Secretariat** presented document *WHC-03/27.COM/13*, drawing the attention of the Committee in particular to the summary tables, which provide information on Preparatory Assistance activities, the status of the Tentative Lists and number of new nominations, among other information that can serve as indicators for the success or failure of the Global Strategy.

2. Reference was made to many interesting initiatives by States Parties in the harmonization of their Tentative Lists at the sub-regional level or on a thematic basis, and in trans-boundary nominations of cultural itineraries. The Camino Inca Project, presented in document *WHC-03/27.COM/INF.13*, is one such example, amongst others such as the Slave Route nominations, already initiated by African States Parties; the Silk Road nominations initiated by the States Parties of Asia, and for the Great Rift Valley - the latter which has already been debated at this session under the agenda Item 12 on International Assistance.

3. The **Secretariat** indicated that the budget for Global Strategy, which had been available in previous years, is no longer available as a separate allocation due to financial constraints, and that the activities presented in the document would have to be initiated under the Regional Programmes.

4. The Delegation of **Mexico** asked if there was any regulation concerning the periodicity in the revision of the Tentative List. It also stated that cultural itineraries, presently treated under the cultural landscape category, perhaps merit its own category.

5. The **Secretariat**, referring to paragraphs 7-8 of the *Operational Guidelines*, stated that a State Party can revise its Tentative list at any time. In many cases, it is just revised to include a property being nominated, hence not permitting the Tentative List to serve its intended function.

6. The Delegation of **Belgium** stated that Global Strategy activities should meet the first of the Strategic Objectives, i.e., reinforcing the credibility of the World Heritage List and made the following proposals: for the Secretariat to make a list of activities and analyses of the results of the meetings and thematic studies carried out in the past under the Global Strategy and make them available to the States parties concerned; to link the revision of the tentative lists to the Regional Programmes as a follow-up of the Periodic Reporting Exercise.

7. The Delegation of **Mexico** added that since countries of many regions have similar properties, it is all the more important that tentative lists are used to foster co-operation.

8. The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the sense of Articles 11 and 12 of the *Convention* has undergone much change in interpretation over the years. Initially, tentative lists were not obligatory for nominations; now they are required, moreover, to be harmonized, regionally and thematically. He indicated that properties on the tentative list risk losing the outstanding universal value they may have had, due to the complicated new procedures in nomination, quotas of one nomination a year per State Party, among others. The Tentative List should perhaps be given greater importance, so that the properties on this List will be considered as having a special category of international recognition.

9. The Delegation of **Belgium** strongly supported this point of giving greater international recognition to the Tentative List.

10. **ICCROM** informed the Committee that many more activities relating to the Global Strategy are actually taking place, especially under programmes such as Africa 2009. They range from assistance for the preparation of national inventories, to training for documentation, to aid in the preparation of nomination files.

11. The Delegate of **Egypt** queried the meaning of "practical and operational activities in the Regional Programmes to enhance representativity of the List", indicated in paragraph 6 (iii) of Draft Decision **27 COM 13.3**.

12. The **Secretariat** responded that this referred to such work as legal support to revise national laws and regulations to provide for new categories of heritage being recognized by the Committee. The Secretariat stated that the recently concluded Periodic Report in the Asia-Pacific Region showed that, for example, there were very few States in Asia which had protective regulations for urban conservation, and much less so for the various types of cultural landscapes; not to mention the lack of management mechanisms or sometimes even laws to protect properties included in a serial nomination located in different administrative entities. These new categories, such as industrial heritage or modern heritage and cultural landscapes, which indeed enrich the World Heritage List, must be protected under provisions of national law and appropriate management entities.

13. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support for this and indicated that new ideas coming from scholars and university experts need to be thoroughly considered. There are cases in which the Committee takes decisions that cannot be implemented under national law.

14. The Committee adopted Decisions **27 COM 13.1** and **27 COM 13.3** as amended.

The Qhapac Nan - Camino Inca initiative

15. The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its strong support for the draft decision on the Qhapac Nan - Camino Inca Initiative. It considered that, in particular, such draft decision would promote an adequate follow up by the Committee of the process of preparation of this important transboundary nomination coordinated by the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation proposed two amendments and three comments. The proposed amendments were to include a paragraph 3bis stating that the Committee "encourages the States Parties concerned to include in their Tentative Lists properties related to Camino Inca on their territories". Further to this, it was proposed to amend paragraph 8 as follows "...that the World Heritage Centre *informs* the Committee on the progress made in the implementation of this initiative".

16. The comments delivered by the Delegation of Argentina included: (i) the use of a virtual forum of six experts through email in preparation for the meeting in Peru in October 2003; (ii) the need for a questionnaire as a needs assessment to be sent out by the Centre to the countries involved before the meeting, and (iii) a request for a statement by the Director of the World Heritage Centre concerning the financial implications of using extrabudgetary funding for Preparatory Assistance requests by States Parties. The funds needed as seed money would meet two objectives: (i) to strengthen the joint proposal for a nomination; (ii) to facilitate additional fund raising activities.

17. The **Secretariat** responded that support for the initial start-up of the project was needed, and was allocated under the Regional Programmes, and that requests by States Parties would be followed up by the Centre. This would be matched by efforts to raise additional funding, by the Centre through partnerships.

18. The Delegation of the United Kingdom requested clarification as to whether if this had any implications for the approved budget, to which the Chairperson responded that this was not the case.

19. The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Hungary** supported the proposals made by Argentina.

20. The Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 13.2** as amended.

Partnerships presentations, 5 July 2003

1. On Saturday 5 July, a short information session on Partnerships was organized by the World Heritage Centre with the intention of providing the members of the World Heritage Committee and other participants in this meeting with a number of example partnerships and projects that reflect the Centre's approach to building Partnerships.

2. A brief introduction by the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** on the strategic direction of the Partnerships Initiative was followed by a series of informal

presentations. These included interventions by Mrs K. Endresen, Director of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation entitled 'A New Network for World Heritage'; by Mr R. Wanner, UNF Senior Advisor on UNESCO issues about the UNF/UNESCO co-operation model for agreements between governments and civil society; by Mr M. Hernandez, Senior World Heritage Programme Specialist entitled 'Establishing a partnership to increase World Heritage monitoring capacity' focusing on the European Space Agency and World Heritage Centre Framework Agreement; by Mr G. Brizzi, Regional Advisor of the World Bank on Culture and Development for Middle East and North Africa Region, on World Heritage and sustainable development; and by Mr A. Addison, a World Heritage Centre Consultant on designing the World Heritage Internet site as a tool for developing new partnerships.

3. A number of interventions were made on the presentations (South Africa, Belgium, Hungary, Argentina, Saint Lucia, United Kingdom, Egypt, Portugal, Israel, UNEP – World Conservation Monitoring Centre) testifying to the importance of these partnerships and the results that they will help achieve, notably in the areas of capacity building, mapping and monitoring site conservation. Encouragement to continue in this direction was voiced by a majority of speakers. An increase in the flow of information on these and other partnerships was also encouraged. Other interventions focused on the educational value of the projects achieved through these partnerships and others still called for the need to create or reinforce links between activities such as the development of the web site and the periodic reporting exercise.

4. After a short conclusion by the **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, who intervened to respond to questions raised, a recommendation was put forward to organize a 1-day session on Partnerships in the context of the 28th Session of the World Heritage Committee in Suzhou, China.

23 OTHER BUSINESS

The World Heritage Committee did not discuss any other business.

The Delegation of Belgium asked what progress had been made with the procedure for the protection of the World Heritage emblem, the name and its derivatives (Decision **26 COM 15**).

2. The Director of the Centre informed the members of the Committee that this procedure was in progress and that the results of this initiative would be presented at the 28th session in 2004.

24 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC-03/27.COM/24

1. The draft report (List of Decisions) was submitted to the Committee on Saturday evening. Upon the request of the Chairperson, the Rapporteur invited the Committee to propose amendments if required.

2. With regard to the substantial amendments asked for by the Committee, the **Rapporteur** indicated that those discussions would be reflected in the Summary Record as suggested by the Chairperson⁵. The linguistic amendments suggested by the Delegates will be integrated in the final version of the Decisions. In addition, the Rapporteur noted that the Secretariat and herself would finalize the concordance check between the two linguistic versions of the Report and ensure coherence in linguistics, meaning, numbering, annexes etc.

3. The Chairperson declared the Report (List of Decisions) document *WHC-03/27.COM/24* adopted (**Decision 27 COM 24**).

25 CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

1. The 27th session of the World Heritage Committee was closed on 5 July 2003 by the Chairperson, Ms Vera Lacoëuilhe (Saint Lucia).

2. The **Chairperson** made a closing speech - reproduced below.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Before I officially close the 27th Session of the World Heritage Committee, I would like to say a few words.

Some of our Colleagues, Members of the Committee, will be finishing their mandate in October at the next General Assembly. Although they will certainly be coming back to contribute as observers, they are now attending their last Committee meeting.

I would like to pay tribute to:

- Zimbabwe, the most passionate member of the Committee.
- The Republic of Korea, who speaks little but speaks so well.
- Greece, this wonderful delegation of women.
- My dear friends the Mexicans.
- Thailand without whom the Committee will not be the same.
- Finland, and our dear Chairman from the Helsinki session. The wisest man of the Committee.
- Hungary and our Chairman from the Budapest session who is always smiling and calm whatever happens.

⁵ For a better understanding of the final Decisions, those discussions are integrated at the end of the relevant agenda item.

- And finally Belgium whom we should thank for voluntarily withdrawing after four years although the rule did not exist when they were elected.

A special mention to Benedicte Selfslagh who carried us through the change of the format of the report with such "brio-."

The other thing I would like to tell the Committee is that when you sit on this side of the room, you see things more clearly! What is crystal clear to me now, is that the state of conservation of the sites is a heavy responsibility that lies to a great extent on the shoulders of the Committee.

I will give you two examples from this session, a failure and a success story.

- The failure story is the Katmandu Valley whose universal value might have been lost, in great part because the Committee failed to take the right decision at the right time.
- The success story is Vienna which is saved from a project of high rise buildings because the Committee reacted quickly and courageously. We should be careful with our decision they can lead to heavy consequences.

We have been through a very difficult week together. We had the longest working hours even from Monday to Saturday.

This was possible thanks to your efficiency, self discipline and your imaginative way of carrying the work forward. We were finally able to finish all the important items of our agenda including the *Operational Guidelines* thanks to the mechanism unanimously adopted by the Committee.

This could not have been achieved without your cooperation and that of the observers who restrained themselves, a lot, because of the length of our agenda. I thank them for that.

I can never thank enough our Rapporteur who had very little to eat or sleep this past week, in order to provide us with excellent Draft decisions. This was possible only with the help of the most exceptional and most dedicated staff I have ever seen.

Some members of the Secretariat have been working some 50 hours in a row including Mrs Sarah Titchen who has made sure that everything worked all week.

On your behalf, I want to thank each and every member of the Secretariat and the interpreters who were very indulgent with us.

Finally, I am most thankful to the Director of the Center, Mr Francesco Bandarin whose cooperation and full

support have been essential for me and for the success of the session.

I would now like to ask Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Vice Minister of the Ministry of Education of China and Chairman of the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, to join me on the podium.

I am very honoured to officially close the 27th Session of the World Heritage Committee and hand over the Chairmanship to our new outstanding Chairman, Mr Zhang Xinsheng, who can count on my full cooperation.

3. The World Heritage Committee thanked the Chairperson for her skill and patience in leading what had been a memorable session.

4. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Chairperson, the other members of the Committee and the staff of the Centre for their contributions to the session.

5. Finally the new **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, H.E.Mr Zhang Xinsheng (China)** addressed the Committee. He thanked the outgoing Chairperson Ms Vera Lacoëuilhe (Saint Lucia), for her commitment and skill during the Committee session. He thanked South Africa for having agreed to defer its hosting of the Committee until 2005 and expressed his hope that the session in China would be a great success.

6. Before closing the session and welcoming all participants to Suzhou, China in 2004, the new Chairperson referred to the collective responsibility required to meet the challenges in conserving World Heritage.

