



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

37 COM

WHC-13/37.COM/12

Paris, 3 May 2013

Original: English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-seventh session

Phnom Penh, Cambodia
16 – 27 June 2013

Item 12 of the Provisional Agenda: Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*

12: Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*

SUMMARY

The World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012) adopted revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* and requested the World Heritage Centre to upload the revised version of the *Operational Guidelines* on its webpage <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide12-en.pdf>. It is proposed that the Committee at its 37th session establishes a Consultative Body on the *Operational Guidelines* to consider requests made by the 36th session and review proposals prepared by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for certain paragraphs. A number of other suggestions were also made, including by other international conventions, which are referred to in this document and which require further reflection by the Consultative Body on the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Draft Decision **37 COM 12** (see point V) will be finalized by the Consultative Body on the *Operational Guidelines* during the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee.

This document should be read in conjunction with Working document WHC-13/37.COM/14.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 12, see point V.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee at its 36th session took note of the results of the Working Group on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* for the Implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* established as a Consultative Body and adopted these revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012).
2. The Committee further requested in Decision **36 COM 13.I** the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies to propose a revision to paragraphs 115, 150, 161-162 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which are included in Section II of this document.
3. Furthermore, it noted that a number of expert meetings made specific recommendations (e.g. International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Criterion (vi), Warsaw, 2012 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/827>) or proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines*, which required further reflections (e.g. International World Heritage Expert Meeting on the notion of integrity of cultural heritage, Al Ain, 2012 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/833>). Section II contains a reference to expert meetings which proposed potential changes to the *Operational Guidelines* and which are also presented in document WHC-13/37.COM/5A.
4. The Committee also asked the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, for proposals on the methodology for revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* for the next cycle, which are outlined in Section IV of this document.

II. REVISION TO THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES* REQUESTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

5. Changes to the following paragraphs of the *Operational Guidelines* were requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012). New proposed text is marked in bold.

Paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Letters from the concerned State(s) Party(ies) detailing the factual errors they might have identified in the evaluation of their nomination made by the Advisory Bodies must be received by the ~~Chairperson~~ **World Heritage Centre** at least 14 days before the opening of the session of the Committee ~~with copies to the relevant Advisory Body(ies)~~ **and the same will be immediately transmitted to the Chairperson and the Advisory Bodies.** Provided that the Chairperson, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body, is satisfied that the letter deals only with factual errors and contains no advocacy, the letter shall be distributed in the working languages **during the first day of the Committee session** ~~to the its members; of the Committee.~~ **at the same time, the letter will be uploaded on the web-page of the World Heritage Centre relating to that particular session. The factual errors contained in the letter will be brought up by the World Heritage Centre** ~~and may be read out by the Chairperson at the time of the presentation of the~~ **related** evaluation. If a letter contains both notification of factual errors and advocacy, only those parts of it dealing with factual errors shall be distributed.

Paragraph 161 of the *Operational Guidelines*

The normal timetable and definition of completeness for the submission and processing of nominations will not apply in the case of properties which, in the opinion of the relevant Advisory Bodies, would **unquestionably** [original in bold] ~~meet the criteria for~~

~~inscription on the World Heritage List~~ **have the capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value, and which are also considered to be in Danger, as a result of having** ~~have~~ **suffered damage or face-facing** serious and specific dangers from natural events or human activities, **and which are faced by an emergency situation for which an immediate decision by the Committee is necessary to ensure the survival of the property.** Such nominations will be processed on an emergency basis and may be inscribed simultaneously on **both** the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger (see paragraphs 177-191).

If the relevant Advisory Bodies consider that the property does not have the capacity to unquestionably demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value, and/or is not considered to be in Danger, and/or is not faced by an emergency situation for which immediate action by the Committee is necessary for the survival of the property, the normal timetable and requirement of completeness for submission and processing of nomination (see paragraphs 132 and 168) will apply.

Paragraph 162 of the *Operational Guidelines*

The procedure for nominations to be processed on an emergency basis is as follows:

- a) A State Party presents a nomination with the request for processing on an emergency basis. The State Party shall have already included, or immediately include, the property on its Tentative List.
- b) The nomination shall:
 - i) describe **the property** and identify **precisely its boundary** ~~the property~~;
 - ii) justify its Outstanding Universal Value according to the criteria;
 - iii) justify its integrity and/or authenticity;
 - iv) describe its protection and management system;
 - v) describe the nature of the emergency, ~~including~~ **and** the nature and extent of the damage or danger and showing that immediate action by the Committee is necessary for the survival of the property.
- c) The Secretariat immediately transmits the nomination to the relevant Advisory Bodies, requesting an assessment of its **capacity to demonstrate** Outstanding Universal Value, and of the nature of the **danger and** emergency, ~~damage and/or danger~~. A field visit may be necessary if the relevant Advisory Bodies consider it appropriate;
- d) If the relevant Advisory Bodies ~~determine~~ **consider** that the property **unquestionably** [original in bold] **has the capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value** ~~meets the criteria for inscription~~, **that it is in Danger as a result of having** ~~has~~ **suffered damage or as it faces serious and specific dangers from natural events or human activities and that it is faced by an emergency situation for which immediate action by the Committee is necessary for the survival of the property** and that the requirements (see a) **and b)** above) are satisfied, the examination of the nomination will be added to the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

[New Paragraph] **If the relevant Advisory Bodies consider that the property does not unquestionably have the capacity to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value, and/or it is not in Danger and/or it is faced by an emergency situation for which immediate action by the Committee is necessary for the survival of the property, then the examination of the nomination will not be added to the agenda of the next session of the Committee;**

- e) When reviewing the nomination the Committee will also consider:
 - i) ~~inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger;~~
 - ii) allocation of International Assistance to complete the nomination; and
 - iii) follow-up missions as necessary by the Secretariat and the relevant Advisory Bodies as soon as possible after inscription **to consider implementation of**

the emergency actions recommended by the Committee and of corrective measures.

6. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies discussed in January 2013 an inconsistency in paragraph 240 of the *Operational Guidelines*. This inconsistency concerns the timelines of the review of International Assistance requests. Since the panel will make its final proposals to the Chairperson well before the last 3 months of the biennium, the following change is proposed:

Paragraph 240 of the *Operational Guidelines*

A balance will be maintained in the allocation of resources between cultural and natural heritage and between Conservation **and** Management and Preparatory Assistance. This balance is reviewed and decided upon on a regular basis by the Committee and ~~during the last 3 months~~ **during the second year** of each biennium by the Chairperson ~~of~~ **or** the World Heritage Committee.

7. A potential revision to the *Operational Guidelines* was proposed by the Committee at its 36th session following discussions on the budget in **Decision 36 COM 15 Point 31**: “Further proposes that given the financial constraints on the World Heritage Fund that consideration be given to amending the number of nominations referred to in paragraph 61 b) and c) of the *Operational Guidelines* by further limiting the number of nominations to be considered annually by the World Heritage Committee”.

In line with this decision, the following changes are therefore proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies:

Paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*

“The Committee has decided to apply the following mechanism:

- a) examine up to two complete nominations per State Party, provided that at least one of such nominations concerns a natural property or a cultural landscape and,
 - b) set at ~~45~~ **30** the annual limit on the number of nominations it will review, inclusive of nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions of the Committee, extensions (except minor modifications of limits of the property), transboundary and serial nominations,
 - c) the following order of priorities will be applied in case the overall annual limit of ~~45~~ **30** nominations is exceeded
 - i) nominations of properties submitted by States Parties with no properties inscribed on the List;
 - ii) nominations of properties submitted by States Parties having up to 3 properties inscribed on the List,
 - iii) nominations of properties that have been previously excluded due to the annual limit of ~~45~~ **30** nominations and the application of these priorities,
 - iv) nominations of properties for natural heritage,
 - v) nominations of properties for mixed heritage,
 - vi) nominations of transboundary/transnational properties,
 - vii) nominations from States Parties in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean,
 - viii) nominations of properties submitted by States Parties having ratified the *World Heritage Convention* during the last ten years,
 - ix) nominations of properties submitted by States Parties that have not submitted nominations for ten years or more,
 - x) when applying this priority system, date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre shall be used as a secondary factor to determine the priority between those nominations that would not be designated by the previous points. “
8. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note furthermore that following Decision **35 COM 8B.61**, an evaluation of the Cairns-Suzhou

decision is foreseen in 2015: "The impact of this decision will be evaluated at the Committee's 39th session (2015)." (Paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*). Therefore, a further revision of these paragraphs could follow the evaluation of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision and subsequent Decisions, including **35 COM 8B.61**. A number of revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* were requested by the first meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group as a follow-up to the recommendations of the external auditors on the Global Strategy in May 2012 which were integrated in the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* made by the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. A second meeting of the Open-ended working group met on 1 February 2013 and focused on the recommendations of the external auditors on the PACT Initiative. No explicit changes to the *Operational Guidelines* were requested through these recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group which are presented in document WHC-13/37.COM/INF.5D. However, the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee is expected to adopt a revised PACT strategy (see WHC-13/37.COM/5D), and the 19th General Assembly will further discuss the implementation of the recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group. Therefore, potential further changes to the *Operational Guidelines* might be necessary as a result of these discussions and may be proposed for review in the future.

9. The emblem-related provisions of the *Operational Guidelines* (Chapter VIII) also continue to remain valid. The States Parties are still in the process of commenting on the Draft Matrix Table proposed to serve as complementary guidance for decision-making and procedures related to the use of the World Heritage Emblem. Any changes that might become necessary once the consultation process is finished and a revised Draft matrix is prepared will be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee in the future.

III. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

10. A number of revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* have been made in the past to improve processes and ensure consistency. With regard to the submission of maps for new nominations, the World Heritage Centre wishes to facilitate processes with States Parties and enhance the understanding of the requirements. It is therefore proposed to change paragraphs 128 and 132 as well as the explanatory notes of Annex 5 as follows:

Paragraph 128 of the *Operational Guidelines*

Nominations may be submitted **at any time during the year** [original in bold], but only those nominations that are "complete" (see paragraph 132) and received by the Secretariat on or before **1 February** [original in bold] [3 If 1 February falls on a weekend, the nomination must be received by 17h00 GMT the preceding Friday.] will be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee during the following year. Only nominations of properties included in the State Party's Tentative List will be examined by the Committee (see paragraphs **63 and 65**).

Paragraph 132 of the *Operational Guidelines*

For a nomination to be considered as "complete", the following requirements (see format in Annex 5) are to be met:

1. Identification of the Property

The boundaries of the property being proposed shall be clearly defined, unambiguously distinguishing between the nominated property and any buffer zone (when present) (see paragraphs 103-107). Maps shall be sufficiently detailed (**see Explanatory Note of**

section 1.e in Annex 5) to determine precisely which area of land and/or water is nominated. Officially up-to-date published topographic maps of the State Party annotated to show the property boundaries **and any buffer zone (when present)** shall be provided if available **in printed version**. A nomination shall be considered "incomplete" if it does not include clearly defined boundaries...[...]

10. Number of printed copies required (including map annexed)

- Nominations of cultural properties (excluding cultural landscapes): 2 identical copies
- Nominations of natural properties and cultural landscapes: 3 identical copies
- Nominations of mixed properties: 4 identical copies

Explanatory Notes of Annex 5

1.e Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone [original in bold]

Annex to the nomination, and list below with scales and dates:

(i) ~~An~~ ~~original~~ ~~copies~~ of a topographic maps showing the property nominated, at the largest scale available which shows the entire property. The boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone should be clearly marked. ~~Either on this map, or on an accompanying one, there should also be a record of~~ The boundaries of zones of special legal protection from which the property benefits **should be recorded on maps to be included under the management section of the nomination text**. Multiple maps may be necessary for serial nominations (see table in 1.d). The maps provided should be at the largest available and practical scale to allow the identification of topographic elements such as neighbouring settlements, buildings and routes in order to allow the clear assessment of the impact of any proposed development within, adjacent to, or on the boundary line. **The choice of the adequate scale is essential to clearly show the boundaries of the proposed site and it should be made in relation to the category of site that is proposed for inscription: cultural sites would require cadastral maps, while natural sites or cultural landscapes would require topographic maps (normally 1:25 000 to 1:50 000 scale).**

Care is needed with the width of boundary lines on maps, as thick boundary lines may make the actual boundary of the property ambiguous. **A boundary line whose width is equal to more than 30 metres on the ground is considered ambiguous.**

Maps may be obtained from the addresses shown at the following Web address <http://whc.unesco.org/en/mapagencies>

~~If topographic maps are not available at the appropriate scale~~ **In addition to the required maps**, other maps may be ~~submitted~~ **submitted**. All maps should be capable of being geo-referenced, with a minimum of three points on opposite sides of the maps with complete sets of coordinates. The maps, untrimmed, should show scale, orientation, projection, datum, property name and date. If possible, maps should be sent rolled and not folded.

Geographic Information in digital form is encouraged if possible, suitable for incorporation into a GIS (Geographic Information System), **however this may not substitute the submission of printed maps**. In this case the delineation of the boundaries (nominated property and buffer zone) should be presented in vector form, prepared at the largest scale possible. The State Party is invited to contact the Secretariat for further information concerning this option. [...]

11. Besides providing further explanatory notes in Annex 5, a systematic upstream support to States Parties preparing nominations would undoubtedly be valuable. A significant number of nominations are deemed "incomplete" because they do not comply with the requirements in terms of completeness of nominations. Each year, the majority of nominations that are deemed incomplete have not been previously submitted in their draft version, thus they

could not benefit from advice on how to improve the final submission. Indeed, the submission of draft nominations is increasing year after year and this year, over the 70% of the nominations submitted by the 1 February 2013 deadline had been voluntarily submitted in their draft version. If the provision for review of draft nominations was made into a compulsory requirement for the dossiers that are going to be officially submitted in their finalized version by the following 1 February deadline, and if these draft nominations could also include maps showing the boundaries for the proposed site, the number of incomplete nominations would be substantially lesser.

Paragraph 127 of the *Operational Guidelines*

States Parties may submit draft nominations to the Secretariat for comment and review **at any time during the year. However it is mandatory for States Parties that are going to submit a nomination by the 1 February deadline to submit their draft version to the Secretariat by 30 September** [original in bold] of ~~each~~ **the preceding** year (see paragraph 168). This submission of a draft nomination ~~is voluntary~~ **should include maps showing the boundaries for the proposed site. Draft nominations could be submitted either in electronic format or in printed version (only in 1 copy without annexes except for maps), in both cases they should be accompanied by a cover letter. Positive comments on a submitted draft nomination do not imply that the official and finalized version of the concerned nomination would necessarily be considered as complete.**

In case the above proposed amendment to paragraph 127 is accepted, in order to ensure the coherence of the text of the *Operational Guidelines*, minor changes to paragraphs 141 and 168 should also occur.

Paragraph 141 of the *Operational Guidelines*

The Secretariat establishes and submits at each Committee session a list of all nominations received, including the date of reception **of the draft version, the date of reception of the finalized official submission**, an indication of their status "complete" or "incomplete", as well as the date at which they are considered as "complete" in conformity with paragraph 132.

Paragraph 168 of the *Operational Guidelines*

TIMETABLE

30 September (before Year 1) [original in bold]

~~Voluntary~~ **Mandatory** deadline for receipt of ~~draft~~ nominations from States Parties **that are intending to submit a nomination by the following 1 February deadline** ~~by the Secretariat.~~

15 November (before Year 1) [original in bold]

Secretariat to respond to the nominating State Party concerning the completeness of the draft nomination, and, if incomplete, to indicate the missing information required to make the nomination complete.

12. Some international expert meetings came up with reflections related to the *Operational Guidelines*. This is the case for the following meetings, which have been referred to in the Secretariat's report in working document WHC-13/37.COM/5A:
 - a) **International expert meeting on earthen architecture**: its preservation and potential for the future (UNESCO Headquarters, 2012, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/972/>). This meeting was organized as part of the UNESCO World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme (WHEAP). It featured case studies of earthen architecture in World Heritage cities, archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, as well as earthen architecture in armed conflict and post conflict situations and

earthen architecture and natural disasters. The expert meeting suggested an Annex on Earthen Architecture to be included in the *Operational Guidelines*.

- b) **International Expert Workshop on the *World Heritage Convention* and Indigenous Peoples** (Copenhagen, 2012, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/906/>) following Decision **35 COM 12D** point 10, came up with in-depth reflections presented in a “Call for Action” and proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines* specifically with regard to issues related to Free, prior and informed consent, human rights and indigenous peoples. These are included in the document that is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/events/documents/event-906-1.pdf>.
- c) **Integrity for cultural properties:** The last Working Group on the *Operational Guidelines* reviewed all proposals presented by the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage (Al Ain, 2012, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/833/>) but felt that it would be premature to include these at this stage; in addition a State Party wrote to the World Heritage Centre underlining that flexibility was needed to determine the aspects that could affect integrity and that were applicable to specific properties. Further reflections were carried out by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies at their January 2013 meeting concerning potential revisions to the existing paragraph 89; it was also noted that other meetings proposed, including the meeting referred to in Decision **36 COM 13.II** to be organized in Brazil in September 2013 on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) may also impact on paragraph 89. The “International Expert Meeting on Visual Integrity” (Agra, India, March 2013), came up with reflections on visual impacts on World Heritage properties and presented a comprehensive report which can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/992/>.

13. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies propose that:

- a) consideration of an Annex on Earthen Architecture for the *Operational Guidelines* should await the outcome of the review process for the *Operational Guidelines* that is planned for 2015 and should also take account of proposals for the development of Policy Guidance (see document WHC-13/37.COM/13).
- b) proposed changes to the *Operational Guidelines* to reflect issues related to human rights and indigenous peoples should be set into the context of the forthcoming UNESCO Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples (<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/priority-areas/links/related-information/ipp/>).
- c) suggested changes to the paragraphs in the *Operational Guidelines* on Integrity should be further discussed at the time of the planned ten year review of the Nara Document on Authenticity, (which had been included into the *Operational Guidelines* as Annex 4) in 2014 when consideration could be given to providing one document on Authenticity and Integrity, to reflect their inter-connectedness.

14. Synergies between the Second Protocol (1999) to the 1954 Hague Convention and the 1972 *Convention*: At its seventh Meeting, held on 20 and 21 December 2012, the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict considered two documents relating to the development of synergies between the 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention and the *World Heritage Convention*. By its Decision **7.COM**

3 (see Annex I), it requested its Secretariat to ensure that synergies apply at all levels when assisting States Parties with the identification, submission of proposals for enhanced protection, inclusion of cultural property on the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection, and protection and safeguarding measures of cultural property both under the 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention and the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*.

15. By its Decision **7.COM 6** (see Annex I), the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict called on States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol to apply for the granting of enhanced protection for their cultural properties that are already inscribed on the World Heritage List. It further invited the Director-General to raise the awareness of the World Heritage Committee regarding possible synergies between the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and the 1954 Hague Convention and particularly its 1999 Second Protocol. It also proposed to the World Heritage Committee to consider the concrete proposal on the modification of the format for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List as well as to take into consideration the synergies in the framework of the Periodic Reports.
16. Pursuant to this decision, the Secretariat of the 1999 Second Protocol sent on 4 February 2013 an e-mail to all States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol inviting them to submit, by 1 March 2013, cultural properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List for the granting of enhanced protection. As a follow-up the Chairperson of the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict had a meeting with the World Heritage Centre referring to the relevant decision of the Second Protocol Intergovernmental Committee adopted in December 2012 concerning the synergies between the Second Protocol and the *World Heritage Convention* and, in particular, to the proposal to adapt the format for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List by including elements related to the granting of enhanced protection.

IV. STRATEGY AND METHODOLOGY FOR FUTURE REVISIONS OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

17. The Committee at its 36th session requested furthermore to develop proposals on the methodology for revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* for the next cycle. This was discussed at the meeting between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. The meeting underlined, that while some changes may be required as a matter of urgency to ensure consistency, others would need further reflections and should be integrated in the four-year cycle requested by the Committee for future revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* by Decision **35 COM 12B**, point 11. One option would be to take into account the evaluation of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision, which will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015 (see paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*), and to envisage these timelines for the next major revision of the *Operational Guidelines*.
18. The Committee had also requested in Decision **36 COM 13.I**, in order to ensure the most effective implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue their reflections on clarifying the links between the different documents and their scope that have been elaborated for the implementation of the *Convention*. These reflections can be found in the document WHC-13/37.COM/13 on the Policy Guidelines.

19. Furthermore, the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) decided to “establish a four-year cycle for updating the *Operational Guidelines* and that the *Operational Guidelines* should be restricted to operational guidance, and that a new document, ‘Policy Guidelines’, be developed as a means to capture the range of policies that the Committee and the General Assembly adopt” (Decision **35 COM 12B**, point 11). In case that such a document on Policy Guidelines will be elaborated, any future revision of the *Operational Guidelines* should be restricted to operational guidance and any policy advice should be captured in the policy document (see also document *WHC-13/37.COM/13*).

V. DRAFT DECISION

20. The following text may be taken into account by the Consultative Body for a Draft Decision **37 COM 12**.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-13/37.COM/12*,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 13** adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012),
3. Decides to establish a Consultative Body under Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure during its 37th session;
4. Takes note of the recommendations of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Earthen Architecture and requests the UNESCO World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme (WHEAP) to prepare draft text and review the best place for such a proposal (e.g. Resource Manuals, web-pages or Operational Guidelines);
5. Welcomes the reflections on the interaction between the World Heritage Convention and the Second Protocol (1999) to the 1954 Hague Convention and also requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to consider the options for making reference to the Reinforced Protection under the Second Protocol (1999) of the Hague Convention (1954) within nominations to the World Heritage List;
6. Also takes note of the revisions proposed on paragraphs 61, 127, 128, 132, 141, 150, 161, 162, 168 and 240 in working document *WHC-13/37.COM/12*, and approves the revisions of the Operational Guidelines for these paragraphs;
7. Further requests the World Heritage Centre to proceed with the corrections of language consistency between the English and French versions of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Finally requests the Consultative Body on the Operational Guidelines to continue its work on the revision of the Operational Guidelines for the duration

of its 37th session, as well as on the recommendations of the international expert meetings and of the World Heritage Centre as presented in section II of the present document.

Decision 7.COM 3 (Synergies between the Second Protocol and the *World Heritage Convention*)

The Committee,

1. Recalling the decision of its fifth meeting regarding document CLT-10/CONF/204/4 and the recent request of its Bureau with regard to the development of synergies between the Second Protocol and the World Heritage Convention,
2. Takes note of document CLT-12/7.COM/CONF.201/3 concerning synergies between the Second Protocol and the World Heritage Convention;
3. Requests the Secretariat to ensure that synergies foreseen in document CLT-12/7.COM/CONF.201/3 apply at all levels when assisting Parties with the identification, submission of proposals for enhanced protection, inclusion of cultural property on the List, and protection and safeguarding measures of cultural property both under the 1999 Second Protocol and the World Heritage Convention;
4. Thanks the Secretariat for its work;
5. Welcomes the efforts of the Secretariat to elaborate the cooperation between secretariats of different standard-setting instruments.

Decision 7.COM 6 (Synergies between the Second Protocol and the *World Heritage Convention*)

The Committee,

1. Recalling its decision adopted during its fifth meeting concerning synergies between the 1999 Second Protocol and the other relevant UNESCO instruments and programmes,
2. Having examined the document CLT-12/7.COM/CONF.201/6, and thanking Belgium for having prepared it,
3. Welcomes the reinforcement of synergies that this proposal could establish between the 1999 Second Protocol and the 1972 World Heritage Convention ;
4. Calls on States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol to apply for the granting of Enhanced Protection for their cultural properties that are already inscribed on the World Heritage List;
5. Invites the Director-General to:
 - raise the awareness of the World Heritage Committee regarding possible synergies between the 1972 World Heritage Convention and the 1954 Hague Convention and particularly its 1999 Second Protocol;
 - propose to the World Heritage Committee to consider the concrete proposal detailed above on the modification of the format for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List as well as to take into consideration the synergies in the framework of the Periodic Reports;
6. Requests the Secretariat to present a progress report based on the work accomplished to its eighth meeting.