



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

World Heritage

22 GA

WHC/19/22.GA/INF.11

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
27-28 November 2019

SUMMARY RECORDS

RÉSUMÉ DES TRAVAUX

FIRST DAY – Wednesday, 27 November 2019
FIRST MEETING
10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla (Kuwait)

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

1A. Opening of the General Assembly

No document
No Draft Resolution

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** welcomed the participants to the meeting and invited the **Assistant Director-General for Culture (ADG/CLT)**, Mr Ernesto Ottone Ramírez, to proceed with the opening of the session.

Le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture ouvre la séance en souhaitant la bienvenue à toutes les Délégations, Observateurs et Organisations consultatives. Il exprime sa sincère gratitude à Son Excellence Monsieur Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaïdjan) pour sa présidence du Comité du patrimoine mondial au cours de l'année écoulée. Il souhaite également la bienvenue au Président de la 44^e session du Comité, Son Excellence Monsieur Tian Xuejun (Chine).

Le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture note les avancées et les progrès de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, mais aussi les défis de plus en plus nombreux et réels auxquels elle fait face en matière de conflits et catastrophes naturelles, et souligne d'autres destructions moins visibles, notamment dues aux conflits sociaux. Il précise que le travail de l'UNESCO, notamment en matière de formation, d'éducation et de transmission du patrimoine doit être renforcé. Il évoque les activités de l'UNESCO comme l'initiative « Faire revivre l'esprit de Mossoul », qui vise à la promotion de la tolérance, ainsi que la réunion sur Palmyre, prévue pour décembre 2019. Il évoque également l'action de l'UNESCO concernant le changement climatique, et précise que depuis un peu plus de 10 ans, 150 rapports sur l'état de conservation concernant plus de 40 biens du patrimoine mondial ont été examinés par le Comité du patrimoine mondial en raison des impacts du changement climatique sur leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Il indique qu'une politique concernant le changement climatique et le patrimoine mondial sera présentée au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 44^e session.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture emphasized the multiple challenges of Agenda 2030 and acknowledged that many of UNESCO Member States have already adapted their public cultural policies to meet the cross-cutting objectives of Sustainable Development. He highlighted the importance of the recently launched *Culture2030 Indicators* as an effective measurement tool and in ensuring that these policies are evidence based. The Assistant Director-General for Culture continued by underlining that one of the crucial challenges in the years to come lies on the upholding of the credibility of the World Heritage Convention. In this regard, he recalled that many States Parties have reaffirmed the importance of high standards of credibility, ethics, transparency, cooperation and dialogue, which must be at the heart of UNESCO's action as showcased by the fact that a specific item on this matter has been added to the Agenda of this session. Finally, the Assistant Director-General for Culture thanked outgoing members of the World Heritage Committee for their contribution and commitment in upholding UNESCO's values and wished success to future Committee members in their great responsibility of safeguarding World Heritage.

[The speech of the Director-General can be found in its entirety in Annex]

1B. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the General Assembly

Document: WHC/19/22.GA/INF.1B
No Draft Resolution

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that, as per Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Assembly must elect a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur. She indicated that the list of Chairpersons, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteurs of the General Assembly since 1991, included in Document INF.1B, was at the disposal of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported by the Delegations of **Jordan** and **Libya**, proposed **H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla (Kuwait)**, as Chairperson of the 22nd session of the General Assembly.

This proposal was approved by acclamation.

On proposals made by the Delegations of **Burkina Faso**, **Ecuador** and **Japan**, the representatives of **Uganda**, **Saint Kitts and Nevis** and **Bangladesh** were designated Vice-Chairpersons by acclamation.

The Delegation of **Hungary** presented the candidature of **Mr Carlo Ossola (Switzerland)** as Rapporteur of the 22nd General Assembly. This proposal was approved by acclamation.

Item 1 of the Agenda was closed.

ITEM 2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OF THE TIMETABLE OF THE 22ND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2A. Adoption of the Agenda of the 22nd session of the General Assembly

2B. Adoption of the Timetable of the 22nd session of the General Assembly

Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/2A
WHC/19/22.GA /INF.2A.Rev
WHC/19/22.GA/2B

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 2A**
Draft Resolution: **22 GA 2B**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** who briefly introduced documents 2A and 2B.

Regarding **item 2B**, the Delegation of **Norway** supported by the Delegations of **Tunisia**, **Palestine**, **Czechia**, **Guatemala**, **Armenia**, **Libya**, **Germany**, **Burkina Faso**, **China** and **Slovenia**, proposed to amend the timetable to discuss item 10 after item 4, arguing this item needed in-depth discussions prior to the elections.

Draft Resolution **22 GA 2A** was adopted and Draft Resolution **22 GA 2B** was adopted as amended.

Item 2 of the Agenda was closed.

**ITEM 3 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 21ST SESSION OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY (UNESCO, 2017)**

No Document

No Draft Resolution

The **Chairperson** informs the General Assembly that unfortunately Ms. Feven Tewolde (Ethiopia), Rapporteur of the 21st session of the General Assembly, could not be present and that she wished to present her Report through a video message.

Le Rapport rappelle que la 21^{ème} session de l'Assemblée générale s'est tenue les 14 et 15 novembre 2017 au Siège de l'UNESCO et qu'elle a adopté un total de 10 résolutions portant sur les aspects conceptuels, financiers et administratifs de la Convention, parmi lesquelles l'élection de nouveaux membres au Comité du patrimoine mondial pour un mandat de quatre ans (Australie, Bahreïn, Bosnie-Herzégovine, Brésil, Chine, Espagne, Guatemala, Hongrie, Kirghizstan, Norvège, Ouganda, Saint-Kitts-et-Nevis). Les principales questions de la session ont porté sur la gouvernance, les contributions au Fonds du patrimoine mondial, l'Avenir de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que la question du patrimoine mondial et le développement durable.

Concernant la gouvernance, l'Assemblée générale a fait référence à la réflexion en cours entreprise par les Organes directeurs de la Convention en vue d'évaluer, d'améliorer et de rationaliser leurs méthodes de travail depuis la 20^e session de l'Assemblée générale (UNESCO, 2015) et depuis la 40^e session (Istanbul, 2016) et la 41^e session (Cracovie, 2017) du Comité du patrimoine mondial. A cet égard, l'Assemblée générale a demandé au Groupe de travail ad hoc du Comité du patrimoine mondial d'assurer le suivi de la Résolution **38 C/101** et de la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Groupe de travail sur la gouvernance établi par la Conférence générale et dont les recommandations ont été entériner lors de la 39^e session de la Conférence générale (2017).

Le Rapport souligne également que l'Assemblée générale a exprimé sa préoccupation quant aux difficultés financières auxquelles le Fonds du patrimoine mondial est confronté et a rappelé à ce titre que le paiement des contributions obligatoires et volontaires mise en recouvrement était une obligation juridique incombant à tous les Etats parties. L'Assemblée générale a en outre souligné l'urgence de trouver des ressources financières adéquates soient identifiées afin d'atteindre les objectifs de la Convention. Dans cette perspective, l'Assemblée générale a accueilli favorablement les recommandations formulées par le Groupe de travail ad hoc du Comité du patrimoine mondial, particulièrement la feuille de route sur la viabilité du Fonds du patrimoine mondial prenant en compte un ensemble d'actions à court et long terme à mettre en œuvre graduellement.

Par ailleurs, le Rapport informe que l'Assemblée générale a accueilli avec satisfaction les progrès continus accomplis dans l'exécution du plan de mise en œuvre du Plan d'action stratégique concernant l'Avenir de la Convention du patrimoine mondial et a demandé que les efforts soient poursuivis à cet égard en collaboration avec les Organisation consultatives et le soutien des Etats parties.

Enfin, le Rapport rappelle que l'Assemblée générale a pris note des progrès accomplis concernant la diffusion et l'intégration de la Politique relative au patrimoine mondial et au développement durable (World Heritage-Sustainable Development Policy) dans les processus de la Convention et a également appelé les États parties à soutenir les programmes et les activités de renforcement des capacités à cet égard, de même qu'à verser des fonds pour la mise en œuvre de la WH-SDP à l'échelle nationale, régionale et internationale.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Rapporteur for the work accomplished. After noting that there were no specific comments on this subject, the Chairperson indicated that the General Assembly took note of this Report.

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

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: 40 C/REP/19
No Draft Resolution

The **Chairperson** welcomed **H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev (Azerbaijan)** and thanked the Republic of Azerbaijan for its hospitality in hosting the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. He invited the Delegates to refer to Document 40 C/REP/19, which was also presented to the General Conference. He underlined that the Report does not require any resolution on the part of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** started by indicating that the 43rd session was attended by more than 2000 participants, including from States Parties to the Convention, Observers from the civil society as well as representatives of the media. He indicated that 53 side events organized by various countries and organizations took place, focusing on the conservation of World Heritage, impacts of tourism and climate change related issues to name a few. In his view, this demonstrates the increasing interest of the international community to preservation of World Heritage and the work of the Committee. He recalled that, at its 39th session, the Committee examined 166 State of conservation reports, and inscribed 29 new properties on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, the Chairperson pointed out that the work carried out by the 2018-2019 intersessional Ad-hoc Working Group led to major decisions on the reform of the Nomination Process, which will greatly contribute to the credibility as well as strengthening the dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies. The Chairperson proudly announced that the session in Baku was the first session to have an Agenda item dedicated to the Priority Africa, enabling meaningful discussions on conservation of World Heritage properties in Africa as well as existing challenges, partnership opportunities and finding synergies between World Heritage protection and Sustainable Development. Moreover, he indicated that as a result of this session, the Baku Declaration was adopted which highlighted for the first time the urgent need to address the destruction of heritage both in conflict areas and in relation with emerging global challenges related to climate change, whether natural or man-made. All these important reflections could be carried thanks to the contribution and spirit of cooperation of all stakeholders to the Convention as mentioned by the Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee informed the General Assembly about the activities and decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee since the last General Assembly. He noted that, as of July 2019, there are 193 States Parties to

the World Heritage Convention. He recalled that the General Assembly would elect at its current session 9 new members to the World Heritage Committee and wished them in advance success in implementing the Convention. He also thanked the 9 outgoing Committee members (Angola, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Indonesia, Kuwait, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe) for their service and support to the Committee. He recalled that the total number of properties on the List as of July 2019 stands at 1,121 (869 cultural, 213 natural, and 39 mixed) located in 167 States Parties. Furthermore, the Chairperson noted that 323 State of conservation reports, including 108 reports of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, were examined by the Committee at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018) and at its 43rd session held in Baku last July. In this regard, he recalled that conservation should remain the heart of the Convention as highlighted by the numerous and intense debates held on this matter during the sessions.

The Report also emphasized the importance of developing capacity-building and of reinforcing the involvement of local communities. In the framework of activities in this regard, notably aimed at strengthening regional and national institutions responsible for heritage protection, capacity-building and dialogue with civil society has been continued through innovative meetings such as the Forum of site managers organized since the 41st session of the Committee (Krakow, 2017). The Chairperson also recalled that several international and regional World Heritage Youth Fora were organized by/with the World Heritage Centre's assistance to develop educational activities, including by the Host Countries of the last two sessions of the Committee (Bahrain and Azerbaijan), underlining once again the importance of youth education and engagement in World Heritage protection. For what concerns awareness-raising and communication, the Chairperson noted that the World Heritage Centre website represent approximately 40% of overall site visits to the UNESCO web page, demonstrating the high global interest in World Heritage with an increase in the visits. He mentioned that the visibility of the Convention has also been supported by a great number of publications.

Finally, the **Chairperson** underlined the increasing interest worldwide in World Heritage as well as the strong commitment of all States Parties to its safeguard. He further recalled the importance of education in transmitting this common heritage and considered essential to further enable and encourage future decision makers in heritage protection. He went on insisting on the major role of the Young Professionals Forum in enhancing capacities and involvement of young generations in responding to continuing threats face by World Heritage. Although he acknowledged that the politicization of the debates remained a persistent concern, the Chairperson also remarked improvements in resolving this issue, stating that reflection on this matter was ongoing and that proposals to enhance overall transparency and decision-making had been examined resulting in concrete decisions. The Chairperson concluded by expressed his confidence that States Parties will have fruitful debates in the interest of the Convention and wished success to China for the hosting of the upcoming 44th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** on behalf of the General Assembly congratulated H.E. Mr Abulfas Garayev for the very thorough report and the results achieved over the past year and asked him to convey thanks and appreciation to H.E. Mr Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa (Bahrain) for his Chairmanship of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Manama, 2018).

The Delegation of **China** thanked the Chairperson of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee for his wishes of success and remarked the fruitful cooperation and experience sharing between the two Host Countries. He also extended his gratitude to the Chairperson of the 42nd session held in Manama, and praised the work carried out in terms of awareness raising on World Heritage. The Delegate further praised the smooth organization of the 43rd session, including the holding of side events. He concluded his remarks by stating that his

Delegation was working closely with the World Heritage Centre to prepare for another successful session in China.

La Délégation de l'**Arménie** rappelle qu'elle n'a pas pu participer à la 43^{ème} session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, déplorant une situation qu'elle juge liée au refus des autorités azerbaïdjanaises d'accorder des garanties additionnelles en termes de sécurité telles que demandées par l'Arménie pour ses représentants. La Délégation remarque que son absence a permis la tenue de propos hostiles à l'Arménie pendant la session comme en atteste le discours prononcé par la Vice-Présidente du Pays hôte lors de la cérémonie d'ouverture. Elle précise que l'accord signé avec l'UNESCO ne couvrait la sécurité des délégués que dans le seul cadre des réunions et ne garantissait donc pas la sécurité des représentants arméniens durant tout leur séjour. S'agissant des garanties spéciales de sécurité demandées, la Délégation rappelle qu'elles se justifiaient par le climat d'hostilité envers les Arméniens. La Délégation de l'Arménie conclut son intervention en exprimant ses remerciements au Secrétariat pour ses efforts déployés et lui suggère de se pencher sur de possibles solutions afin d'éviter qu'une situation similaire ne se reproduise à l'avenir.

The Delegation of **Estonia** joined other in congratulating the Chairperson on his election. It then welcomed the focus on capacity-building and training over the past biennium in line with the World Heritage Capacity-building strategy, which targeted heritage professionals on regional and national levels while offering training activities to youth and local communities. The Delegation expressed its appreciation for the work done by the Ad-hoc Working Group in examining different possible reforms of the Nomination Process to facilitate dialogue and transparency while alleviating financial and human resources constraints within this process. The Delegation commented it believed the Preliminary Assessment could be a useful tool and called to further explore ways for strengthening dialogue during the nomination cycle itself. Nonetheless, the Delegation raised concern over the increasing discrepancies during the past couple of years between Advisory Bodies' recommendations and decisions by the Committee, demonstrating a clear sign of politicization taking precedence over scientific-based approach of decision making as illustrated by instances of recommendations for non-inscription turned into inscription. In this regard, the Delegation welcomed the Agenda item on a Code of Conduct as timely and useful to the reflection on ensuring full compliance of rules and enhancing credibility of statutory processes.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne le regain d'intérêt dans son pays pour la Convention du patrimoine mondial, ce qui permet de renforcer l'attractivité du territoire pour les biens culturels et naturels. Elle annonce à l'Assemblée générale une contribution volontaire exceptionnelle de 107,000 euros au fonds du patrimoine mondial, s'ajoutant à celle effectuée pour l'organisation de la réunion sur les « Sites associés à des conflits récents et d'autres mémoires négatives et controversées » (Paris, décembre 2019), au regard de l'importance de cette réflexion. La Délégation de la France montre son attachement au sujet de la mémoire, jugée indissociable de la mission et des valeurs de l'UNESCO, et souhaite que la réflexion entreprise suscite l'intérêt des Etats parties et débouche sur des propositions d'orientations en la matière. Elle félicite enfin le Secrétariat pour le travail remarquable accompli dans le cadre de la Convention.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the efforts of the World Heritage Committee on its activities as well as those of the World Heritage Centre in implementing Committee's decisions. The Delegation further acknowledged the several capacity-building activities undertaken by all stakeholders to the Convention and particularly praised in this regard the work done in the framework of the World Heritage Leadership Programme jointly organized by IUCN and ICCROM. It affirmed its belief that the World Heritage Policy Compendium online tool supported by the Republic of Korea will also contribute to the enhancement of capacities of heritage actors by ensuring broad based and easy access to

States Parties to relevant information on policies related to World Heritage. The Delegation also recognised the critical role of the International assistance programme in order to provide effective protection for heritage at risk in developing countries and hope that further measures to strengthen capacities of these countries could be taken into consideration in the long term. Moreover, the Delegation reiterated its satisfaction to financially contribute to the expert meeting on “Sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories” to be held in December 2019, and hoped it will contribute to an in-depth discussion of the Committee at its next session. The Delegation remarked on this matter that the Republic of Korea had hosted a side event on raising awareness on World Heritage interpretation during the last two sessions of the Committee and planned on organizing similar events. With more than a thousand inscribed properties on the World Heritage List, the Delegation believed crucial that the World Heritage Committee remained strongly committed to the implementation of the Convention and to active debates among State Parties resulting in decisions fully respected by all.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** joined the Delegation in welcoming the focus on capacity-building and training, and raised the pressing issue of preservation and risk management in Africa. While acknowledging efforts done in this regard, the Delegation felt that more could be done by both States Parties and the Secretariat to support the African World Heritage Fund. The Delegation recalled that most of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger are located in Africa and stressed that more emphasis should be put on this continent.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** responded to the Delegation of Armenia regarding its complaint over the lack of guarantees in terms of security of their representatives in the framework of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation recalled that, as per Rules of Procedures of the Committee, a letter of invitation was sent to all States Parties with reference to the Host Country Agreement, which contains provisions stating the obligation of the Host Country to ensure the safety of all participating delegates without any distinction. The Delegation further explained that it believed the Secretariat had reassured the State Party of Armenia prior to the session regarding safety assurances. It claimed that allegations by the Delegation of Armenia were unfounded and praised the successful holding of the 43rd session in Baku.

La Déléation de la **Tunisie** salue le travail remarquable du Secrétariat dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention patrimoine mondial et rappelle l'attachement de la Tunisie à la Convention ainsi que son engagement historique dans ce programme phare de l'UNESCO. La Déléation évoque que la Convention fait maintenant face à des défis majeurs, notamment pour ce qui trait à l'amélioration du processus d'inscription. A cet égard, la Tunisie a accueilli en janvier 2019 une réunion d'experts sur pour réfléchir à des propositions de réformes. Un autre défi relevé par la Déléation réside dans un équilibre intelligent et vertueux à trouver entre décision politique et expertise scientifique, rappelant que les fondateurs de la Convention l'ont délibérément pensé pour être mixte. La Déléation souligne ensuite la nécessité d'assurer la transmission des savoirs et des capacités techniques entre différentes régions. Ceci amène la Déléation à désigner comme autre défi majeur celui de la représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, dont la répartition géographique déséquilibrée démontre une forme de défaillance éthique et morale que les Etats parties à la Convention devraient impérativement s'attaquer. Enfin, la Déléation de la Tunisie rappelle qu'elle soutien la nécessaire mise en place d'un dialogue entre les différentes Convention de l'UNESCO, en particulier celles du Secteur de la Culture.

La Déléation de l'**Arménie** reprend la parole pour réaffirmer que l'accord signé entre l'UNESCO et le Pays hôte de la 43^{ème} session du Comité ne s'appliquait qu'aux réunions

mais ne donnait pas de garanties aux représentants arméniens pour l'intégralité de leur séjour.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 4** of the Agenda.

ITEM 10 **POSSIBILITY OF ELABORATION OF A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE STATES PARTIES, THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES**

Document: *WHC/19/22.GA/10*

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 10**

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to examine item 10 of the agenda concerning the possibility of elaboration of a Code of Conduct and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to briefly introduce the item.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** firstly recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session (Baku, 2019) encouraged informal consultations between States Parties on the possibility of the elaboration of a Code of Conduct for States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and therefore requested to include an item on the Agenda of the 22nd session of the General Assembly to initiate discussion on this matter. She explained that the working document prepared in this regard by the Secretariat did not propose any draft resolution to avoid prejudging such discussion.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated its belief that the credibility of the World Heritage Convention was at stake and raised concern over politicization of statutory processes often focused on the short-term benefits of the inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation reaffirmed the need for a longer vision for the World Heritage List so as to not lose its value. In this relation, the Delegation believed that a Code of Conduct could be an excellent and useful tool not only within UNESCO but also to outside stakeholders to the Convention. In the Delegation's view, such Code of conduct does not require to be complicated and should rather be as simple and readable as possible, putting forward only the most important elements from existing texts of the Convention, notably with regard to the Global Strategy and adhering to a better representativity of the World Heritage List. The Delegation concluded that it thought that a Code of Conduct articulating ethical principles and norms would enhance the integrity and credibility of the World Heritage system while enhancing efficiency as well.

La Délégation de l'**Arménie** fait état de ses préoccupations concernant les inscriptions sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ces dernières années qui témoignent d'une tendance inquiétante à une déviation croissante entre les recommandations émises par les Organisations consultatives et les décisions prises par le Comité. Selon la Délégation, cette situation risque d'affecter la fonction d'évaluation dévolue aux Organisations consultatives, aboutissant à des inscriptions de sites dont la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle n'est pas reconnue et *in fine* à l'affaiblissement de la crédibilité du système du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation rappelle que celui-ci est fondé sur des principes d'objectivité, de transparence et d'une façon générale sur des principes éthiques qui garantissent le crédit et la renommée du système. A ce titre, la Délégation estime que des dispositions devraient être adoptées afin d'écartier la possibilité pour le Pays hôte d'une session du Comité d'avoir la possibilité de proposer des sites pour inscription. La Délégation termine en apportant son soutien à l'élaboration d'un Code de conduite et estime que les Principes éthiques rédigés dans le cadre de la Convention de 2003 pourraient alimenter la réflexion sur ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Australia** endorsed the framework suggested by the Delegation of Norway on the elaboration of a Code of Conduct and joined the Assistant-Director General for Culture in saying that the work of the World Heritage system must be irreproachable. The Delegation noted with deep concern the increasing drift of the World Heritage Committee away from the technical foundations on which the World Heritage Convention is built and considered a collective responsibility of the States Parties to the convention to halt such drift in order to preserve the value of the List. The Delegation asserted its confidence on the ongoing reforms of the Nomination Process but considered them not sufficient. It commended the proposal of a Code of Conduct that would be complementary to these reforms and that would represent an essential tool for collective accountability fostering the credibility of the Convention. The Delegation believed such a code should apply not only to the Committee but to all stakeholders to the Convention, as it is often the States Parties that are source of numerous wrong practices during Committee sessions, notably in relation to nominations. Therefore, the Delegation said the elaboration of a Code of Conduct should be the business of the General Assembly of States Parties which should ultimately endorse it.

La Délégation de l'**Espagne** rejoint les orateurs pour affirmer l'importance d'élaborer un Code de conduite considérant les changements que traverse la Convention. La Délégation estime qu'un tel Code de conduite, ou déontologique suivant la dénomination qui sera retenue, pourrait servir à restaurer les principes fondateurs de la Convention qui reposent avant tout sur la coopération internationale et la conservation du patrimoine mondial plutôt que sur les inscriptions. La Délégation conclut que le Code de conduite devra s'appliquer non seulement aux Etats parties à la Convention mais également aux Organisations consultatives et au Secrétariat.

La Délégation de la **France** partage les inquiétudes sur les tendances constatées à s'écarter de l'avis des experts et à ignorer certaines dispositions des Orientations. A ce stade, elle n'est cependant pas persuadée que l'élaboration d'un nouveau texte sous la forme d'un Code de conduite soit véritablement la manière façon de résoudre les difficultés auxquelles fait face la Convention. La Délégation rappelle que la question de la soumission de propositions d'inscriptions par des Etats membres du Comité pendant leur mandat a longuement été débattue par le passé. Elle fait référence à l'article 9.3 de la Convention et argumente que les dérives ne devraient avoir lieu si les Etats membres du Comité choisissent pour les représenter des personnes qualifiées dans le domaine du patrimoine culturel ou naturel. La Délégation estime qu'il faudrait suivre de manière plus stricte les Orientations, bien qu'elle reste ouverte à la discussion de l'élaboration d'un Code de conduite.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged the necessity to outline the shared responsibilities of the stakeholders of the Convention. However, it drew the attention to the fact that a Code of conduct denotes punitive measures and notes that the 2003 Convention has established Ethical principles. In this vein, the Delegation believed that it might be more relevant to elaborate a Code of ethics underscoring the principles of due diligence, confidentiality and the primacy of States Parties to decide on the timing and content of information divulged to the public when sharing information with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. The Delegation highlighted that a Code of conduct might not address the root causes of the Committee's decisions deviating from the Advisory Bodies' recommendations. It considered more beneficial to target root causes, such as a complicated Nomination Process, differences in scientific opinion, as well as exploring alternative processes and mechanisms of dialogue in order to reinforce collaboration of all involved people in the interest of the World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of **China** underlined that many topics, such as the credibility of the Convention, the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage List, as well as the

goodwill of all States Parties should be considered separately from the question of a Code of conduct. The Delegation was of the opinion that if such a code was to be elaborated, it should be a comprehensive and balanced code, which could address the root causes for deviations of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee from the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Hungary** believed that a Code of conduct would be an excellent tool to guide the work of States Parties and that the Convention would benefit from the elaboration of such a code. While all stakeholders are involved in the implementation of the Convention, the Delegation believed that the delineation of the roles of the various actors in World Heritage activities is necessary when discussing a possible Code of conduct. It noted that certain actors, notably the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, already have a set of guidelines and codes of ethics of their own which they are following. Therefore, the Delegation stressed that discussions should revolve around a Code for States Parties as well as for Committee members which have different responsibilities. In the Delegation's view that the basis of a code should be a set of principles already embedded in the Convention and the Operational Guidelines and not be generate an overly complex document. The Delegation underlined that the spirit of this kind of document was not to be punitive. It explained that by nature a Code of conduct is not legally binding and that States Parties and Committee members would be expected to honor its content.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** recalled that the 2018-2019 Ad-hoc Working Group chaired by Azerbaijan discussed important issues complementary to a Code of Conduct, namely how to strengthen dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties and increase the balance and credibility of the Nomination Process. It further recalled that following the recommendations by the Working Group the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in Baku endorsed the Preliminary Assessment, which the Delegation believed would contribute to enhance the transparency and the credibility of the Nomination Process. In this regard, it drew attention to the fact that the World Heritage Committee in Baku discussed agreed that evaluations by the Advisory Bodies should remain consistent with previous decisions of the Committee in order to contribute to the credibility of the process. It reminded that as discussed many times in the framework of the Ad-hoc Working Group and during the 43rd session of the Committee, the crucial aspect of the credibility was not the sole responsibility of States Parties but was a collective responsibility shared by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. Consequently, the Delegation underlined that a Code of Conduct should be balanced and apply to all stakeholders. It emphasized that such a code would not be legally binding and would only reflect obligations stipulated in the Convention and the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation concluded by referring to the Ethical principles of the 2003 Convention, and considered this text as a good example to be applied by the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** stated that a Code of Conduct should be comprehensive and in line with existing legal regimes. It joined previous speakers in recalling that such a code could not impose new obligations. The Delegation stressed that the text should consider a comprehensive overview, including diverging scientific opinions and a complicated Nomination Process. It concluded by saying that the aim is to make inscriptions accessible to all while ensuring that sites inscribed in the World Heritage List are truly of Outstanding Universal Value, and if framed this way a code would have a wider acceptance.

The Delegation of **Libya** supported the elaboration of a Code of Conduct which should be applicable to all States Parties as well as to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It believed that the Code of Conduct should have core credible and clear ethical, emphasizing on values such as honesty and unbiased judgement. In the Delegation's opinion, while a code would not be legally binding it should ensure best standards and

practice as well as accountability by all, including with some kind of disciplinary action such as mechanisms to deal handle complaints.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** rappelle le rôle vital que joue la Convention dans la promotion de la paix par la compréhension mutuelle et en célébrant la diversité culturelle des Etats. Elle est de l'avis que toutes les parties prenantes, à savoir le Comité du patrimoine mondial, les Etats parties à la Convention, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives ont une obligation partagée de défendre la crédibilité et l'intégrité de la Convention ainsi que de son application. La Délégation pense que le Code de conduite aurait pour vocation de compléter les documents existants et de fournir une ligne directrice déontologique. Dans ce sens, elle estime qu'il ne devrait pas impacter les textes de la Convention, des Orientations ou des Règlements intérieurs. La Délégation rappelle que l'éventualité d'un Code de conduite a été discutée au sein du Groupe de travail ad hoc, y compris à travers un document informel qui présentait des éléments que pourrait contenir un tel code. A cet égard, elle estime que la réflexion autour de tels éléments mérite d'être poursuivie. La Délégation pense que le Code de conduite pourrait s'appliquer aux Etats parties sans leur imposer de nouvelles obligations. Elle conclut par son souhait réitéré de voir le dialogue entre toutes les parties prenantes renforcé.

The Delegation of **Germany** appreciated the elaboration of a Code of Conduct. It thought that it should be a comprehensive and integrated document for all stakeholders. The Delegation that during its chairmanship of the World Heritage Committee in 2015, the process for enhancing transparency and dialogue had been launched with the establishment of the Ad-hoc Working Group. It stressed that a strengthened dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies concerning running nominations was considered as one of the visible and effective results. The Delegation further stressed that the World Heritage Committee was in the end a decision-making body and believed crucial to organize a dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the experts from the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Slovenia** recalled its active participation to the activities connected to the reform of the Nomination Process as member of the Ad-hoc Working Group and reiterated its strong commitment to ensure credibility, transparency, professional based methodology and respect of procedures for all parties involved in this process. As the credibility of the Convention is considered the main principle of stakeholder's endeavours, the Delegation indicated that it continued to work with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and greatly appreciated their engagement, as well as the coordination with other States Parties sharing its concerns. It encouraged other States Parties to be active in this task and was convinced that the reform of the Nomination Process would bring positive changes through collective efforts and the notion of shared responsibilities based on values the Convention stands for. The Delegation regretted the trend in practice of deviating from expert advice and overlooking provisions of the Operational Guidelines, not only with regard to inscriptions but also concerning deferrals and referrals. The Delegation highlighted that this increases the gap between the activities of the States Parties and within the States Parties themselves, i.e. between experts, local communities and decision makers who focus on nominations rather than on conservation issues, leaving room in such cases for politicization. Therefore, the Delegation believed that the elaboration of a Code of Conduct should include all stakeholders and was an essential tool, not only for reasons of professional ethics, transparency and dialogue, but also as a reference point for good practice, advice and guidance. Finally, the Delegation strongly supported the framework developed through the Non-paper of the Ad-hoc Working Group and considered that the General Assembly should further elaborate on it and finally approve a Code of Conduct by consensus.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** strongly supported the elaboration of a Code of Conduct which in its view would not be in contradiction in any way with the Convention or the Rules of

Procedure of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation did not see any obstacle to develop a Code of Conduct for the 1972 Convention and noted an urgent need to enhance the credibility of the World Heritage system through a better adherence to ethical standards, which are the very basis of the work within UNESCO and the World Heritage activities. Furthermore, it remarked that ethical principles had been already elaborated for World Heritage regarding climate change and for the 2003 Convention, and are in the process of elaboration with regard to artificial intelligence. The Delegation fully agreed with that the credibility of the system is a shared responsibility but at the same time believed that a code could clarify the specific duties and responsibilities individual actors and States Parties should uphold as well as the special role and function of the World Heritage Committee as provided under the Convention. It considered that a Code of Conduct could be a set of best practices with core principles such as balance, transparency, non-politicization, adherence to the rules and accountability. It was the hope of the Delegation that an inclusive process could be launched by the General Assembly with a view for the adoption of a Code of Conduct at its next session.

The Delegation of **Sweden** welcomed the elaboration of a Code of Conduct which it believed would be in the interest of everyone in order to strengthen the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and its credibility. It supported the creation of an Open-ended working group tasked to develop such a code which it believed could be an efficient tool to ensure the fundamental principles of objectivity, transparency and impartiality in the decision-making processes of the Committee in line with the Global Strategy for a balanced World Heritage List. The Delegation Highlighted several issues should be covered when elaborating a code, notably the clear risk of conflict of interest relating to nominations submitted by Committee members, as well as the worrying tendency to deviate from the advice of the Advisory Bodies since it threatens the credibility of the Convention, of the Committee and of the World Heritage List. The Delegation underscored that this questions the use of Advisory Bodies expertise and resources, as well as the impartiality and objectivity of the Committee. It stressed that a sustainable World Heritage List should be a globally balanced list, with a financially secured situation for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a list built upon inscriptions considered objectively with established Outstanding Universal Value founded on expertise advice. The Delegation concluded that conservation of the common heritage should be at the very core of the work of the Convention.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** estime qu'élaborer un Code de conduite clair, simple, respectable et respecté par tous serait une excellente idée. Elle pense qu'il s'agit de trouver un juste équilibre entre la volonté des Etats d'inscrire des biens et l'avis des Organisations consultatives, lequel n'est parfois pas très bien perçu par les Etats. Elle considère nécessaire d'examiner les causes profondes qui ont amené à une telle situation. La Délégation est convaincue qu'un tel code serait une solution sans créer de contraintes juridiques. Elle conclut qu'il est toutefois à rappeler que les Etats parties doivent s'engager à coopérer davantage avec les Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Denmark** recalled that since the last session of the General Assembly, the World Heritage Committee has inscribed three sites recommended for non-inscription by the Advisory Bodies, and has turned other similar recommendations into deferrals or referrals. Furthermore, the Delegation noticed that the Committee's decisions on state of conservation were often seen as "soft", with inscriptions on the List of World Heritage in Danger repeatedly postponed as per the wish of the States Parties concerned. It acknowledged the work by led by the Ad-hoc Working Group towards better Tentative lists and nominations as well as a more sustainable economy in relation with these processes. However, the Delegation considered there is still a need to address the decision-making process and secure the principles of objectivity and impartiality, as well as to address potential conflicts of interest,

notably when a nomination from Committee member is examined. It strongly supported the elaboration of a Code of Conduct as a promising step in this direction.

The Delegation of **Barbados** stressed that the integrity of the principles of objectivity, transparency and impartiality are grounded in the text of the Convention, which is based on the expectation of a global knowledge and technical comprehension of the characteristics of the sites being nominated. It deemed that the credibility of heritage conservation relies on international cooperation. In this regard, it highlighted that the development of shared heritage is connected with the development of shared knowledge and should be considered as a fundamental principle. The Delegation appreciated the enhancement of the upstream process which allows for knowledge sharing in support of elaboration of valuable nominations and called for a closer collaboration with regional experts, especially where the presence of Advisory Bodies is scarce. The Delegation agreed with elaborating guidelines which clarify duties, roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved. It was of the view that overall transparency and balance in the Convention processes would also increase the credibility of local and indigenous knowledge. It believed that similar codes, such as the Ethical principles of the 2003 Convention, are useful models that could serve as a basis.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recalled that it has always fully supported decisions by the World Heritage Committee and as such has implemented the Global Strategy with regard to the credibility of the World Heritage List. The Delegation agreed with concerns raised by States Parties and considered that a Code of Conduct should fully commit States Parties and the World Heritage Centre, as well as the Advisory Bodies on an ad hoc basis concerning more transparent upstream advice, evaluations of nominations, recommendations on state of conservation and their respective presentations to the Committee. Regarding the latter, the Delegation recalled what has occurred during past session, notably during the 34th session of the Committee (Brasília, 2010). It reiterated its disposal to collaborate in the full recovery of the credibility of the Convention through a reinforced cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as recently witnessed with the generous support of the State Party of Cuba, of the World Heritage Centre and the Category 2 Centre of Zacatecas for the revision and the establishment of a more objective methodology for the creation of Tentative lists in the LAC sub-regions of Mexico and Central America, and the Caribbean.

The Delegation of **Iceland** fully supported the elaboration of a Code of Conduct as set out in the working document prepared by the Secretariat. The Delegation believed that such a code would strengthen the credibility and the implementation of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recognized that the Ad-hoc Working Group already provided with relevant input to further elaborate on a Code of Conduct. The Delegation attached great importance to highest standards of integrity and transparency of working methods during the decision-making process of the Convention. It commented that the nominations are a continuation of such process, from their preparation to their presentation to the World Heritage Committee. In this regard, the Delegation stressed that States Parties expected a more comprehensive evaluation phase. It argued that initial evaluation missions are not always conducted by experts specialized in the characteristics of the nominated site, nor additional information provided by States Parties fully reflected in the evaluation. While understanding the workload and limited resources of the Advisory Bodies, the Delegation stressed that the evaluation phase required a specific emphasis in a Code of Conduct. It underlined that there was a necessary reflection to be conducted on how to find a common ground between divergent scientific arguments of States Parties and Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Czechia** welcomed the work and recommendations provided by the Ad-hoc Working Group, which it was convinced that would contribute to achieve the highest integrity and transparency of the working methods of the decision-making bodies as well as

of the Advisory Bodies through the reform of the evaluation and nomination processes. Therefore, the Delegation supported the elaboration of a Code of conduct as an important tool to reinforce the authority of the decision-making bodies. The Delegation commented that the authority of the Advisory Bodies, which are involved in Reactive monitoring missions or other forms of guidance, is also of high importance and that repeatedly failing to consider their recommendations was harmful. The Delegation noted that public online broadcasting of the debates of the World Heritage Committee allowed for better transparency and witnessed the quality of the decision-making process.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** commended the work of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It echoed other Delegations in emphasizing the utmost importance to respect the highest standards of integrity, impartiality and transparency of the working methods within the decision-making process of the Governing Bodies of the Convention, and added there was a need to create an appropriate culture in relation with these principles by respecting the already established rules under the Convention. The Delegation noted that the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat have their own codes of conduct and staff rules and regulations, as well as at the States Parties level which are represented by professionals and civil servants who also have rules and regulations, including codes of conduct. The Delegation stressed that working methodology might be a challenge and drew attention to the fact dialogue and consultations between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies was not sufficient enough. It requested further reflection on this important issue.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient fortement l'idée d'un Code de conduite. Elle fait part de sa préoccupation par rapport à certaines dérives observées dans le fonctionnement des mécanismes régissant la Convention. Elle convient qu'un Code de conduite ne résoudra pas l'ensemble des problèmes étant donné que ne sera pas un document contraignant, mais en tant que recueil de bonnes pratiques, la Délégation estime qu'il constituerait un guide utile à tous, un pas important dans la bonne direction, et contribuerait au renforcement du système de la Convention. La Délégation note plusieurs principes de base évoqués tels que la transparence, l'efficacité, la crédibilité et l'impartialité. Elle encourage l'Assemblée générale à adopter une résolution ouvrant la voie à l'élaboration d'un Code de conduite, accompagnée par les principes de base que l'Assemblée générale souhaiterait voir émerger. A cette fin, la Délégation suggère la création d'un groupe de rédaction afin d'adjoindre ces principes au projet de Résolution 22 GA 10.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed the idea of a Code of Conduct. It considered that the principles of impartiality and objectivity should be enshrined for all States Parties. It believed that conflicts of interest exist in the case of nominations submitted by Committee members, and further recalled the worrying trend of Committee's decisions deviating from Advisory Bodies recommendations. It was convinced that a Code of Conduct could bring clarity and avoid misunderstandings.

The Delegation of **Palestine** noted there was a clear wish to elaborate some kind of text, whether named Code of Conduct or Ethical principles. It underscored that while not legally-binding, a code could be considered as morally binding, a moral obligation. The Delegation reassured that it would remain optional and would add new obligations not foreseen in the Convention. The Delegation explained that Committee members had been encouraged several times not to submit nominations during their mandate and that it is up to the State Party to follow this encouragement or not. It recalled that Portugal had decided not to submit nominations during its tenure at the Committee. The Delegation highlighted that this question has been on the table since a long time and thanked the State Party of Norway for having defended eloquently the idea of a Code of Conduct at the Ad-hoc Working Group. It believed

that the support for the elaboration of such text was strong and that the concerns raised were really not connected to its content nor substance.

The **Chairperson** briefly summarized the debates held on Agenda Item 10 and noted a support for the elaboration of a Code of Conduct, the need to involve all stakeholders in this process, and the need to strengthen dialogue between States Parties and Advisory Bodies. He proposed to create a drafting group to discuss the Draft Resolution to be examined as per the Provisional timetable. Agenda Item 10 remained open.

ITEM 5 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: *WHC/19/22.GA/5*
 WHC/19/22.GA/INF.5A
 WHC/19/22.GA/INF.5B

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 5**

The **Chairperson** recalled that 9 members of the Committee were completing their mandate at this session of the General Conference and that 12 members of the Committee would continue their mandate until the end of the 41st session of the General Conference in 2021. He recalled that the General Assembly, in 2015, decided that the floating seat between Groups III and IV would be allocated to Group III in 2017, and would then be rotated between Groups III and IV at each session. Thus, the floating seat is assigned to Group IV at the present session, and will be assigned again to Group III at the 23rd session in 2021.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the first ballot of this session will be for **allocated seats for the Electoral Groups**. He recalled that, considering the current composition of the World Heritage Committee, and in accordance with Rule 14.1(c) of the Rules of Procedure, **this ballot will only be for allocated vacant seats for Groups IV, Va, and Vb**. Indeed, with 2 members of the Committee representing Group I, 2 members of the Committee representing Group II and 3 members of the Committee representing Group III remaining in office until 2021, the number of seats allocated for these three groups have already been reached. The Chairperson informed the General Assembly that the ballots for the allocated seats to Groups IV, Va and Vb will take place simultaneously and that the ballot papers with the candidates for each of these three groups are printed on a single page. The Chairperson recalled Rule 14.1(d) of the Rules of Procedure which stipulates that “*at each election due consideration shall be given to the election of at least one State Party which has never served as a Member of the World Heritage Committee*”.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to explain the election procedure

The Secretariat provided the practical details concerning the elections.

The **Chairperson** informed the General Assembly that Ms Spela Spanzel (Slovenia) and Mr Steve Devonish (Barbados) have accepted to be tellers for this electoral process and invited States Parties to proceed with the voting in Room VI et VII.

The meeting was closed.

FIRST DAY – Wednesday, 27 November 2019
SECOND MEETING
3 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla (Kuwait)

ITEM 5 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (*continuation*)

Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/5
WHC/19/22.GA/INF.5A
WHC/19/22.GA/INF.5B

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 5**

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the ballot for the allocated seats for Group IV, Va and Vb:

Results for the Allocated seats

Group IV (Total votes: **170** - Valid votes: **156** - Invalid votes: **14** - Abstentions: **0**)

Thailand: **156**

Group Va (Total votes: **170** - Valid votes: **168** - Invalid votes: **0** - Abstentions: **2**)

Ethiopia: **97**

Mali: **118**

Nigeria: **128**

South Africa: **130**

Group Vb (Total votes: **170** - Valid votes: **159** - Invalid votes: **10** - Abstentions: **1**)

Egypt: **38**

Iraq: **9**

Oman: **95**

Saudi Arabia: **17**

The **Chairperson** declared the following States Parties elected to the World Heritage Committee for **Group IV: Thailand**, for **Group Va: Mali, Nigeria** and **South Africa**, and for **Group Vb: Oman**.

Results for the Open seats (Total votes: **168** - Valid votes: **168** - Invalid votes: **0** - Abstentions: **0** - Majority: **85**)

Egypt: **147**

Ethiopia: **125**

Iraq: **95**

Russian Federation: **110**

Saudi Arabia: **102**

The **Chairperson** declared the following States Parties elected to the World Heritage Committee: **Egypt**, **Ethiopia**, the **Russian Federation**, and **Saudi Arabia**.

Draft Resolution **21 GA 5** was adopted as amended.

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

SECOND DAY – Thursday, 28 November 2019
THIRD MEETING
10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla (Kuwait)

ITEM 6 EXAMINATION OF THE STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND, INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF STATES PARTIES

Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/6
WHC/19/22.GA/INF.6

Draft Resolution: 22 GA 6

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to examine item 6 of the agenda.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** gave a brief introduction on the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund. Two sets of financial statements were presented: the first one covering the 2016-2017 biennium, which required the approval of the General Assembly, and the second set of interim Financial Statements as of 30 June 2019 covering the first 18 months of the current biennium, only for information purposes with an expenditure rate of 77% of the Approved Expenditure Plan. He indicated that the sets of financial statements were presented in a consistent manner with prior periods, and that expenditure included amounts for goods and services delivered in the financial period as well as outstanding legal obligations/commitments. The Representative stated that in the statement of assets and liabilities, the cash balance was of \$6.7M and liabilities of \$1M relating to unliquidated obligations.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** remarque que, sur les documents WHC/19/22.GA/INF.6 et WHC/19/22.GA/INF.7, les chiffres et les lettres sont trop petits sur l'état des contributions obligatoires. Une remarque additionnelle est faite par la Délégation sur les deux tableaux des contributions obligatoires et des contributions volontaires, les choses ne sont pas faites de la même manière : dans le premier tableau, la colonne à la fin résume le total du montant non payé ou avancé alors que sur le tableau volontaire, il n'y a pas cette colonne. La Délégation de la Palestine demande au Secrétariat d'expliquer aux Etats parties qu'il n'y a aucune différence sur les deux contributions car elles sont finalement obligatoires toutes les deux.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** informed that the update of the presentation of the status of contributions to the World Heritage Fund will be discussed with Bureau for Strategic Planning to ensure that they are in line with previous decisions on the subject.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** commended the work of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and noted that the contributions of a number of States Parties were still in arrears. The Delegation recommended that the World Heritage Centre, in consultations with the Vice-Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee, determine the causes for each region for arrears, which often only consist of small amounts that could easily be paid.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded that voluntary and compulsory contributions relate to Article 16.1 and 16.2 of the Convention. She clarified that according to

Article 16.2 States Parties at the time of the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention can choose not to be bound to Article 16.1. She took note that there is no full calculation of the total of unpaid contributions and confirmed that it will be checked whether this can be provided in the future. She also recalled that there were intense discussions at the World Heritage Committee to encourage all States Parties to duly pay their contributions. She welcomed the recommendation made by the United Republic of Tanzania for Electoral Groups to look into this situation together with the Vice-Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Resolution **22 GA 6** was adopted.

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

**ITEM 7 DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE
WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF
ARTICLE 16 OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

*Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/7
 WHC/19/22.GA/INF.7*

*Draft Resolution: **22 GA 7***

The **Chairperson** indicated that the next item on the agenda is **Item 7** and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the Agenda item.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that the General Assembly shall determine the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund, applicable to all States Parties according to Article 16 of the World Heritage Convention. She recalled that the income of the World Heritage Fund comes from the contribution that States Parties are bound to pay and noted that this income would not increase in the future. She recalled that over the past years the sustainability of the Fund has been one of the most critical issues of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. She reminded that the number of properties on the World Heritage List has increased, whilst the budget of the World Heritage Fund has decreased by during the same period. Since the needs are increasing, the World Heritage Committee has envisaged various ways of also increasing the resources of the World Heritage Fund. She recalled that the voluntary doubling of contributions was recommended by the General Assembly at its 19th session in 2013 (Resolution **19 GA 8**), which is also inscribed as a short-term measure in the “Roadmap for the Sustainability of the World Heritage Fund” - set of complementary short-, medium-, and long-term actions to be implemented in a phased timeline - endorsed by the World Heritage Committee in 2017 and presented to the General Assembly in 2017. She stressed that a major contribution from Norway of US\$ 2.9 million was received under the Fund, which will be dedicated to Africa and sites in danger. She encouraged other States Parties to consider doubling their contributions or simply make voluntary contributions to the Fund. She reported that another way of increasing the resources of the Fund was envisaged by the Committee by a possible voluntary annual fee to be paid by each World Heritage property but stressed that only a very low proportion of World Heritage properties would be willing to contribute. She recalled that the World Heritage Committee endorsed in 2018 a “Resource mobilization and communication strategy” as the implementation of the Convention is dependent upon the funding of its States Parties. She reminded that the Committee encouraged all States Parties to assist the Secretariat in fundraising activities, which could be done in various ways. She indicated that a proposal by Norway of a cost-sharing model for the evaluation of nominations was adopted by the Committee at its 43rd session (Baku, 2019). This new

mechanism consists of a voluntary contribution paid by nominating States Parties, with some exceptions, and would help financing the evaluation of nominations. She stressed that it would be on a voluntary basis, since imposing a mandatory fee for the submission of nominations would not be in accordance with the Convention. She clarified that the implementation of this mechanism would be starting with the forthcoming evaluation cycle, that is nominations submitted by 1 February 2020.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** réitère ses remarques apportées au point 6 de l'ordre du jour. Concernant le point 7, la Délégation note que plusieurs initiatives créatives sont données par le Secrétariat pour pallier la crise financière dont pâtit le Fonds du patrimoine mondial avec une diminution des fonds conséquente de l'ordre de 20% depuis 2012. La Délégation s'interroge sur les racines de ce problème. Elle considère que certains Etats parties ne respectent pas les provisions de la Convention en refusant volontairement de payer leur contribution. Elle considère également qu'il s'agit d'une obligation légale mais relève avant tout d'une obligation morale. Elle souligne que les Etats parties doivent respecter leur engagement, notamment les grands contributeurs afin de permettre la soutenabilité du Fonds du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation de la Palestine propose un amendement au projet de Résolution en ce sens.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted that it has doubled its contribution to the World Heritage Fund and is willing to continue with this dynamic. The Delegation underlined that States Parties have to fulfil their commitments and stressed that the Secretariat is implementing the contributions in a good manner. In particular, the Delegation emphasised that the work on thematic studies provides a good opportunity for all stakeholders to advance on state of conservation issues of World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed concern about the budget situation emphasizing that state of conservation issues are pressing whilst funds have been decreasing. It considers that this mismatch between the implementation of the Convention and available funds called upon the responsibility of States Parties to secure funding for natural and cultural heritage in light of the 2030 Agenda. The Delegation highlighted that it has doubled its compulsory contribution and would continue to be extended. It further stressed that it provides support to Priority Africa and to natural World Heritage properties.

La Délégation de la **France** est consciente des difficultés financières de la Convention. Elle souligne que la redevance volontaire par candidature a été présenté de manière hâtive à Bakou. La Délégation y est opposée sur le principe car cette redevance rompt l'égalité entre les différents porteurs de projets. Tous ne disposant pas de grandes ressources financières, elle souligne que les porteurs de projets privilégient des contributions volontaires déconnectées des inscriptions. La Délégation rappelle qu'elle a donné plus de 100,000 euros supplémentaires en 2019 et espère augmenter sa contribution volontaire en 2020.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** highlighted that the issue of the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund is of utmost importance for all States Parties and for the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation further emphasised the moral responsibility of States Parties to make their compulsory and voluntary contributions. Finally, it reiterated its suggestion to explore options to involve the Vice-Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee and proposed to use the National Commissions to UNESCO as a second sphere of consultations.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stressed that while the limitation of nominations represented a step forward, further limitations would be required. It recalled that it has also doubled its contributions and encouraged other States Parties to provide support through voluntary resources. It welcomed the new cost-sharing model for the evaluation of nominations but underlined that this should be seen as complementary to assessed contributions and not

replace them. Finally, the Delegation requested the Secretariat to include this cost-sharing mechanism in the regular reporting.

The Delegation of **Botswana** expressed its support to the World Heritage Fund and to the proposal by the United Republic of Tanzania.

The Delegation of **Hungary** joined other Delegations in raising concerns about the World Heritage Fund sustainability and underscored that no political conditions should be attached to payments. Regarding the cost-sharing model for the evaluation of nominations, the Delegation recalled that the proposal was discussed for two years resulting in an overwhelming support and its adoption by the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation therefore called on all submitting States Parties to pay this new voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund in order to support its sustainability.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** echoed the suggestion on more encouragement within countries to fulfil their legal obligation. The Director expressed her gratitude to all States Parties that have increased their contribution to reinforce human resources of the Secretariat, particularly given the considerable workload that is added with every newly inscribed World Heritage property.

Le **Rapporteur** fait la lecture paragraphe par paragraphe du projet de Résolution et fait part de l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la Palestine, qui inclut notamment d'ajouter que le paiement des contributions annuelles au Fonds du patrimoine mondial est également une obligation morale ; de suspendre temporairement l'examen des propositions d'inscriptions présentées par les Etats parties qui refusent délibérément de payer leurs contributions mises en recouvrement jusqu'à ce qu'un accord soit trouvé concernant un futur plan de paiement ; et de demander au Secrétariat d'adresser une lettre à tous les États parties ayant des arriérés, leur demandant s'ils sont disposés à établir un tel plan de paiement des contributions impayées.

La Délégation de la **France** invite l'Assemblée générale à s'interroger sur le concept de moralité. Elle estime superflue soumettre le paiement des contributions annuelles au Fonds du patrimoine mondial à une évaluation à la fois légale et morale. La Délégation exprime l'avis que le paiement des contributions relève d'une obligation légale tandis que la moralité reste un jugement subjectif. Elle souhaite ainsi le retrait du terme moral de l'amendement au projet de Résolution.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested to maintain the original Paragraph 6 of the Draft Resolution.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** supported not to include the term "moral" in the paragraph, while understanding concerns raised by the Delegation of Palestine.

The Delegation of **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** expressed its preference to keep the word "moral" in the paragraph, given that States Parties to the Convention have a moral obligation.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** considère que l'Assemblée générale manque de cohérence avec les propos qu'elle a tenu précédemment sur les obligations légales et morales des contributions au Fonds du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation regrette que plusieurs Etats membres se dérobaient dès lors que l'on évoque les questions de principe et insiste néanmoins sur le maintien du terme moral.

La Délégation de l'**Arménie** considère que la difficulté réside dans la juxtaposition du terme moral au concept d'obligation. Elle propose ainsi de laisser l'expression d'obligation légale en y ajoutant que le paiement de la contribution revêt aussi un caractère moral.

The Delegation of **Seychelles** commented on the difference between legal and moral obligations, that sanction exists for legal obligation whereas moral obligation speaks to one's conscience. The Delegation stated that there is no need to say legal and moral, as moral obligation exists before transformed to legal obligation.

The Delegation of **Brazil** also indicated that it is not necessary to add morality and suggested to keep the original Paragraph 6 of the Draft Resolution.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** revient sur la proposition de la Délégation de l'Arménie et attire l'attention du Président sur la traduction dans la version anglaise de la notion du caractère moral en remplacement de l'obligation morale.

The Delegation of **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** reiterated that a reference to morality should be included in the paragraph, considering that there are two distinct groups between those who cannot pay contributions and those who do not want to pay and thus are not complying with their obligations under the Convention.

The Delegation of **Palestine** clarified that the point of discussion is about the States Parties who deliberately refuse to pay contributions. The Delegation expressed its willingness to withdraw its proposal if the proposal by Armenia is accepted by consensus.

La Délégation de la **Bosnie-Herzégovine** remarque qu'une chose légale n'est pas nécessairement morale et soutient en conséquence la proposition de la Délégation de l'Arménie.

The Delegation of **Israel** indicated that it would not support the proposal by the Delegation of Armenia and reiterated that the paragraph should stay as per the original Draft Resolution.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support to the proposal of the Delegation of Armenia.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** considère que les Etats contribuent au Fonds du patrimoine mondial non seulement par obligation légale mais aussi pour l'intérêt des sites du patrimoine mondial et parce qu'ils sont convaincus de l'esprit de la Convention. La Délégation estime que la moralité réside dans cet intérêt et cet esprit et apporte conséquemment son soutien à la proposition de la Délégation de l'Arménie.

The Delegation of **Guatemala** expressed its support for the Delegation of Armenia's proposal and agreed with Palestine and Venezuela on the importance of a moral dimension. In order to remain consistent with the discussions held on a Code of conduct, the moral dimension should be considered in the framework of legal obligations under the Convention.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also supported the proposal by the Delegation of Armenia, indicating that it is an appropriate wording.

The Delegation of **Jordan** joined other Delegations in support of the Delegation of Armenia's proposal.

The Delegation of **Tonga** also supported the proposal to include the word "moral" or "goodwill". It requested clarifications on whether States Parties that have ratified the Convention also includes those which have just signed the Convention.

The **Legal Advisor** explained regarding the difference between legal and moral that a legal obligation does not necessarily imply that it is moral nor the contrary not, in other terms, legal and moral are concepts that do not exclude each other.

The Delegation of **Palestine** reiterated that there was no contradiction in keeping its original proposal but supported Armenia's proposal as a consensual solution.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that Article 16.1 of the Convention with the use of the term "*undertake*" clearly implies the legal obligation for States Parties to pay contributions regularly, every two years, to the World Heritage Fund. He pointed out that Article 16.2, however, would imply that States Parties which made such a declaration "*shall not*" be bound to pay regularly every two years, to the World Heritage Fund. However, he noted that this does not conclude the reasoning, since Article 16.4 contains a further provision, which stipulates that the contributions "*shall*" be paid on a regular basis, but "*should not*" be less than the contributions which they should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of Article 16.1. He reiterated that States Parties which have not made the declaration have an obligation to contribute every two years in the amount that is determined by the General Assembly. He explained that States Parties which have made declarations in line with Article 16.2 still have the obligation to pay contributions on a regular basis at least every two years. The amount of such contributions is not determined but it is recommended not to be less than the contributions which they should have paid if they have been bound by Article 16.1. Lastly, he commented that Article 16.5 nevertheless contains a negative consequence for those States Parties which have not paid voluntary or compulsory contributions for the current year and the calendar year immediately preceding, as they "*shall not be eligible as a Member of the World Heritage Committee*".

La Délégation de l'**Arménie** s'interroge sur la nécessité de relayer l'appel du Comité du patrimoine mondial lorsque l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties est légitime à lancer ledit appel. Le représentant de la Délégation de l'Arménie souhaite ainsi que l'Assemblée générale lance un appel aux Etats parties pour le règlement dans la mesure du possible de leurs contributions annuelles.

The Delegation of **Jordan** agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Armenia, considering that the General Assembly is a the more suitable Governing Body to make such call to all States Parties.

The Delegation of **Palestine**, supported by **Jordan**, noted that it is not the first time that the General Assembly calls on State Parties to pay their contributions, and therefore suggested to that the General Assembly reiterates its plea to the States Parties.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** raised concerns over the use of the word "deliberately", considering difficult to assess whether not paying its contributions is deliberately done or not.

The Delegation of **Brazil** was not in favor to temporarily suspend the examination of nominations submitted by States Parties with arrears, given that the penalty for non-compliance with Article 16 of the Convention is established under Article 16.5.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked the Legal Advisor to clarify whether the suspension of the examination of nominations submitted by States Parties with arrears was in line with the requirements of the Convention.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated that it was a complex question with no simple yes or no answer. He first recalled Article 16.5 of the Convention which provides a negative consequence for not paying financial contributions relating to the eligibility to be a member of the Committee. He explained that the General Assembly could not impose to States Parties new obligations in addition to those foreseen in the Convention without revising the Convention. He noted that the question is linked to whether the suspension of the examination of nominations would affect rights and obligations provided under the Convention. He referred to the 7th Extraordinary session of the Committee in 2004, during which the Legal Advisor provided a legal opinion on possible restrictions on the submission and examination of nominations. He noted that based on Article 11.1 and 11.2, to prohibit Committee members from submitting nominations would be contrary to the provisions of the Convention. He quoted the Legal Advisor's explanation at the time: "*it does appear to be possible that the Committee imposes on itself certain restrictions in examining nominations*" such as to "*set a low priority to the nominations submitted by its members or not to examine them during the session with a view to rationalizing its activities and methods of work*" which "*would not impinge on the basic rights of the members of the Committee to have their properties considered for inclusion in the World Heritage List*". He commented that the same reasoning could be extended to States Parties not member of the Committee. He stressed that this matter requires a very careful consideration, to ensure that any limitations would not impinge on the rights of States Parties under the Convention. He indicated that the amendment to the Draft Resolution was not precise enough to assess in full all the possible legal implications.

The Delegation of **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** proposed to add "*without detriment to the rules regarding the protection of those States that cannot pay for causes beyond their control*", such as natural disasters, in order to distinguish them from those who deliberately refuse to pay their contributions.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated that the proposed amendment was unclear on whether the proposed suspension applies only to the final examination by the Committee or also to prior steps of the evaluation of the nomination, and if such suspension would be effective immediately or later during the Nomination Process. He remarked that refusing to pay deliberately was not a notion precise enough and would require to specify the procedures and which entity would determine if a State Party has deliberately refused to pay. He also indicated that the entity in charge of coordinating this process and reaching out States Parties concerned regarding a future plan of payment should be clarified. He noted that the procedures to determine the adequacy of a plan and the conditions for terminating the suspension also required further elaboration, giving the example of possible cases when the plan of payment is not respected. He noted that the amendment could suggest the Secretariat to be entrusted with this overall task as it is invited to submit to the World Heritage Committee a draft amendment to the Operational Guidelines that includes details for a temporary suspension of examination of nominations for States Parties refusing the establishment of a plan of payment.

The Delegation of **Palestine**, while respecting rights of States Parties to submit nominations, explained that the aim of its proposal was to push States Parties to fulfill and respect an existing obligation in view of the costly process of the evaluation of nominations. It further clarified that the proposed suspension is valid until the State Party expresses its willingness to pay and would therefore not affect countries in difficulty to pay arrears. The Delegation clarified that it could be assumed that a State Party deliberately refuse to pay if it responds negatively to the letter addressed by the Secretariat asking if the State Party is willing to establish a plan of payment.

The Delegation of **Germany**, referring to the cost-sharing model for the evaluation of nominations, drew attention to a potential complicated situation where a State Party pay this voluntary contribution for nominations without paying its assessed contributions. Considering the pending issues to be clarified, it proposed to postpone this discussion on the revision of the Operational Guidelines to the next Committee session.

La Délégation de la **Bosnie-Herzégovine** adhère aux propos tenus concernant les conséquences en cas de défaut de paiement des contributions. Elle soutient la proposition de la Délégation du Venezuela. La Délégation est d'accord avec la proposition de la Délégation de la Palestine de biffer le mot délibérément mais juge nécessaire le report de l'adoption du projet de Résolution afin de concilier l'impératif d'ordre moral sans pour autant sanctionner les Etats parties.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** raised concerns over the wording of the amendment to the Draft Resolution, believing that the question of arrears relates to factual considerations rather than deliberate decisions. It suggested to mandate the World Heritage Committee to consider the possible suspension of States Parties which have not paid their assessed contributions since a determined date. According to the Delegation, the determination of a specific date would make the implementation of such measure easier and may also be decided by the General Assembly.

La Délégation de l'**Arménie** estime qu'une dernière chance doit être offerte avant de décider d'une sanction à l'encontre d'un Etat partie. Elle est en accord avec l'envoi d'une lettre demandant aux Etats membres s'ils sont disposés à établir un plan de paiement des contributions. La Délégation croit que le plus important est d'obtenir une réponse qui permet de mieux apprécier le degré de bonne volonté d'un pays. La Délégation est d'avis qu'en fonction de cette réponse des sanctions peuvent éventuellement être prises contre un Etat partie, comme la suspension de ses droits d'éligibilité au Comité du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation conclut qu'une telle sanction serait bien plus justifiée à la suite de la réception d'une réponse négative de l'Etat partie sur sa volonté d'établir un plan de paiement des contributions.

The Delegation of **Australia** believed preferable to identify a specific date in the calendar year a nomination is lodged concerning States Parties with arrears. It noted that the World Heritage Committee can decide on how it conducts its business, including on restrictions in examining nominations. It requested further clarifications from the Legal Advisor as to whether the General Assembly has the authority to decide on this matter or whether it is a prerogative of the Committee. In such case, the Delegation considered that the General Assembly could only request the Committee to consider this issue without giving any direction.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** raised concerns on the suspension of examination of nominations, pointing out many issues such as the question of the relevant entity to decide upon such suspension. It considered that adding such a penalty would not be in line with the Convention and therefore recommended to reflect on this issue at a later date.

The Delegation of **Israel** raised concerns over a language associated with sanction and punishment and proposed to delete the reference to the suspension of examination of nominations.

The **Legal Advisor** reiterated the legal opinion provided at the 7th Extraordinary session of the Committee in 2004, which stated that States Parties have the right to submit and have their nominations examined by the Committee. He further reiterated that the Committee has the possibility, without impinging on the rights of States Parties, to set a low priority to the

nominations submitted or to not examine them during a Committee session with a view to rationalizing its activities and methods of work. He reaffirmed that the amendment to the Draft Resolution was not precise enough for him to assess all the legal implications that such a measure could have.

The **Chairperson** informed that the discussions on Agenda Item 7 would be continued at a later stage of the present session pending clarifications on legal aspects.

ITEM 10 **POSSIBILITY OF ELABORATION OF A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE STATES PARTIES, THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES** (*continuation*)

Document: WHC/19/22.GA/10

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 10**

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis, Vice-Chairperson of the General Assembly and Chairperson of the drafting group created to prepare a Draft Resolution on Agenda Item 10, to brief the General Assembly on the outcomes of the drafting group.

The Delegation of **Saint Kitts and Nevis** reported that the drafting group acknowledged diverse views, where some States Parties wished to widen the discussion of a Code of Conduct to the Nomination Process and to all stakeholders while other States Parties wanted to exclusively focus on States Parties themselves. The Delegation explained that according to legal advice provided to the drafting group, it should be stressed that UNESCO staff and the Advisory Bodies have their own rules and texts with respect to ethical standards, and that any contradiction to existing rules and regulations should therefore be avoided. The Delegation explained that different perceptions existed on the title of a Code of Conduct and that a consensus would need to emerge from a future Open-ended working group. It pointed out that a Code of Conduct should not reinvent the wheel, considering that binding and non-binding elements have been created over the years within the framework of the Convention. A Code of Conduct should therefore build on those elements and not contradict existing texts of the Convention. The Delegation underlined that a future Open-ended working group would have to be inclusive and would need engage at the appropriate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in order to consider the views of these important stakeholders. The Representative of the Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis was of the opinion that a Code of Conduct should be primarily designed for States Parties not with the aim of sanctioning, but of inducing behavioral change among States Parties in order to achieve the highest ethical standards of professionalism, equity and transparency. He concluded by stressing that such a text would not be an end but a way of oiling the existing well-functioning wheels of the Convention and to help all stakeholders.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed of the practical modalities of the 13th Extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee, held to elect the Bureau of the 44th session of the Committee.

The meeting was closed.

SECOND DAY – Thursday, 28 November 2019
FOURTH MEETING
3 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla (Kuwait)

ITEM 8 FOLLOW UP AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE AS ENDORSED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/8
WHC/19/22.GA/INF.8

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 8**

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to examine item 8 of the agenda and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for a brief presentation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** outlined that the World Heritage Committee after having examined relevant recommendations of the General Conference open-ended working group on governance requested the World Heritage Centre to transmit Document WHC/18/42.COM/12B and corresponding Decision 42 COM 12B to the working group and to the current session of the General Assembly. She indicated that the Information Document (WHC/19/22.GA/INF.8) refers to Recommendation 74 of the Working Group and presents a consultation process. She further indicated that a synthesis report of the consultations would be reflected in the Culture Sector's contribution to the Director-General's Preliminary Proposals on the 41 C/4 and 41 C/5.

The Delegation of **Denmark** expressed great appreciation with the Secretariat's efforts in the implementation of the Governance Recommendation, underscoring that the governance reform was among its top priority. It looked forward for further reporting, particularly regarding the need to reduce and manage politicization of nominations and decision.

The Draft Resolution **22 GA 8** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 8** of the Agenda.

ITEM 9 FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: OUTCOMES AND PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN 2012-2022

Document: WHC/19/22.GA/9

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 9**

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to examine item 9 of the agenda and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for a brief presentation.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the General Assembly adopted in 2011 the Strategic Action Plan and the Vision to guide the Implementation of the World

Heritage Convention over the decade 2012-2022. She indicated that the General Assembly in 2013, 2015 and 2017 welcomed the progress in the performance of the implementation plan of the Strategic Action Plan and requested that a progress report on the implementation of this Strategic Action Plan be submitted to its session in 2019. She also indicated that the progress report presents the implementation status since the 21st session of the General Assembly, notably of the six goals and 17 priorities as well as relevant key outcomes.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** welcomed the progress in the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan. Regarding the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Delegation considered that it needed further examination to ensure that it is done in conformity with paragraphs 183 to 187 of the Operational Guidelines for inscription and removal. The Delegation emphasized that irregularities currently surround procedures related to the List of World Heritage in Danger Listing have not been adequately treated.

The Delegation of **Norway** remarked that in general the implementation of the Convention has improved in communication, development of policy guidelines, capacity-building, more transparency, dialogue and a better prioritization. The Delegation commended all stakeholders that contributed to this success and appreciated their efforts. However, it remarked that there were still worrying trends, such as the tendencies to inscribe properties without clearly identified Outstanding Universal Value. It stressed that such decisions have an impact on resources of all involved stakeholders, and stated having high expectations on the reform of the Nomination Process. It pointed out that the increasing number of state of conservation reports with Impact Assessments not sufficiently carried out. It stressed that the role of the Convention as one of the most important global conservation instruments and called on the States Parties to be conscious of the common responsibility to guarantee its credibility. It pointed out that cost effective resolutions, clear priorities of actions and decisions in line with resources should be guiding principles without exception. It supported seizing the 50th anniversary of the Convention as an opportunity to reflect on the Global Strategy that would be an important guidance in the implementation of the Convention.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed the importance of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to tackle challenges such as climate change, growing populations and cities, access to sustainable and affordable energy. It further stressed the urgency of addressing these issues to avoid negative consequences for World Heritage properties. The Delegation emphasized the need to strengthen existing strategies, such as the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation (HUL). It believed efforts should focus on World Heritage properties located in densely populated urban areas, where achieving SDGs and to safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value is much required. It proposed to set up meetings for sharing experiences and best practices to tackle these challenges.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** welcomed the efforts of the Secretariat in the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan and emphasized the need for the World Heritage Centre to more actively accommodate growing demands and strengthening the role of the Convention in developing and facilitating relevant discourses in heritage interpretation, imperative to allow better presentation of heritage by promoting larger engagement with related communities and reflecting their diverse perspectives. It recalled that the Delegation has been committed to foster interpretations strategies that can promote better understanding of World Heritage properties. The Delegation recalled World Heritage Committee's decisions of 2015 and 2018 regarding the Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining. The Delegation expressed its disappointment to the lack of willingness by the Government of Japan towards the dialogue encouraged by the Committee. Nevertheless, it hoped that Japan had made its utmost and faithful efforts to implement previous Committee decisions, and looked forward to these reflected in the updated state of conservation report of this property. It brought the attention

to this critical matter to uphold the authority and credibility of the Committee, and requested due diligence and goodwill to encourage the Government of Japan to take appropriate follow-up measures on this matter.

The Delegation of **China** commended the World Heritage Centre for achieving the implementation of many goals of the Strategic Plan. It hoped that the General Conference and the World Heritage Centre could achieve further implementation in order to have more ambitious discussions of a future plan after 2022. It looked forward to closer cooperation between the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and Category 2 Centres. It mentioned that Chinese Category 2 Centres would like to increase their contribution. The Delegation expressed its will to support the Priority Africa and strengthen its cooperation with African States Parties. It also indicated its will to organize a youth and culture creativity forum to attract more youth to work in the field of World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the Secretariat for clarifications on the financing of the Upstream process.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to discussions held during the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Baku, 2019) regarding the List of World Heritage in Danger and the review of the Reactive Monitoring process. She reassured that the World Heritage Centre is aware of the issue and would continue looking into this question during the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan. With regards to the Global Strategy towards the 50th anniversary, she indicated that proposals by the Delegation of Norway had been covered in the Draft Resolution and discussions held at the current session. In this regard, she welcomed proposals by the Delegation of the Netherlands, notably on the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation (HUL). She supported statements made on the importance of Category 2 Centres and Priority Africa. She clarified that the Upstream process is financed through a special budget line available for Small Island Developing States and Least Developed Countries, and also through the World Heritage Fund under Preparatory Assistance subject to availability of funds.

The Draft Resolution **22 GA 9** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 9** of the Agenda.

ITEM 10 **POSSIBILITY OF ELABORATION OF A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE STATES PARTIES, THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES** (*continuation*)

Document: WHC/19/22.GA/10

Draft Resolution: **22 GA 10**

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Draft Resolution prepared by the drafting group had been finalized and distributed to all States Parties. He then gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for additional comments.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** observed that the establishment of an Open-ended working group implied financial resources from the Secretariat to pursue it. She remarked that the funding could follow the same scheme than of the Ad-hoc Working Group, i.e. the States Parties could organize themselves the Open-ended working group.

Le **Rapporteur** présente le projet de Résolution paragraphe par paragraphe.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed a wording to reflect that the Open-ended working group would be financed by extra-budgetary funding or organized by the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Norway** stressed the importance of organizing the Open-ended working group and requested clarifications on the funding procedures of working groups in other Conventions of the Culture Sector.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether no funding for the Open-ended working group would result in the impossibility of developing a Code of Conduct.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recognized that the establishment of an Open-ended working group was a necessity and could not be subject to extra-budgetary funding. In this regard, she reiterated that a possible solution would be that States Parties organize it similarly to the Ad-hoc Working Group.

The **Assistant Director-General** replied that in the case of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC) the working group is financed by funds from the IFPC, and in the case of the working group of the 2003 Convention funds come from extra-budgetary funding from two States Parties.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed to encourage States Parties to provide extra-budgetary funds for the Open-ended working group or to organize it.

Draft Resolution **22 GA 10** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **item 10** of the Agenda.

ITEM 7 DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 16 OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION (*continuation*)

*Documents: WHC/19/22.GA/7
 WHC/19/22.GA/INF.7*

Draft Resolution: 22 GA 7

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to examine Agenda Item 7. He recalled that several paragraphs of the Draft Resolution were approved but some paragraphs still had to be adopted following further consultations. He then gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture to present the amendments to the Draft Resolution.

Le **Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture** présente le projet de Résolution en soulignant qu'un consensus a été atteint vis-à-vis de la partie restante à approuver par l'Assemblée générale.

Le **Rapporteur** lit les paragraphes restants à adopter du projet de Résolution.

The **Chairperson** commented that discussing at length this Agenda Item allowed for a very positive Draft Resolution. He thanked States Parties that have doubled their contributions and encouraged other States Parties to do the same.

The Delegation of **Palestine** clarified that the amendment it has proposed were not suggested for any national interest nor punishing any State Party, but to ensure the respect of an existing obligation in the Convention and the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The Delegation stressed that it has never used terms related to sanction or punishment during its interventions at the present session, and concluded that it hoped that States Parties who may have felt targeted by the amendment would reconsider their position and understand that paying its contributions is not only a legal obligation but also a moral obligation.

Draft Resolution **22 GA 7** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **item 7** of the Agenda.

The Delegation of **Palestine** proposed to include an item in the Provisional Agenda of the 23rd session of the General Assembly regarding the revision of the allocation of seats to the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation explained that following Resolution **1 EXT.GA 3** the provision to avoid clean slates was not implemented at the last three sessions of the General Assembly and believed the next session of the General Assembly could be the opportunity to reconsider this matter.

La Délégation du **Mali** exprime sa plus sincère gratitude à l'Assemblée générale pour son élection au Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle l'engagement du Mali pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Elle rappelle également que les quatre sites maliens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial représentaient des attractions touristiques jusqu'à la crise politico-sécuritaire de 2012. La Délégation s'engage à réduire son mandat de 6 ans à 4 ans.

La Délégation du **Japon** rappelle qu'elle emploie tous les efforts nécessaires pour la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle assure que le rapport sur l'état de conservation sur les Sites de la révolution industrielle Meiji au Japon : sidérurgie, construction navale et extraction houillère, sera soumis au Secrétariat dans les délais impartis.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** terminant son mandat au sein du Comité du patrimoine mondial, souhaite remercier l'Assemblée générale des États parties, les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, les membres du Groupe Va, le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain, le Secrétariat et les Organisations consultatives pour leur confiance et leur soutien indéfectible durant son mandat. La Délégation rappelle que la préservation du patrimoine n'est pas toujours reconnue comme une priorité dans les pays en développement mais que l'unité des membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial facilite l'atteinte des objectifs. Aussi, elle indique que des résultats significatifs ont été atteints durant son mandat, notamment en ce qui concerne le renforcement des capacités. Elle reconnaît que des défis persistent comme une Liste du patrimoine mondial plus représentative et équilibrée, et la contribution effective des États parties au Fonds du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** being the Chairperson of the 1st Extraordinary session of the General Assembly (UNESCO, 2014) confirmed that at the time there was a proposal for applying this distribution of seats on an experimental basis for 6 years and then reevaluate it. However, it pointed out that this proposal was not adopted by the General Assembly of State Parties. It affirmed that there are parts of the decision, namely the issue of clean slates that were not being respected.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by the Delegations of **Australia, France, Estonia, Finland, India, Turkey, Japan, Barbados, Switzerland** and **Armenia** underscored that it was premature to consider reopening the debate on this matter.

The Delegation indicated that the elections had been running smoothly and did not deem necessary to reopen this issue. It also stressed that each State Party is sovereign to decide whether to present its candidature or not and was not in favor of the proposal of the Delegation of Palestine.

The Delegation of **Palestine** reiterated that this issue needed to be reviewed and noted that even State Parties not in favor to reopen the debate admit that Resolution **1 EXT.GA 3** was not being respected. Although understanding it could be premature, it indicated that the system has been tested for the past three sessions and stressed that it needed to be evaluated at a future session. The Delegation requested that the Secretariat keep the proposed Draft Resolution in the records for the future.

The **Chairperson** observed that a majority of States Parties did not wish to include an item on this matter at the next session of the General Assembly.

Before closing the session, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** congratulated newly elected members of the World Heritage Committee, underlining the very responsible task they were entrusted with. She reminded of the critical importance of the World Heritage Convention in view of its 50th anniversary.

The **Chairperson** thanked the General Assembly for its professionalism and constructive debates. He further thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and her staff as well as all staff that contributed to the success of the meeting.

The **Chairperson** closed the 22nd session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

**Address by Ernesto Ottone Ramírez,
Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO,
on the occasion of the opening of the 22nd Session of the General Assembly of the
State Parties to the World Heritage Convention**

Excellences, Mesdames, Messieurs,

Je voudrais souhaiter chaleureusement la bienvenue à toutes les Délégations, Observateurs et Organisations consultatives à cette 22^e session de l'Assemblée générale des États parties à la Convention du patrimoine mondial. Permettez-moi tout d'abord d'exprimer ma sincère gratitude à Son Excellence le Ministre Garayev pour sa direction du Comité du patrimoine mondial au cours de l'année écoulée. J'ai également l'honneur de souhaiter la bienvenue au Président de la 44^e session du Comité, Son Excellence Monsieur le Vice-Ministre Tian Xuejun qui a été élu en juillet dernier.

Chers collègues,

A l'aube du 50^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, je suis certain que vos discussions se concentreront sur les avancées, les progrès mais aussi sur les défis auxquels la Convention fait face.

Si ces défis sont présents depuis plusieurs années, ils sont de plus en plus nombreux et complexes. Les menaces sont devenues réalités. Les conflits armés qui engendrent la destruction intentionnelle du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel sont réels. Les catastrophes naturelles sont de plus en plus nombreuses et dévastatrices. De nouveaux conflits, notamment sociaux, apparaissent dans de nombreux pays causant également une destruction moins visible du patrimoine. Il convient de prendre en considération les insuffisances que nous avons pu expérimenter afin de renforcer la mission de l'UNESCO en termes d'éducation, de transmission et de sauvegarde du patrimoine. Ceci nous permettra en fin de compte de sensibiliser sur le fait que la destruction du patrimoine est synonyme de destruction de notre identité.

Vous avez pris des mesures et exprimé à maintes reprises votre unité contre la destruction aveugle du patrimoine et plus largement vous avez donc élevé votre voix contre

l'obscurantisme qui mène à la haine, contre l'ignorance et la méconnaissance de l'autre qui mènent à la barbarie, contre le repli et l'isolement qui sont les germes de la guerre.

Face à ces défis et menaces globales, l'UNESCO a renforcé son action notamment en développant ou en s'associant à des initiatives concrètes au cours des dernières années. Je pense notamment aux différentes initiatives comme celle de la Directrice générale concernant Mossoul qui, à travers la revitalisation des institutions éducatives et culturelles et la réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel, vise à la promotion de la tolérance notamment, ou encore prochainement le séminaire sur Palmyre (Syrie) qui aura lieu le 18 décembre.

Je pense également à l'action de l'UNESCO envers un enjeu déterminant de notre époque, le changement climatique, qui touche tous nos domaines de compétences et en premier lieu le patrimoine. Ainsi, depuis un peu plus de 10 ans, plus de 150 rapports sur l'état de conservation concernant plus de 40 biens du patrimoine mondial situés dans 33 États parties de toutes les régions du monde ont été examinés par le Comité en raison des impacts du changement climatique sur leur valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Dans ce cadre, une politique concernant le changement climatique et le patrimoine mondial sera présentée au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa prochaine session, pour adoption.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The challenges of Agenda 2030 are multiple. Many of UNESCO Member States have already adapted their public policy to meet the more cross cutting objectives of Sustainable Development. This process of evaluation and adaptation must continue if cultural policies are to remain relevant and to meet the needs of society. We must ensure these policies are evidence based and effectively measure impacts. In this regard, UNESCO launched culture 2030 indicators, which their importance have been highlighted during the Forum of Ministers of Culture.

The key to the success of the World Heritage Convention relies on high standards of credibility, ethics, transparency, cooperation and dialogue.

Many of you are reaffirming the importance of these standards of conduct which must be at the heart of our action and the fact that you will discuss a specific item on this matter during this session underlines the importance you are giving to it. Indeed, the credibility of the World Heritage Convention must be absolute at all stages, and it is primarily on the States Parties that this responsibility lies.

Showcasing culture within the United Nations and therefore in the eyes of the world, UNESCO must be irreproachable and credible to a public that is defiant. In these difficult times, we must ensure that our decisions are taken in mutual respect and in the respect of expertise which should be the source of scientific-based decisions.

This is a very serious matter that will ensure the credibility of our work and the credibility of the Convention to avoid undermining the spirit and values it has been carved in.

Dear colleagues, before you start your debates, allow me to congratulate the members of the World Heritage Committee that are terminating their mandate. Their actions and reflections have indeed contributed a great deal to the protection and safeguarding of World Heritage. To members who will be elected in the coming days, I would like to say that they have in their hands a very heavy responsibility. Indeed, World Heritage conservation means not only protecting sites of Outstanding Universal Value, it is protecting a legacy. It is an essential and immense responsibility that makes you accountable to future generations.

I thank you for your attention.