



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

# 16 GA

**Distribution Limited**

**WHC-07/16.GA/13**  
**Paris, 10 December 2008**  
**Original: English / French**

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

**SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES  
PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION  
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters**  
**24 – 25 October 2008**

## Report



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DAY 1 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>First Meeting.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.A    Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO .....	1
1.B    Election of the President, Vice-Presidents and Rapporteur of the General Assembly .....	4
2.A    Adoption of the Agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly.....	5
2.B    Adoption of the timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee ....	6
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee .....	10
<b>DAY 1 .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Second Meeting.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	13
3.A    Elections to the World Heritage Committee - Reflection on election procedures of World Heritage Committee Members and on the distribution of seats to ensure an equitable representation of the different Regions and Cultures of the World. ....	14
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	15
3.A    Elections to the World Heritage Committee - Reflection on election procedures of World Heritage Committee Members and on the distribution of seats to ensure an equitable representation of the different Regions and Cultures of the World (continued).....	16
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	22
3.A    Elections to the World Heritage Committee - Reflection on election procedures of World Heritage Committee Members and on the distribution of seats to ensure an equitable representation of the different Regions and Cultures of the World (continued).....	23
<b>DAY 2 .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Third meeting.....</b>	<b>27</b>
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	27
4.    Report of the Intergovernmental Committee for the protection of the World cultural and natural heritage on its activities (2006-2007).....	28
5.    Implementation of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre .....	29
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	34
5.    Implementation of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre (continued).....	34

<b>DAY 2 .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Fourth meeting .....</b>	<b>43</b>
3.A    Elections to the World Heritage Committee - Reflection on election procedures of World Heritage Committee members and on the distribution of seats to ensure an equitable representation of the different Regions and Cultures of the World (continued).....	43
3.B    Elections to the World Heritage Committee (continued) .....	46
6.      Assessment report of the Advisory Bodies' activities .....	47
7.      Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of the States Parties' contributions .....	49
8.      Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> .....	50
9.      Progress in the implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List .....	51
10.    Policy document on the impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties .....	60
11.    Report on the development of a revised recommendation on the conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes .....	64
12.    Other business: protection and management plans, conservation tools and promotion of World Heritage properties .....	65
13    Closure of the session.....	68
<b>ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>69</b>
Annex 1 : Agenda of the session	
Ordre du jour de la session .....	71
Annex 2 : Address by the Director-General of UNESCO .....	73
Annex 3 : Report of the chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on its activities in 2006-2007 .....	77
Annex 4 : Results of the elections to the World Heritage Committee	
Résultats des élections au Comité du patrimoine mondial.....	93

## DAY 1

### FIRST MEETING

24 October 2007

10h20 – 13h00

#### 1.A OPENING OF THE SESSION BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO

1. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO** opened the 16th General Assembly recalling that, for those having no seats in Room XI (where the General Assembly was being held) it was also possible to listen to the transmission of debates in Room X. She then gave the floor to the Director-General.
2. **Mr Koichiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO** welcomed the representatives of the States Parties and more particularly the four new States Parties, namely Guinea-Bissau, Montenegro, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Swaziland. He added that with the Republic of Djibouti, adhering on 2 November next, the *Convention* would soon number 185 States Parties. Thus, universality has almost been achieved.  
He recalled the interventions of these past days in the plenary sessions of the 34th session of the General Conference that had unanimously recognized the 1972 *Convention* as a flagship programme of UNESCO. Mentioning the “three normative pillars” in the cultural field – the Conventions of 1972, 2003 and 2005 – he emphasised their implementation in a complementary and coherent manner as they held great potential for the preservation and promotion of the major components of cultural diversity. He added that, until appropriate coordination mechanisms could be developed, it was essential that these three instruments mutually strengthen each other and develop in a harmonious complementarity. Thanking Lithuania and New Zealand for the excellent organization of the last two sessions of the World Heritage Committee (Vilnius in July 2006 and Christchurch in July 2007), he remarked that the forty new inscriptions over the past two years were always a great joy for all concerned. In this respect, he congratulated the States Parties of Mauritius, Gabon and Namibia for their first inscriptions on the World Heritage List. In regretting the removal for the first time in the history of the *Convention* of a property from the World Heritage List, the Director-General said that this demonstrated that, despite the efforts of the international community, it was not always possible to find ways to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of an inscribed property, and he called for increased vigilance and strengthening of preventive actions to avoid similar situations in the future. However, he was pleased that during the last two sessions, the working methods of the Committee had been rationalised, so that all the agenda items were discussed in the allotted time. In this respect, he congratulated the Chairpersons of these two sessions for leading the debates with rigour and courtesy.  
He indicated that the Committee must seriously concentrate its attention on the essential issues if it wished to accomplish its mission effectively and in the allocated time, and recalled that the state of conservation, the follow up to the Periodic Report as well as the inscriptions on the World Heritage List, must remain its priorities. He recalled that 2007, in more than one way, was an “evaluation year” for the *World*

*Heritage Convention*, and mentioned four points relating to an evaluation: evaluation of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision; evaluation of the results of the implementation of the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee; evaluation of the Partnership for the Conservation of the World Heritage (PACTE) ; and the Report of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre. He underlined the importance of the evaluation of the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee (4Cs) namely, Credibility of the List, Conservation, Capacity building and Communication, and was pleased with the addition of the 5th “C ” for “ Community ”. This addition was proposed by the New Zealand Delegation to enhance the role of communities in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*; it echoed the concern of the authors of the 2003 Convention who wished to include in the body of the text of the Convention, the importance of ensuring the widest possible participation of the communities who create, maintain and transmit the intangible heritage and actively involve them in its management. The Director-General concluded on this point, indicating that it was clear that it was one of many examples where the 1972 and 2003 Conventions mutually reinforced one another. With regard to the Audit Report on the Management of the World Heritage Centre, the Director-General indicated that it also comprised an important step in the work of the Committee by highlighting the need to improve the accounting and budgetary management of the Centre, clarify its structure, consolidate its administrative flexibility and strengthen its human capital. He added that, in conformity with Decision **31 COM 19**, an implementation plan for the recommendations of the Audit is presented for the attention of the participants of the General Assembly. He was pleased that his proposal to introduce an analytical accounting system, which could be considered as a pilot experience for the Organization, had been well received by the Committee, and hoped that it would be the same for the Assembly. He announced that after having consulted the Executive Board, he was ready to restructure the World Heritage Centre to enable a more rational functionality and to create an Orientation Committee comprising the two Assistant Directors-General for Culture and Sciences as well as the Director of the Centre. This Committee would be responsible for orienting the preparation of each C/5 and the corresponding work plans for the World Heritage Centre to ensure the effective involvement of the Science Sector.

Recalling the importance of geographical representation, he addressed his best wishes for success to the candidates for the nine seats to be filled, as well as to the new Chairperson of the Committee, Madame Cameron, and warmly thanked the outgoing members of the Committee for their unfailing commitment and remarkable contribution to the work of the Committee. The complete speech of the Director-General is in Annex 2.

3. Thanking the Director-General, the **Assistant Director-General for Culture** proposed presenting possible intersectoral cooperative perspectives before proceeding with the election of the Chairperson of the General Assembly and members of the Committee. She then gave the floor to the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Sciences.
4. The **Assistant Director-General for Sciences** presented the strategic cooperation objectives of the Natural Sciences Sector and the World Heritage Centre in the light of achieving the Millennium Development Goals and enhancing environmental and social sustainability through the existing programmes. He underlined the complementarities of the Programmes of the Natural Sciences Sector and the *World Heritage Convention*, particularly pointing out the mutual benefit of the Man & Biosphere Programme, GeoParks and World Heritage sites. Recalling the different legal status of the sites protected as biosphere reserves or World Heritage sites, he mentioned the necessity to enhance cooperation mechanisms between the sectors so as to provide best support to the States Parties. He further mentioned examples of such cooperation carried out among others in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In view of strengthened

exchange and cooperation, the Assistant Director-General for Sciences invited the States Parties to attend the forthcoming World Congress on Biosphere Reserves, which will be held in Madrid (Spain) in February 2008. Next to the important issue of Climate Change, he designated additional fields for future cooperation, namely coastal and urban ecosystems and sustainable tourism. He highlighted the link to be made between the World Heritage Cities Programme, as well as the Sustainable Tourism Programme of the World Heritage Centre, and the initiatives in the Man & Biosphere Programme of the Natural Sciences Sector with a view to protecting urban environment and enhancement of tourism management. He finally emphasized the need for a joint capacity building initiative carried out by both sectors. The Assistant Director-General for Sciences informed the General Assembly that the document on the New Strategy for the Collaboration of the World Heritage Centre and the Natural Sciences Sector will be elaborated in the forthcoming months and presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in July 2008 in Quebec, Canada.

5. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** was pleased with this will to strengthen cooperation between the two sectors, cooperation which has existed on an ad hoc basis for many years, but which needed to be widened and made systematic. However, she wished to comment on three points that were the subject of mutual concern.

The first point of her intervention concerned the links between biological diversity and cultural diversity. She added that a common programme had been launched during the preceding biennium and developed at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, on the conservation of biological and cultural diversity. She pointed out that the international symposium on the role of sacred sites and cultural landscapes in the framework of the Aichi Universal Exhibition (Japan) in May 2005 had comprised one of the important steps, and recalled that the cultural values and traditional systems of belief are powerful elements for the protection of the world environment and its living organisms. A chapter of the World Report on Cultural Diversity will deal with this reflection.

The second point concerns the close links that must be woven between the work carried out on the World Heritage marine sites and that of the International Oceanographic Commission concerning the protection of marine ecosystems as well as between the World Heritage sites and Biosphere Reserves, indicating that about thirty World Heritage sites had a direct link with a biosphere reserve. She added that when a World Heritage property constituted the core of a biosphere reserve, the latter – as a buffer zone or transition zone – enables ecological connection where a viable socio-economic development is conceivable, in particular in respect of tourism. A concerted action with regard to conservation and sustainable development must therefore be established between biosphere reserves and properties inscribed on the List, but also between marine sites and sites protected by the IOC.

The last point of her intervention concerned the systematic use of space technologies. She indicated that to document and measure the disappearance of forests, desert encroachment or the development of cities, the systematic use of spatial technologies enables a monitored surveillance of the changes affecting the most outstanding places of the planet and the biosphere reserves for which the two sectors have responsibility. Citing the sociologist, Edgar Morin, she added that the demands of conservation must accommodate the social changes and ways of life of populations, and required innovative models and participative modalities that can ensure a balance between a social and environmental viability and appropriate conservation. The global challenges such as climate change, deforestation, desertification, the loss of biodiversity, and rapid urbanisation with which we are all confronted, need a global and interdisciplinary approach to be able to meet the complex challenge. It is in UNESCO's power to promote this interdisciplinary approach. She concluded that it was an opportunity that we should exploit.

## **1B ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE-PRESIDENTS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/1B,*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.1B*

6. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** then addressed the first item on the agenda for adoption (1B), the election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur of the General Assembly and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to provide clarifications and new information.
7. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that the Secretariat had received a letter from Morocco proposing H.E. Mrs Bennani as Chairperson of the 16th General Assembly. He added that the Secretariat had also received letters from the Delegations of Austria and Japan concerning the function of Vice-President and from Cameroon for the function of Rapporteur of the General Assembly. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** opened the floor to the room.
8. The Delegation of **Algeria** supported the candidature of Mrs Bennani, adding that she had long experience in Arab and world heritage.
9. The intervention received acclamation approving the candidature of Morocco and the **Assistant Director-General for Culture** judged that there was no need for other delegations to take the floor, and requested Mrs Bennani to take a place on the platform. She requested delegates if they were in agreement with the remainder of the composition of the Bureau as read out by the Director of the World Heritage Centre. She obtained their agreement by acclamation.
10. After having thanked the States Parties for their confidence in her, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proceeded with the adoption of item 2A.
11. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the draft agenda as included in item 2A, pointing out that Resolution **16 GA 3A.2** on the adoption of the electronic voting system would need immediate discussion. He also informed the General Assembly that there was a specific paper form if States Parties wished to make amendments to resolutions.
12. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** briefly explained the voting mechanism.
13. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the timetable of the 16th session of the General Assembly as per item 2B, informing the delegates that the electronic voting system would be a first-time event at UNESCO, and explaining the recess of the afternoon due to conflicting timetables with the General Conference session.
14. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** warmly welcomed this new electronic voting system which would be a great time-saver.



**Resolution: 16 GA 1B**

The General Assembly,

1. Elects H. Exc. Mrs Aziza BENNANI (Morocco) as Chairperson of the 16th General Assembly;
2. Elects Raymond ASOMBANG (Cameroon) as Rapporteur of the 16th General Assembly;
3. Elects Austria and Japan as Vice-Chairpersons of the 16th General Assembly.

**2.A ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/2A*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.2A*

15. Following the presentation by the **Secretariat** of Agenda Items 2 and 3, as well as Draft Resolution **16 GA 3A**, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** invited the States Parties to make observations and move towards the adoption of the Agenda (see Annex 1).
16. The Delegation of **Norway** said that the agenda was very heavy and not much time had been allocated to important issues.
17. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** and the **Secretariat** mentioned that the agenda had planned for a “ night session ” to provide time for discussions on all items.
18. The Delegation of **Lithuania** noted that was not necessary to organize the General Assembly during the General Conference and proposed choosing another timeframe for future General Assembly sessions.
19. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** informed that it would present a draft resolution on this issue for the General Assembly to be organized before or following the General Conference.
20. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the General Assembly was an independent body under an international convention.
21. The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the Chairperson on her election, and underlined that the period of the General Conference is a unique period when representatives from all States Parties are present at UNESCO’s Headquarters. It mentioned that it was very important that all delegations participate in the General Assembly. It noted that, in conformity with the Rules of Procedures, the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention* meets during the sessions of the General Conference of UNESCO.
22. The Delegations of **Japan** and **Algeria** concurred with the intervention of the Delegation of Brazil.

23. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the Agenda proposed which gave the opportunity to also follow the Director-General's speech on 24 October 2007.
24. The Representative of the **Director-General** indicated that the General Assembly must be held during the General Conference, however, the sessions of the other UNESCO Conventions were held at other periods. She recalled that the General Assembly was held in conjunction with Commission IV of the General Conference. Often, the same representatives of States Parties participated both in the General Assembly and that Commission. She also recalled the logistical constraints linked to the organization of this Assembly (simultaneous interpretation, availability of meeting and office space) and underlined the importance of ensuring the efficient conduct of the sessions.
25. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** invited the delegations to adopt the Agenda and Timetable for the Elections. Resolutions 2A and 2B were unanimously adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 2A**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Documents *WHC-07/16.GA/2A* and *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.2A*
2. Adopts the Agenda included in the above-mentioned document.

**2.B ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE FOR THE ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/2B*

26. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** called upon the delegations to choose the voting system.
27. The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested applying the new electronic voting system.
28. The Delegation of **Norway** requested the Legal Advisor to comment on Rules 12.5 and 14.1 of the General Assembly and especially whether a secret ballot was possible
29. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** gave the floor to the Legal Advisor.
30. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that Rule 12.5 mentioned that voting would normally be by a show of hands, and in conformity with Rule 14.1, the election of members of the World Heritage Committee shall be conducted by secret ballot whenever five or more delegations having the right to vote so request, or if the Chairperson so decides. The current amendment was proposed to allow the use of electronic voting.
31. Concerning item 3.A, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** recalled that if delegations wished, the Secretariat could prepare an amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly. She asked delegations to indicate whether or not they supported the principle of an electronic vote, in conformity with the decision proposed by the Secretariat.

32. The Delegation of **Lithuania** understood that the electronic voting allowed for secret voting, and therefore supported the implementation of the system.
33. The Delegation of **Gabon** congratulated the Chairperson for her election. The Delegation supported the interventions of the Delegations of Norway and Lithuania. If it was possible to hold a secret ballot with the electronic vote, it supported the principle.
34. The Delegation of **Norway** considered that its question concerning secret ballot and ordinary vote had not been answered by the Legal Advisor.
35. The Delegation of **Yemen** suggested having a simulation of the electronic vote before taking any decision.
36. The Delegation of **Bulgaria** congratulated the Chairperson on her election. It supported the electronic voting, if secret voting was possible.
37. The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the Chairperson on her election. It requested a clarification concerning the decision to vote electronically "as a matter of principle". Some decisions taken by the General Assembly might require a secret ballot.
38. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** gave the floor to the Legal Advisor.
39. The **Legal Advisor** reminded the delegations of the Rules of Procedures for the General Assembly. There were two types of votes: the first related to general decisions; it is public and defined by Article 12. The secret ballot is usually not foreseen for these decisions. The second type of vote is related to elections, and is defined by Article 14. From a legal point of view, there is no difference to vote by a show of hands or electronically for any general decisions. She noted that it was not a change of the rules, but an amendment.
40. The **Secretariat** indicated that Room XI is the only room in UNESCO that is technically equipped for an electronic vote. The system has not been specifically created for secret ballot elections for the World Heritage Committee, but it is compatible with the specific requirements of the General Assembly. The system used is dependable and guarantees a rapid vote as requested at the last session of the General Assembly. The system permits a secret vote without mention of the names of the voting countries, only the final result being indicated on the screens. Delegations have one minute to vote. They may change their minds, as only the last button pressed would be taken into account. Each candidate corresponds to a coloured button. There is no specific button for abstention. The Secretariat invited the delegations to proceed with a trial run of the electronic vote, which was carried out in the space of the one minute indicated on the screen.
41. The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** requested whether the trial run vote was for four or five candidates.
42. The Delegation of **Yemen** considered that it was necessary to request a trial run because it appears that the electronic vote was somewhat complicated. It requested whether the results indicated clearly corresponded to its vote.
43. The **Secretariat** indicated that the trial run corresponded to four candidates. During real voting, there could be five candidates, placed in English alphabetical order.

44. The Delegation of **Bhutan** asked for clarification. According to the screen, three votes had not been registered. How was it possible for a State Party to control whether its vote had been taken into account and was not cancelled due to technical reasons?
45. The Delegation of **India** considered that the electronic vote is not a secret one; every delegate could look at the colour chosen by his neighbour and know his/her vote. Therefore, the system proposed was not acceptable and not reliable.
46. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** agreed that this system should be adapted.
47. The Delegation of **Yemen** proposed that only normal votes should be made electronically. The current system did not provide a real secret ballot for elections. Therefore, it did not support this proposal.
48. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** recalled the draft decision proposed by the Secretariat which gives free choice of the possibility of a vote by a show of hands or electronically for general decisions.
49. The Delegation of **India** requested that the current amendment be modified to clearly indicate that electronic voting will only be used for general decisions and not for the elections of members of the Committee.
50. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** mentioned that this decision is only related to general decisions, according to Article 12. The Rules of Procedures for elections of the members of the World Heritage Committee are mentioned in Article 14.
51. The **Legal Advisor** proposed to add the following amendment "Subject to Rule 14.1".
52. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked if States Parties approved the proposed amendment made by the Legal Advisor.
53. The Delegation of **India** accepted the amendments proposed by the Legal Advisor.
54. The Delegation of **United States of America** recommended carefully considering the amendment before changing the rule.
55. The Delegation of **Norway** pointed out that Rule 12 in substance, did not refer to elections, although paragraph 14 did, and therefore saw no need to change the wording. It further agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America to adopt the amendment before changing the rule.
56. The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** agreed with India's concern and considered electronic voting totally unacceptable for secret voting.
57. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** accepted Rule 12, with or without the amendment of the addition proposed by the Legal Advisor.
58. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** noted that the majority of the States Parties was not in favour of electronic voting. She also noted that Article 12 of the Rules of Procedure do not appear to be questioned, even if it is always possible to adopt an amendment concerning the use of electronic voting.
59. The Delegation of **Norway** asked to read the amendment out loud.

60. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed to give the floor to the Delegations of the Dominican Republic and Romania before reading out the draft resolution.
61. The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** wished to support the intervention of the Delegation of India and requested that the sense of the proposed amendment be explained again.
62. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** informed States Parties that any decision on an amendment to Article 12 was not irreversible. She indicated that the opinion of States Parties was requested on two issues: suspension of the decision for electronic voting for elections; inclusion of an amendment to Article 12.5. She requested the Rapporteur to read out the proposed amendment.
63. The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment in full.
64. After having declared the amendment to Article 12.5 adopted (Resolution **16 GA 3A.2**), the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested the Secretariat to summarize the discussions so that the work could proceed.
65. In response to the Chairperson, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested that the General Assembly allow the start of the election procedure for the reserved seat before discussions on item 3A, which would gain time. He also recommended to start elections immediately.

**Resolution: 16 GA 2B**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document **WHC-07/16.GA/2B**,
2. Adopts the timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee presented in the above-mentioned document.

**Resolution: 16 GA 3A.2**

The General Assembly,

1. Decides to amend the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* as follows (new text proposed in bold):

**New Rule 12.5 :**

***Subject to Rule 14.1, voting shall normally be either by a show of hands or by electronic means with each Member's vote displayed on a screen.***

### 3.B ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/3B,*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B1*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B2*

66. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested the Secretariat to explain again the organization of the vote for the reserved seat.
67. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the vote would take place at the entrance to Room XI where urns and voting booths would be placed. He reminded the Assembly of the need to amend the work timetable. He explained that it would take an hour to enable all States Parties to vote and proposed that voting begin at 12.30 pm and finish at 1.30 pm. He informed the General Assembly that the results of the first round would be given at 6 pm in conformity with the current timetable. He gave the floor to his colleague, Chief of the Policy and Statutory Meetings Unit, for her to explain the voting system.
68. The Delegation of **France** asked whether it was still foreseen to discuss item 3B simultaneously with the vote.
69. The Delegation of **Australia** referred to the time constraints of the Assembly session and proposed to ballot for the second round during the planned recess before 6 pm.
70. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** indicated that to begin the second round, the General Assembly must already be informed of the results of the first round.
71. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** informed the General Assembly that the Plenary of the General Conference planned to finish at 4 pm.
72. Based on new information provided by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed that the General Assembly meet in Room XI at 2.30 pm to learn of the results of the first round. However, she proposed to continue proceedings between 4 pm and 5.30 pm and then free the delegations to follow the election results for the Executive Board.
73. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** informed the General Assembly that with the new hours proposed, the availability of the interpreters must be ascertained.
74. The Delegation of **France** reminded that there had been no response to its question concerning the discussion of item 3B.
75. Based on the different interventions, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** suggested that the work recommence at 2.30 pm without interruption.
76. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the details on the voting procedure for the reserved seat: the five candidates as indicated on the ballot paper, namely Angola, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Maldives and Vanuatu had all accepted a term of four years. He added that the voters were requested to circle the name of only one out of the five proposed States Parties. Each Delegation should designate one person to vote, so each country had one vote per round.
77. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** confirmed that interpretation would be available at 4 pm. She suggested that the General Assembly return at 2.30 pm for the results of the first round, voting for the second round, if necessary, and adoption of the

new timetable. She also proposed that the resumption of the session be at 4 pm and that the night session would also be maintained.

78. The Delegation of the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** suggested that the vote ballots be distributed in the Room to allow one and all to vote rapidly.
79. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded that the General Assembly must nominate two tellers. He informed that the Secretariat had received a proposal designating the Delegations of Croatia and Mexico. The decision on the choice of tellers was adopted by the General Assembly by acclamation.
80. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** read out the list of candidate States Parties for election to the reserved seat for a State Party without property inscribed on the World Heritage List: Angola, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Maldives and Vanuatu.

The meeting closed at 13:00





## DAY 1

### SECOND MEETING

24 October 2007

2.30 – 8.00 pm

#### 3.B ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents *WHC-07/16.GA/3B*,  
*WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B1*  
*WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B2*

81. The results for the “ Reserved seat ” round for States Parties with no property inscribed on the World Heritage List was announced by the Chairperson:

<b>Number of voters:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Number of valid ballot papers:</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Required majority:</b>	<b>79</b>

Angola (29), Barbados (57), Burkina Faso (28), Maldives (17), Vanuatu (26).

82. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced that as no candidates had obtained the required majority to be elected in the first round, the organization of a second round would be necessary.
83. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the General Assembly about the current voting situation after the first ballot, by clarifying that the required quorum had not been achieved, thereby opening the way to a second round of elections. He continued by asking the States Parties candidates to the World Heritage Committee whether they wished to confirm their candidatures or to withdraw them, in order for the Secretariat to prepare an updated ballot for distribution before proceeding to the second round.
84. The Delegation of the **Maldives** indicated that its country withdrew its candidature.
85. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked the Delegation of the Maldives to indicate whether its withdrawal only concerned the second round.
86. The Delegation of the **Maldives** responded in the negative.
87. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** provided a certain number of indications concerning the organization of the second round and the announcement of the results of the vote. These indications are listed below:
- Preparation of the ballot papers for the four remaining candidates;
  - Distribution of the ballot papers organized in the room;
  - Delegates invited to vote at 3 pm and return to the room at 4 pm;
  - Announcement of the results of the vote in the room as soon as they are known.

### 3.A ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE - REFLECTION ON ELECTION PROCEDURES OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS TO ENSURE AN EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES OF THE WORLD.

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/3A,*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3A*

88. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** invited the General Assembly to refer to item 3A of the agenda which she briefly presented. She requested the General Assembly to pursue reflection on the election procedures for World Heritage Committee members.
89. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took the floor in order to summarize some points concerning the discussion of the election system which had taken place during the World Heritage Committee in Christchurch. He recalled that the voting system was based on two mechanisms: the first being that the election take place according to a majority system and the second that the election be undertaken to ensure an equitable representation of seats. During the 31st session of the Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the results of a questionnaire about the election methods were presented but only 19 States Parties answered. He suggested that a consultative group should be created during this session of the Assembly in order to discuss the election methods on the occasion of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in Quebec, Canada. He then proposed three options: the first to continue with the same voting system; the second the creation of a consultative group; the third to change the electoral procedures during this Assembly.
90. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Director and invited the participants to a calm and constructive debate.
91. The Delegation of **Italy** underlined that this debate was very important. Italy has always favoured the reduction of the mandate to four years, the abstention of the vote in the case of conflicting interests, and also indicated that the system of distribution of seats could pose problems. Cultures might not be represented with the risk of a lack of clear reference to geographical origin. The Delegation wished for one round of voting based on the majority vote. It could support the creation of a consultative group to study the question in depth, but would prefer that the group comprise States Parties to the *Convention* and not only Committee members. The Delegation supported project 1, option 2 as set out in the working document.
92. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson on her election and said that election methods were an issue of great concern. It supported the view that all members are equal and that every group needed to be equally represented. It recommended the creation of a consultative group which could address its concern as regards the non equal representation of the seats.



### 3.A ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE - REFLECTION ON ELECTION PROCEDURES OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS TO ENSURE AN EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES OF THE WORLD (continued)

Documents    *WHC-07/16.GA/3A*,  
                  *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3A*

101. The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its concern about the not equitable geographic representation, even though it is established in Article 8 of the *World Heritage Convention*. It asked the Legal Advisor if amendments had to be made to the Rules of Procedure or the *Convention*. It agreed on the majority system and concurred with the Delegations of Japan and India that a consultative body should be established and should meet in Paris.
102. The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Chairperson on her election and suggested to the General Assembly that the voting system needed to be changed. It recalled Article 8.2 of the *World Heritage Convention* and wished to intensify all efforts in order to find a solution. It recommended the creation of a consultative body by the General Assembly, but this brought the financial issue of its creation and its ensuing abolishment.
103. The **Legal Advisor** recalled Article 8.2 of the *World Heritage Convention* and said that the equitable representation should be achieved through the elections. She explained that in the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly no consultative body was foreseen but an informal group can be created. A consultative body can also be created and this entity could be composed of members of the World Heritage Committee and States Parties, NGOs could also integrate this entity. The consultative body would not need to meet outside of the sessions of the General Assembly and only needed to send a report for consideration by the General Assembly.
104. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** continued, stating that the Rules of Procedure allowed for the creation of an informal group, and the place of meeting could be in another venue than that of the UNESCO Headquarters.
105. The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the Chairperson on her election and considered that the General Assembly could not solve the issue of the election methods there and then. It agreed to have an equitable representation and also agreed to the creation of an informal group.
106. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** reiterated the possibility of forming an informal group.
107. The Delegation of **Portugal** took the floor and considered that the World Heritage Committee should elect a consultative body.
108. The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that a decision must be taken regarding item 8.2. In particular, it would be difficult to take a decision regarding members of the Committee today – therefore Option 2 was preferable. With regard to the informal group, the Delegation questioned how this group could consider issues that concerned the General Assembly and questioned how all States could have the opportunity to participate. To whom would it report? When would the results of its discussions be presented?

109. The Delegation of **Norway** agreed that an equitable geographic representation was not insured according to the *World Heritage Convention*. It considered the voting system to be very complicated as it takes hours to vote. It advised that the voting system be changed during the 17th session of the General Assembly in 2009.
110. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** highlighted the fact that Option 2 appeared to be favoured by the majority of the participants and that the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Japan and India must be included. She encouraged the Delegation of Norway to put in writing its proposed amendment to the text.
111. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the list of 16 speakers who had requested to take the floor: the Delegations of Belgium, France, United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Lithuania, Saint Lucia, Spain, Greece, United States of America, Benin, Hungary, India, Yemen, Turkey, Bulgaria and Bhutan.
112. The Delegation of **Belgium** recalled that it was aware of the imbalance of the World Heritage List, and the under-representation of southern hemisphere countries. It further recalled that Belgium had always called for increased representivity for properties in southern hemisphere countries. However, it raised the need to strengthen the mechanisms of institutional capacities in States Parties and to support the implementation of capacity building programmes conducted by the World Heritage Centre. It wished to maintain the current election system and considered it risky to adopt the Executive Board model or that of the Intangible Heritage Convention opting for geographical distribution, as that would ensure an almost permanent seat for certain members. It supported Option 2, including the amendment of Japan and India, if the working group reports to the World Heritage Committee where policy decisions are taken.
113. The Delegation of **France** recalled that the 1972 *Convention* was one of the flagship programmes of UNESCO. The measures taken to improve its functioning have notably enabled a balanced situation thanks to the voluntary reduction of the mandate period from 6 to 4 years and the allocation of a seat to a country having no site inscribed on the World Heritage List. These measures have allowed for a better geographical representation of States Parties. However, it recalled that, from now on, the *Convention* numbered 185 States Parties and the Committee only 21 members. Moreover, the debates of the Committee mainly concerned the state of conservation of properties on the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger and required interventions from members in their capacity as experts. France called for prudence so as not to threaten the established balance. It is in favour of Option 2 and would wish the Committee create an informal consultative body as requested by the General Assembly where all the States Parties could participate to ensure equitable representation.
114. The Delegation of **United Kingdom** emphasized that the Committee should remain an expert body and should not become a political one. It also stated that equitable representation included fair rotation. It was opposed to deleting the term "fair rotation in the Committee" as proposed by India and Japan. It was in favour of paragraph 8.2 of the Rules of Procedure.
115. The Delegation of **Netherlands** was in favour of the current election system and against changing it. It noted that self-restriction was the key to success. It supported Option 2 and informed the meeting that it would be able to accept the proposal made by the Delegations of Japan and India, but had a problem with the wording of paragraph 4.

116. The Delegation of **Lithuania** agreed with the need for equal distribution, recalling that the General Assembly is the ultimate decision-making body. It supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada to meet after the Committee meeting. It recommended being careful when changing the rules.
117. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recommended retaining the present election system as long as a new one had not been approved. Equitable cultural distribution was as important as the geographical one. It agreed with Option 2, proposed by the Delegations of Japan and India. It emphasized that any new election system should, however, study the issue of rotation.
118. The Delegation of **Spain** noted with satisfaction the interest of the General Assembly and the importance of the debate concerning the election system. It recalled the specificity of the 1972 *Convention* and emphasized the fact that a consensus concerning the election system was necessary. The *World Heritage Convention* enables the transmission of heritage from one generation to another and it hoped that the General Assembly would perpetuate this, the main objectives of the *Convention* being conservation and preservation. The success of the *Convention* is such that the States Parties must take part in discussions, which is why Option 2 is to be conserved. The rotation system ensures the representivity and preserves good practice, it was a reminder that acceptable solutions from the legal viewpoint must be found. A consensus must be sought between the Secretariat's proposal as well as those proposed by the Delegations of Japan and India.
119. The Delegation of **Greece** stated that the issue was very important and that time was needed to work in concert on such a serious matter. It declared to be in favour of Option 2 with the establishment of a consultative group to be created by the World Heritage Committee and open to all States Parties. The three principles adopted in 2000 should be retained: 1. Voluntary reduction of the mandate from 6 to 4 years; 2. Non-cumulation of mandates to ensure rotation; and 3. A reserved seat for countries having no site inscribed on the World Heritage List.
120. The Delegation of the **United States of America** recognized the importance of rotation, but was concerned by any formal rule for the creation of geographical election groups. It recommended that the Committee should remain technical and not become a political body. It supported Option 2.
121. The Delegation of **Benin** underlined the importance of focusing on the problem of imbalance of the World Heritage List which cannot be resolved in the short-term. It recalled that eight years ago a working group made proposals on this issue that enabled a slight improvement to the imbalance. These decisions were adopted at the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee (Cairns, 2000). It recalled that other decisions had been taken since then. It considered that the working group should be established between the 16th and 17th sessions of the General Assembly.
122. The Delegation of **Hungary** was conscious of a need for an equitable representation within the Committee. It supported Option 2 proposed by the Delegations of India and Japan. It also supported the proposal to enlarge the mandate of the reflection group. It was in favour of increasing the number of members of the Committee from 21 to 24 and supported rotation. It also recommended maintaining the original paragraph 4, as in the Draft Resolution.
123. The Delegation of **India** was of the opinion that the words "technical" and "expertise" had different meanings in different parts of the world, depending on how developed the country was. It also expressed its opinion with regard to the embarrassing fact that the

ASPAC and African States Parties were badly represented on the Committee. It requested clarification from the Legal Advisor as to whether the Committee could set up a consultative body, who should be its members, who it should report to and by whom it would be chaired. It strongly emphasized that it would not wish such a body to be chaired by the Secretariat.

124. The Delegation of **Yemen** acknowledged the geographical and cultural imbalance on the Committee and wished experts from countries all over the world to be part of it. It was in favour of Members' mandates of four years. It supported Option 2 but did not wish to delete paragraph 4. It was also in favour of rotation.
125. The Delegation of **Turkey** supported Option 2 and the amendment made by the Delegations of India and Japan regarding paragraph 6. It was also in favour of rotation of Committee members.
126. The Delegation of **Bulgaria** supported Option 2 and the amendments made by the Delegations of Japan and India. It was also in favour of increasing the number of Committee members and supported the cultural and geographical distribution of the Committee.
127. The Delegation of **Bhutan** supported the modifications made by the Delegations of Japan and India.
128. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** reminded the General Assembly that 10 minutes remained before voting began and gave the floor to the Legal Advisor to respond to questions from the Delegation of India.
129. The **Legal Advisor** responded to the three questions raised by the Delegation of India:
  1. Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure allowed the Committee to establish a consultative body. Membership would be defined by the Committee and could include Committee members and non-members.
  2. Such a consultative body would report to the Committee, which could also mandate reporting to the General Assembly.
  3. Each consultative body would elect its Chairperson and Rapporteur, who could be a Committee member or not.
130. The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the correct way of establishing a consultative body would be through the General Assembly and not the Committee. It proposed an amendment to the text proposed by the Delegations of India and Japan and read it out: "The General Assembly.....decides to establish an informal, open-ended working group to carry out an in-depth analysis of the different alternatives and report to its 17<sup>th</sup> session".
131. The Delegation of **India** affirmed that the current state of affairs was totally unsatisfactory because the Committee is not regionally well-represented and urged the Assembly to look carefully at the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil because of the need to come up with an equitable response.
132. The Delegation of **Japan** said that, in principle, it would have preferred the General Assembly to establish this body rather than the Committee, but that it was advised that it would be more appropriate for the latter to set up the working group.
133. In relation to the two distinct proposals of an informal group established under the aegis of the General Assembly or a group with a specific mandate of the Committee, the

Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its perplexity regarding the time required for a subsidiary body to provide its recommendations. In this respect, it declared that perhaps it was preferable to have confidence in the Committee in order to avoid waiting until the next session of the General Assembly to receive the conclusions of a subsidiary body.

134. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed some concern because it was not clear what the mandate of the proposed working group would be. The Delegation also reminded the meeting how it had been struck and impressed by the efficiency of the Committee's work in Christchurch. It invited the Assembly to wait another day to see the composition of the new Committee before drawing too many conclusions.
135. The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the General Assembly that it had been absent from the Committee for many years and stressed the importance of rotation for better representation.
136. The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** drew attention to the fact that the issue of a better representivity of the composition of the Committee went to the core of the *Convention*. It asserted that it was enough to refer to the *Operational Guidelines* to find good guidance on this matter. It also said that it did not see any inconsistencies in what had been proposed.
137. The Delegation of **Mauritania** said that there was need to establish some criteria and that it would have been happy to participate in this process. It also agreed to give this assignment to the General Assembly, rather than to the Committee, because it was a matter of capital importance and should be treated by all the States Parties.
138. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed to listen to the Rapporteur who would read the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway.
139. The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment: "*Further decides to inscribe this item on the agenda of its 17th session, October 2009, with a view to making the necessary modificatio an equitable, balanced, regional and more efficient voting method*".
140. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested that the amendment be distributed in the room as it was too long to just be read out by the Rapporteur and would therefore facilitate its examination by the room.
141. The Delegation of **Netherlands**, while expressing its sympathies with the Delegation of Norway and its usually good interventions, expressed its disagreement with the amendment that had just been read by the Rapporteur because it completely prejudged the results of the working group.
142. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its disagreement with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway, recalling that it was unthinkable to amend the text of the *Convention* before even having secured prior agreement on the new voting methods.
143. The Delegation of **Yemen** proposed to integrate the Norwegian proposal, harmonising it with paragraph 4.
144. The Delegation of **France** expressed its agreement with the intervention by the Delegation of Saint Lucia. It further requested that the different amendments proposed be projected onto the screen.



145. The Delegation of **Spain** said that the mandate to the group should not be limited as currently exposed in paragraph 6 of the Draft Resolution and recalled that the terms of reference for such a group had not been adopted by the Committee nor by any other body under the *Convention*. It further recalled that it should be, in any case, an open group in which all members should be represented.
146. The Delegation of **Norway** assured the meeting that it did not want to insist on keeping the proposed amendment; however it did not see how this could preclude any result as it just indicated that, at the next General Assembly, there should be some results “in a view to”.
147. The Delegation of **India** requested the Secretariat to answer the question that had been asked earlier about the financial implications that the setting up of such a working group would have for the General Assembly, or for the Committee. It also thanked the Delegation of Norway for its amendment which was done in good faith.
148. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** stated that she had not reiterated the question as in the meantime she had been informed that the World Heritage Centre would cover the costs in the event that a group would be established under the authority of the General Assembly, whereas the World Heritage Fund would cover the costs if it was decided that this group would be a consultative body of the World Heritage Committee.
149. The Delegation of **India** asked for more precision and asked if when it was mentioned “the Centre” as financial source, it meant the World Heritage Fund, the extra-budgetary sources, or something else. It said it was important for the Assembly to know in order to take a decision on this matter.
150. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** clarified that the costs for this consultative body would be assured by the Regular Budget. She added that it was difficult to provide precise figures at this stage, but stated that the costs would mainly be for interpretation and translation of documents.
151. The Delegation of **Brazil** also wished to refer to the same question that had just been brought up by the Delegation of India. It said that the answer given by the Secretariat reinforced the view that, as the Delegation of Brazil thought, UNESCO should cover the costs, which would certainly represent the most democratic way to proceed with this delicate matter. It also reminded the General Assembly that the World Heritage Centre was the Secretariat to the *Convention* and that it should facilitate the work of the working group. It finally stated that it would be inappropriate to give this mandate to the Committee.
152. The Delegation of **Kenya** affirmed its appreciation for the very important matter of this debate but had the impression that the discussion was now going round in circles. It stressed the importance of taking some steps forward, now that the problems were identified; the way to advance was to choose the composition of the working group and its mandate.
153. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reserved its comments until the General Assembly proceeded with the examination of the Draft Resolution, paragraph by paragraph.
154. The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the intervention made by the Delegation of Kenya, but did not understand why and, in any case, did not agree that UNESCO should cover the costs of such a working group. In its view, the UNESCO Regular Budget should not finance this kind of work.

155. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the discussion on budget implications was very interesting and that it was reasonable to have an idea of the financial implications before proceeding and taking any decision. It noted that the difference between the two proposals was that one was likely to be slow and expensive and the other one faster and less costly.
156. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** informed that the text would shortly be projected on the screen. She recalled the two different proposals, one of a policy character and the other more technical.
157. The Delegation of the **United States of America** repeated its formal objection for the UNESCO Regular Budget to cover the expenses of the proposed working group.
158. The Delegation of **Brazil** did not appreciate the way the debate was turning and recalled that since the beginning it had always been UNESCO that took on the costs of the *Convention*. It also repeatedly stated that this discussion was ridiculous and that there would not be any difference in terms of effectiveness by choosing one way or another.
159. The Delegation of **Japan** said that its understanding was that all this discussion was futile as in any case the UNESCO budget would cover the costs.
160. The Delegation of **India** also reminded the meeting that the entire cost of the Assembly was covered by UNESCO and that this was not an issue of cost effectiveness, but a far more important issue. It supported the latest interventions made by the Delegations of Brazil and Japan.
161. The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that this discussion was not dealing simply with budget issues. If it were true that UNESCO was contributing to a big part of the World Heritage Centre's budget which the Centre decided to use for the setting up and workings of this working group, logically there would be less budget left to carry out other activities.

### 3.B ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/3B,*  
                          *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B1*  
                          *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B2*

162. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced the results of the first round of the general election:

<b>Number of voters:</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>Number of valid paper ballots:</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>Required majority:</b>	<b>77</b>

Angola (36), Australia (99), Bahrain (86), Brazil (75), Burkina Faso (37), China (103), Democratic Republic of the Congo (27), Egypt (81), Georgia (25), Iraq (51), Jordan (62), Malta (30), Nigeria (65), Poland (52), Romania (50), Sweden (72), Thailand (53), Togo (27), Ukraine (30), Vanuatu (28), Venezuela (36), Yemen (31).

Australia, Bahrain, China and Egypt were declared elected as members of the World Heritage Committee.

163. The Delegations of **Iraq, Yemen, Togo, Venezuela** and **Georgia** withdrew their candidatures. 13 candidates maintained their candidatures for the second round of voting.
164. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** congratulated the elected members and thanked those who had withdrawn their candidatures.

### **3.A ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE - REFLECTION ON ELECTION PROCEDURES OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS TO ENSURE AN EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES OF THE WORLD (continued)**

165. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** returned to the issue of the running costs for the consultative committee and announced that costs could be covered by UNESCO's Regular Programme. The Committee managed the World Heritage Fund, but it was not for UNESCO or the World Heritage Centre to decide on the use of these funds. The budgetary application should not in any way be an obstacle to decision-making.
166. The Delegation of **India** considered that it would be preferable to set up a small working group in order to improve the amendments so that the resolution could be adopted by consensus.
167. The Delegation of **Santa Lucia** was not against the creation of a consultative working group, but it wished that prior to this the amendments be posted, and the Assembly review them, paragraph by paragraph.
168. The Delegation of **Belgium** was in agreement with paragraph 6, and wondered whether other alternatives existed such as "carry out an in-depth analysis....".
169. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** confirmed that the draft decisions would be reviewed, article by article and discussed.
170. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** confirmed that the draft decisions would be reviewed one by one and gave the floor to the Rapporteur.
171. The **Rapporteur** read out paragraphs 1 and 2.
172. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced that paragraph 1 was adopted; for paragraph 2 it was recommended to add "recalling the spirit of the preceding General Assembly discussions".
173. The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 3.
174. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested that the text of the *Convention* be respected.
175. The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated its support for the Delegation of Saint Lucia and suggested replacing "Recalling" by "Having in mind".
176. The Delegation of **India** also indicated its support for the Delegation of Saint Lucia and suggested the wording "Keeping in mind".

177. The Delegation of **Algeria** supported the Delegations of India and Brazil.
178. The Delegation of **Greece** suggested during “the” 31st session.
179. The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4.
180. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced that paragraph 5 was adopted without change and continued to paragraph 6.
181. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that the deletion of the last part of the paragraph was not acceptable and requested to keep the reference to rotation.
182. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested also adding “geographical”, in order to refer to geographical regions, not only political.
183. The Delegation of **Belgium** reminded that account must be taken of the amendment that it had presented.
184. The Delegation of **Brazil**, author of the amendment, was in agreement with the modifications.
185. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** wished for a concise formulation.
186. The Delegations of **Saint Lucia** and **Algeria** were in agreement with the Delegation of India.
187. The Delegation of **India** recalled that the Delegation of Japan had explained the reasons for this amendment. However, it believed that they could both agree to remove the amendment and come back to the original paragraph 4.
188. At the request of the **Chairperson of the General Assembly**, the **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5 and the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.
189. The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its concern that the General Assembly was only considering the alternatives in the text, but that there could be other alternatives.
190. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Barbados representative and gave the floor to the Delegation of the United States of America.
191. The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed and asked for a clarification of the original text regarding the various amendments: the ones from the Delegations of Brazil, Japan and India.
192. The Delegation of **India** suggested that this paragraph be sent to a working group for revision.
193. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** disagreed with the amendment.
194. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested the Delegation of the Netherlands to comment first of all on the proposed amendments.
195. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** regretted that the text had not been distributed in the room and therefore it was difficult to discuss it.
196. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Delegation of the Netherlands for all these clarifications.

197. The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed.
198. The Delegation of **Spain** wondered what the working group would discuss. It was in agreement with the Delegations of Belgium and Barbados.
199. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked whether there was agreement for the withdrawal of the amendment of the Delegation of Norway. She indicated also that the working group would work on paragraphs 6 and 7.
200. The Delegation of **Norway** made it clear that it did not insist on keeping its amendment but concluded that it was necessary to ensure the balance and the different voting system. The objective of this amendment was only to facilitate the work.
201. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that the amendment had been proposed in good faith, but it could not support it as it precludes that the Rules of Procedure will be changed.
202. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** indicated its support for the Delegation of Saint Lucia.
203. The Delegation of **India** expressed its interest in the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway and suggested sending it to the working group.
204. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** insisted on proceeding with the debate and was pleased with the progress in consensus.
205. The Delegation of **Barbados** agreed with the Delegation of India.
206. The Delegation of **Greece** stated its disagreement with the amendment.
207. The Delegation of **France** stated its disagreement with the amendment.
208. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it could not support the amendment and that it was concerned about sending it to the working group.
209. The Delegation of **Peru** affirmed that the amendment of the Delegation of Norway would be useful as regards concrete aspects. However, it shared the opinion of India.
210. The Delegation of **Algeria** affirmed that the task of the working group was clarified, and invited the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** to establish this working group.
211. The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and Grenadine** supported the Delegation of Saint Lucia and did not support the amendment.
212. The Delegation of **Hungary** pointed out a problem of consistency between paragraph 4 and this one, as most of the wording was the same but that, in this case, the references to cultures and rotation had disappeared. It proposed either to keep the terms of paragraph 4, or to at least make reference to it.
213. The Delegation of **Italy** supported the Delegations of Saint Lucia and the United States of America for the same reasons.
214. The Delegation of **Bolivia** disagreed with the amendment of the Delegation of Norway, and did not appear to agree to entrust this work to a working group.

215. The Delegation of **Norway** stressed that cultures had been included and stated that, as the proposal seemed to displease many States Parties, the suggestion made by the Delegation of Peru “*with a view to possible changes*” was a solution. It also recommended including the rotation and that these considerations could give directions to the working group.
216. The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it did not see the need to send this amendment to the working group and suggested keeping paragraph 7 as it was, considering that its phrasing did not preclude the debate.
217. The Delegation of **Norway** pointed out that the majority did not seem to think that the amendment would help the work of the working group and that it therefore decided to withdraw the amendment.
218. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced the composition of the working group: Algeria, Bosnia Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Montenegro, Norway, Saint-Lucia, Spain, United States of America.
219. The Delegation of **Japan** stated that it would be an open-ended meeting, to which anyone could attend, and asked whether it would be possible for the Secretariat to ensure interpretation.
220. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced that the working group would meet on 25 October 2007 from 9.00 am to 10.00 am in Room XI.

The meeting closed at 19.50



226. The Delegation of **Bosnia-Herzegovina** also requested that equitable representation be respected.
227. The Delegation of **India** also drew the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that that Group IV was also under-represented in the World Heritage Committee.
228. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** further drew attention to the under-representation of Group IV, and requested the preparation for the third round of voting, wishing confirmation as to whether the Delegations of Jordan, Poland, Sweden and Thailand maintained their candidatures for the election, which was duly confirmed. She informed that the Delegation of Japan was preparing a presentation on the election system, on behalf of the working group, and which would be made shortly. Before examining the items on the agenda, the Chairperson emphasized that discussion on equitable representation was closed, and requested the distribution of the voting papers, voting to take place between 10.30 and 11.30. She informed the General Assembly that item 3 of the agenda was postponed whilst the Delegation of Japan gave its presentation on the results of the working group.

#### 4. **REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE ON ITS ACTIVITIES (2006-2007)**

Document of the 34th session of the General Conference of UNESCO: *34C/REP/13*

229. The **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** presented the report concerning the main activities and decisions taken by the Committee since the 15th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, held in October 2005 (see Annex 3). In order to better present the large spectrum of information contained in the report, the main activities and decisions of the Committee were grouped according to the Strategic Objectives adopted by the World Heritage Committee, i.e. the 5 Cs: credibility, conservation, capacity-building, communication and the involvement of communities in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. The report was also presented to the 34th session of the General Conference of UNESCO and summary information was included in document 34 C/REP/13 (<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-16ga-4e.pdf>).
230. The **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** then informed the General Assembly about the reinforced monitoring mechanism which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, July 2007). Its main purpose was to ensure the proper implementation of the Committee decisions regarding the five natural World Heritage properties in Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, and the Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany). She further regretted that, for the first time in the history of the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, the World Heritage Committee had decided upon the deletion of a property, the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman), from the World Heritage List because the State Party had failed in its obligations defined in the *Convention*, in particular the obligation to protect and conserve the World Heritage property.
231. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** then presented the thematic of the reflection meetings held on the procedure for Periodic Reporting, and the orientations that had been proposed to the States Parties following these meetings. In particular, she mentioned the monitoring framework based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. She added that for the in-danger properties, the Committee requested



States Parties to establish a monitoring framework for the properties based on the OUV, an essential step towards improving decision-making. She further drew attention to the approval of the new format for the International Assistance request, as well as the amendments to the “ *Guidelines* ” which are published on the Internet site of the World Heritage Centre.

232. The **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** then invited Mr. Tumu te Heuheu, former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, to introduce to the General Assembly the Fifth “C” on enhancing the role of communities in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* as adopted by the Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). On this occasion, Mr. Tumu te Heuheu also presented a tapa cloth to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to honour the contribution made by him and his staff to support the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Pacific region.

**Resolution : 16 GA 4**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document 34C/REP/13,
2. Takes note of the report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on the World Heritage Committee’s activities in 2006-2007.

**5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE**

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/5*

233. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** made a general presentation on item 5 of the agenda concerning the implementation of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre. She recalled that following Decision **30 COM 6**, a report was presented to the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), that adopted Decision **31 COM 19**. Six recommendations were proposed as follows:
- a. Improve the accounting, budgetary management and internal control mechanism
  - b. Strengthen the management process.
  - c. Clarify the organizational structure and personnel requirements, including a mapping of the workload and innovative proposals for the engagement of non-permanent staff.
  - d. Delineate the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.
  - e. Develop and implement a strategy for knowledge management and information sharing.
  - f. Prepare guidelines for carrying out World Heritage missions.

By Decision **31 COM 19**, a plan for the application of the main recommendations is contained in Document *WHC-07/16.GA/5*. She then invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present this document.

234. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the results-based plan for implementing the major recommendations of the management audit of the World Heritage Centre requested by the Committee at its 31st session in Christchurch. He mentioned that internal consultations had been undertaken with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau of Human Resources Management and the Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs. For the past few months it had proposed a number of ideas, recommendations and solutions for both immediate and long-term action. He pointed out the most important aims of this implementation plan, as follows:

- Improve the accounting and budgetary management and internal control mechanism (key terms: flexibility, establishment of an internal control management system and an analytical accounting system for the World Heritage Centre).
- Strengthen management process (key terms: regular staff meetings, improved methods for the Administration Unit of the World Heritage Centre, coordination with UNESCO Field Offices).
- Clarify the organizational structure and personnel requirements, including a mapping of the workload and innovative proposals for the engagement of non-permanent staff (key terms: simpler organization structure for the World Heritage Centre, assessment of the workload and solutions for budgets from different sources).
- Delineate the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (key term: development of protocol).
- Develop and implement a strategy for knowledge management and information sharing.
- Prepare guidelines for carrying out World Heritage missions.

He also mentioned that an updated version of this implementation plan would be presented at the next session of the World Heritage Committee in Quebec City, Canada (July 2008), and expressed commitment to ensure that changes would be carried out in the best possible way.

235. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the presentation of this report, and then invited the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to provide further explanations from a budgetary point of view.

236. The **Director of the Bureau of the Budget** emphasized that the question posed by the Audit was to know how to finance the implementation of the key functions of the World Heritage Centre, being aware that these functions were indispensable for the implementation of the core activities of the Centre, permanent by nature and requiring specific competencies whatever the project and funding source. Currently, these functions are implemented by the Centre staff, whether they be permanent or temporary and, when they are fulfilled by temporary staff, these functions are financed either by the Regular Programme or by extra-budgetary projects.

The recommendations of the Audit have thus led the Secretariat to initiate a preliminary reflection to build the base for an innovative funding mechanism for staff involved in

these key functions. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget underlined that work was still ongoing and that to date no decision was required on behalf of the States Parties.

Indeed, before initiating any changes, certain prerequisites must be established by the World Heritage Centre and the Culture Sector, mainly in cooperation with the Human Resources Management and Budget Offices:

- a. A shared vision of the structure of the Centre (organizational chart) and the nature of the key functions, based on an internal agreement within the Organization.
- b. A budgetary and financial analysis of the cost of these functions, their current means of funding and potential funding sources to respond to the needs of a permanent nature.

Based on these analyses, the mechanism proposed would permit the funding of staff implementing key functions (by Centre resources) appropriate to the permanent nature of these functions. If deemed necessary, the following could be proposed:

- Convert credits for activities of the Regular Budget into staff credits.
- Request the approval of the General Assembly to use the World Heritage Fund to finance certain staff costs of the Centre, notably funds financed from contributions voted by States Parties (compulsory and voluntary).
- Fund a part of these permanent staff costs from extra-budgetary resources, in planning and recuperating these permanent staff costs from projects. In this event, the prior agreement of donors would have to be obtained.

However, this innovative mechanism could only be implemented under certain conditions:

- a) The implementation procedure must be progressive and prudent.
- b) With regard to extra-budgetary activities, the Centre must develop its negotiation capacities with donors, to ensure the funding of permanent posts for the implementation of extra-budgetary projects.
- c) In the knowledge that donors cannot make commitments beyond the duration of the projects, a safety net is necessary so that the creation of these permanent posts, financed from multiple extra-budgetary sources, does not entail a deficit in the event of a reduction in these same resources. That is why the World Heritage Fund could be proposed as a guarantee to ensure the availability of short-term funds (cashflow arrangements) or in the event of the abolition of posts, to finance departure indemnities.

In conclusion, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget indicated that this innovative mechanism would enable the recognition that key functions of the Centre must be implemented by permanent staff. This mechanism is also in accordance with the principles of the Cost Recovery Policy of the Organization, according to which costs must be debited to appropriate funding sources (in accordance with the Results-based Management, RBM) and the rates of support costs applied to extra-budgetary projects (10% on special accounts since January 2008).

237. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for their reports, and invited comments from the States Parties.
238. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Secretariat for the two presentations. There is only USD 6 million annually in the World Heritage Fund and many other tasks to fund. Using the World Heritage Fund to finance staff costs would be difficult. It requested that extra-budgetary funds finance posts, but not people.
239. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** then declared its position against the use of the World Heritage Fund as a source for regular Secretariat positions. The World Heritage Fund is the only guarantee for true multilateral action and should be used exclusively for the conservation of sites. If eventual donors accept the innovative scheme for funding, in which the World Heritage Fund could be used as a reserve and a guarantee for the reliability of the system, how would the candidates for the posts be selected? Do the donors have any power of decision in their recruitment? It further requested a report regarding the conditions of this innovative financing scheme. In reaction to paragraph c), recommendation 1 of the proposed implementation plan, which stated that an analytical accounting system for the World Heritage Centre would be developed, the Delegation of Saint Lucia inquired about the reasons why the World Heritage Centre did not continue to use UNESCO's accounting system. In reaction to paragraph e), recommendation 2 of the proposed implementation plan, it mentioned that the relationship with the Advisory Bodies should be respected, and that consequently the latter should be paid on time.
240. The Delegation of the **United States of America** mentioned that it was satisfied with the results of the implementation plan and the progress made in this regard. However, it brought attention the fact that, although the World Heritage was one of UNESCO's most successful programmes, judging by its importance it should be a priority, but it still does not receive enough funding. Regarding the personnel, it stated that the relationship with the Advisory Bodies should be strengthened and properly maintained. In reaction to recommendation 3 of the proposed implementation plan, it voiced the need for a clear organizational chart of the World Heritage Centre, which should be made available online and regularly updated.
241. The Delegation of **Peru** thanked the Secretariat for the reports presented. It underlined the need for an Assistant Director-General for Latin America and the Caribbean. Currently there are five countries participating in the preparation of the inscription for the Main Andean Road and a need for an Assistant Director-General to coordinate the file.
242. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested a response from UNESCO.
243. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** mentioned that the Centre will prepare a new organizational chart which will be posted on the web and regularly updated. This would clarify the role of the personnel and thus facilitate the work of new staff members. He said that the World Heritage Centre was in the process of improving its financial relationship with the Advisory Bodies and apologized for the problems that occurred this year with ICOMOS. He pointed out that, in the future, the contracting procedure of the Advisory Bodies will be changed and, according to the new system, this would coincide with the cycle of the Committee (starting in August and ending in July, the following year).
244. The **Director of the Bureau of the Budget** emphasized that in 2006 the Regular Budget of the World Heritage Centre amounted to USD 5M, of which USD 3.4M

represented staff costs. In other words, 68% of the Regular Budget of the World Heritage Centre was devoted to staff costs in 2006. If the voted contributions to the World Heritage Fund (USD 3M in 2006) are added to these USD 5M, the total resources amount to USD 8M and the ratio staff/activities stands at 42%. Whilst recalling that the global ratio staff/activities of UNESCO is 59% (Regular Programme), it clearly appears that the Regular Programme finances a part of the staff costs for the implementation of the activities financed thanks to the World Heritage Fund. In the framework of result-based management, the innovative mechanism would provide an improved reading of staff costs and enable the alignment of the Centre's staff/activities ratio with that of the Organization.

In response to the question posed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget clearly indicated that there was only one and the same general accounting system for UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre. Moreover, this system must evolve towards an accounting exercise (accruals) with the adoption of IPSAS (International Public Sector Accounting Standards) standardization in 2010 by UNESCO and all the United Nations system. With regard to the development of an analytical accountancy for the Centre, as a pilot project, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget explained that there was a need to link the multiple types of financing of the Centre's activities.

Finally, with regard to the innovative financing system for the key functions of the Centre, a clear vision of the needs was required, and then the possibility of responding within the existing system must be considered, and finally an alternative solution should be sought if necessary. This mechanism could be experimental for the World Heritage Centre, and then extended to the whole of UNESCO if the current evolution of funding sources for extra-budgetary resources continued to increase.

245. The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for Culture** responded that recruitment was for the post and not the person, and that recruitment would be carried out in conformity with recruitment rules for the Organization. She added that the analytical accountancy system was a pilot project. If it proved positive, it could be applied to other sectors of the Organization.
246. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** wished that UNESCO respond to the issue of the Assistant Director-General for Latin America and the Caribbean, that had been reiterated several times.
247. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** clarified that it concerned a post of Chief of the Latin America and Caribbean Unit and not for an Assistant Director. This post of Chief of the Latin America and Caribbean Unit would be open to recruitment shortly.
248. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed thanks for the detailed presentation of the results-based plan. Supporting the intervention made by the Delegation of the United States of America, it pointed out the need to find a core budget for the permanent programmes of the World Heritage Centre. It further stated that, according to Article 14 of the *World Heritage Convention*, the Secretariat's core functions should be provided by the UNESCO Regular Programme. Concerning the use of the World Heritage Fund to finance permanent staff positions, it mentioned that it is impossible to take any definite decision now. A thorough risk analysis is absolutely necessary, with both the best and worst case scenarios. It further suggested that, before the General Assembly takes a decision, a proper risk analysis be carried out and submitted in reference to paragraph 3 of Decision **31 COM 19**. It added that it had prepared a new draft paragraph, as in paragraph 3 of the Draft resolution, "including the World Heritage Funds" cannot be added. It felt it was still too premature.

249. The Delegation of **Italy** expressed thanks to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his presentation of the results-based plan. It voiced similar concerns to those of the Delegation of Saint Lucia, for the introduction of an analytical accounting system and its integration within UNESCO's accounting system. It then suggested the creation of new posts at the World Heritage Centre in order to fulfill its core functions. It pointed out that in the past years the workload has increased continuously and there were not enough human and financial resources to deliver the core posts. In principle, it declared itself ready to analyze the proposed system, but it mentioned that it is still not clear how this new system will work. A number of questions were addressed in this regard: whether the World Heritage Fund would function as a guarantee for the core posts, or whether it would finance them directly, or whether extra-budgetary resources would be used for this purpose. The Delegation of Italy mentioned that the proposed solution was a pragmatic one which required more explanatory information.

### **3.B ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (continued)**

Documents    *WHC-07/16.GA/3B,*  
                  *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B1*  
                  *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3B2*

250. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** announced the results of the third round of voting.

<b>Number of voters:</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Number of valid ballot papers</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Required majority:</b>	<b>67</b>

Jordan (64), Poland (58), Sweden (63) and Thailand (44). As no candidate obtained the required majority, a fourth round would be necessary.

### **5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE (continued)**

251. The Delegation of **Spain** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the presentation and all the work achieved to respond to the Audit Report and the debate that took place in New Zealand (Christchurch, 2007). Concerning the analytical accountancy, it considered that it would be interesting if the World Heritage Centre developed an analytical accountancy pilot project for UNESCO. Reflection on this point would be useful. It expressed the importance of knowing whether, when a decision is taken, staff members required for its implementation are present. All information on human resources is necessary. The Delegation supports more stable posts. Like the Delegation of Saint Lucia, it is not in favour of the use of the World Heritage Fund. It proposes that key expert posts be financed from the Regular Budget as well as extra-budgetary funds. There was a need for more information on the assessment of stable extra-budgetary contributions. It requested an evaluation of what the World Heritage Centre received and what scenarios were possible.

252. The **Director of the Bureau of the Budget** recalled that the UNESCO budget only increased by 3.4% in 2008-2009 (Scenario USD 631M), which was not sufficient to fully cover the statutory staff adjustments and inflation. Whereas the World Heritage Centre had benefitted from an increase in its staff credits of 19% (= 4 posts) and its credits for

activities of 32% in comparison to the preceding biennium (33C/5). She recalled that the context of the whole of the Organization must be considered. The World Heritage Centre had increases in resources well above other parts of the budget. This increase in volume had been compensated for by cuts elsewhere.

253. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** recalled that in preceding years, there had been a clear increase in the volume of activities of the World Heritage Centre but not in the budget allocated, either to UNESCO, or to the Culture Sector. She recalled that the Culture Sector had several conventions to implement and that a Secretariat was required for each convention. The posts and the staff needed to be stabilised. With regard to the amount of available funds, one must try to respond to the expectations of States Parties, whilst facing up to reality.
254. The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its pleasure in seeing that the recommendations of the Management Audit were being followed by the World Heritage Centre. The audit highlighted a number of positive aspects but also made recommendations for a number of improvements concerning the structure and the organization of the World Heritage Centre: the roles and responsibilities of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and good use of experienced staff and the management of information and documentation. While recognizing the dilemma of the staffing situation, with a great number of staff on temporary posts, the risk of losing highly qualified people and the difficulty of the funding situation, there is a need to explore new possibilities with imagination and flexibility. In this respect, it may be necessary to look at the possibilities of multiple sources of financing to find solutions to this dilemma. The Delegation hoped that the situation could be solved.
255. The Delegation of **France** considered as very positive the importance that the Director-General of UNESCO accorded to the follow up to the Management Audit. It understood that the results-based plan presented was a first draft of a more complete plan to be presented to the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008. It underlined that in this perspective, an effort of harmonisation should be made to coordinate this plan with certain observations of the Audit, Committee recommendations at its 31st session, and proposals made by the Director-General of UNESCO. With regard to staffing, it seemed logical that there would be a staff increase and that innovative solutions would be required, but there was a lack of global information. The Audit indicated that there was no quantitative global data on the World Heritage Centre's activities that might justify an increase in its human resources. It considered that before improving the situation, it was important to have this general evaluation of the World Heritage Centre's activities. Account must also be taken of the perspectives presented by the recommendations of the service and audit evaluation that go beyond the measures of the report. It recalled that the establishment of an analytical accountancy would be an absolutely necessary means for the implementation of several recommendations for which the degree of legal, financial and political pertinence was unknown.
256. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** was also very pleased with the outcome of the Audit. However, there was one point that had been missed which was of an analytical nature and concerned the Organization as a whole. This should be seen as a chance for the entire Organization, as well as for the World Heritage Centre, to reach a more modern and better system. The Delegation shared the concerns expressed by the other delegations about the World Heritage Fund and its use for staff costs. It agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada and reiterated that the risk assessment analysis should be carried out before making a decision. The Delegation underlined that caution should be exercised and clear limits set in order to avoid too much pressure on the World Heritage Fund.

257. The **Director of the Bureau and the Budget** presented the financial situation of the Centre in 2006, taking into account all the funding sources: the Regular Programme of the Centre amounted to USD 5 million (29%), the World Heritage Fund USD 4.1 million of which USD 3 million of resources originating from States Parties' contributions; FITOCA funds of USD 400,000 and extra-budgetary funds of USD 7.3 million. The budget allocated to staff is USD 3.4 million, which is 68% of the Regular Programme, which is only understandable when reviewing the entire Centre funding.
258. The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the proposal in response to the Management Audit. It nevertheless voiced reservations concerning the creation of posts with multiple funding sources, although it had deep sympathy with the World Heritage Centre, with its increasing work load and the constraints under which this is being carried out. The Delegation felt that more time was needed to study the possible impact of the proposal and especially the use of multiple sources in the long term. It expressed the wish that the proposals for creation of posts be submitted to the Director-General for consideration and that the situation should be carefully examined before the final green light be given.
259. The Delegation of **Switzerland** was convinced of the need to ensure the central role of competence for World Heritage. It required adapted resources and their efficient management. The proposed action plan to respond to the recommendations of the Management Audit appeared to be a good beginning but required further development. The Delegation suggested a rapid implementation of the envisaged measures to ensure improved monitoring. Referring to item 3c) of the results-based plan of the Management Audit, it queried whether this practice responded to the established rules for the use of the Fund or whether it concerned the modification of the Financial Regulations. Moreover, it shared the suggestions made by the Delegation of Canada concerning an analysis of the possible risks of using the World Heritage Fund.
260. The Delegation of **Barbados** indicated that the work of the World Heritage Centre and the Management Audit were greatly appreciated. It went a long way to address the issues raised over the past years and the progress which needed to be undertaken. The Delegation was in agreement with the points raised by the Delegations of Spain and France concerning the need for further analysis, as well as with the comments made by the Delegations of the United States of America, Canada and Japan, who expressed the need for the risk assessment analysis on the use of the World Heritage Fund. The Delegation expressed the wish to see scenarios produced for the use of multiple sources to address the staffing situation. However, of core concern was the original intent of the World Heritage Fund to support States Parties with the management and conservation of their sites, with the preparation of nominations, especially in this region. It further noted, as the Delegation of Saint Lucia had done, that the region had experienced considerable frustrations in accessing funding. It was particularly concerned about the fact that the priority functions of the World Heritage Fund were not being met and that this would put into question the use of this Fund for another purpose. The Delegation further pointed out that the region was currently underrepresented and that a post for the Latin America and Caribbean Unit should be a priority, in particular for someone familiar with small islands. It finally indicated that it was not able to associate itself with the proposal for the use of the World Heritage Fund before the scenarios for the proposal were adequately examined.
261. The **Director of the Bureau of the Budget** confirmed that a modification to the Financial Rules of the World Heritage Fund was incumbent on the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*. She reaffirmed that the request for scenarios and the evaluation of risks is a point of view that the Bureau of the Budget shared, and that this work was a priority before any decision.



262. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** underlined the very experimental character of what was envisaged and that a horizon must be established, and an evaluation of the experimental innovations introduced in the current system for the funding of posts would have to be carried out. In this respect, a risk analysis exercise would be valuable. Moreover, she stated that she did not envisage creating an Assistant Director-General post for the Latin America and Caribbean region, but a post of Chief of Section.
263. The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the present proposal for the use of the World Heritage Fund had raised considerable concerns with a number of countries. The proposal, which will be pending for the next two years, would also mean that for the next two years the staffing situation would continue to be uncertain, which would be negative for the functioning of the World Heritage Centre. It proposed that UNESCO find a short-term solution to improve the staffing situation. It further asked UNESCO to devote more of its resources to this flagship programme from its Regular Programme to ensure that the World Heritage Centre receives the support which it is currently not receiving from UNESCO. The Delegation noted that a further analysis of the Fund needed to be made and expressed its reservations on the current proposal for the use of the World Heritage Fund. The Delegation of Australia pointed out that the Summary Record of the 15th session of the General Assembly had been provided exactly two years after it had taken place. In addition, the documents pertaining to the 16th session of the General Assembly had also not been ready in advance and requested that, in the future, these documents be presented earlier.
264. The Delegation of **Brazil** associated itself with the remarks made by the Delegation of Australia concerning documentation. It underlined the fact that the Summary Record should be made available well in advance and that documents should also be presented well in advance, in order to ensure that the delegations have time to examine them in detail. As a matter of principle, the Delegation of Brazil declared that it would not comment on the administrative arrangements taken by the Director-General concerning the functioning of the Secretariat of the 1972 *Convention*. It stated it was not in agreement with paragraph 11 of the Decision taken by the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee, which concerns the use of the World Heritage Fund for posts. Since it would be difficult to amend the financial regulations, which would not be decided upon during this General Assembly, the Delegation requested that the last paragraph of the Draft Resolution be deleted. It further shared the preoccupation of other Latin American countries concerning the need for a post in the Latin American and Caribbean Unit. It was particularly concerned that, as expressed by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, this post no longer existed within the structure of the Organization and that it should be re-established immediately, as a matter of priority.
265. The Delegation of **Colombia** was in agreement with the Delegations of Brazil and Barbados and the focus on the Latin America and Caribbean region. It hoped that the person designated for the Latin America region be an Assistant Director. The World Heritage Centre's human resources must act in synergy and reflect the equitable criteria for gender. In Latin America, the pioneer work is the nomination file for the Main Andean Road, which could be a pilot project. It spoke of the need for an expert to be recruited from the region and preferably a woman.
266. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** recalled that it was not a decision of the Assistant Director-General, but of the Director-General. She indicated she was sensitive to gender concerns.
267. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the work undertaken since the World Heritage Committee meeting. It expressed its agreement

with the comments made by the Delegation of Australia on the staffing issue. It also noted that an assessment of the workload of the World Heritage Centre should be carried out. At the same time, the possibilities to engage long term staff should be explored. However, the Delegation questioned whether the World Heritage Centre was doing too much and also requested that the World Heritage Centre's capabilities should be assessed. The second question raised concerned the continuous departure of personnel from the World Heritage Centre and underlined that the issue of staffing was important especially for staff morale and their positions. It also questioned whether UNESCO was allowed to have so many temporary staff. The Delegation further agreed with the need for a Latin America and Caribbean position. It pointed out that the lower level positions were not being considered adequately and concluded by emphasizing the need to identify priorities adequately.

268. The Delegation of **Bolivia** requested a clear timetable as to when the post for the expert for Latin America and the Caribbean would be filled. There were important changes taking place in these countries and the heritage there should be enhanced. Mechanisms need to be found to assist in the nomination of properties. It shared the concern of the Delegations of Brazil and other countries in the region regarding this post of Assistant Director for the Latin America and Caribbean region.
269. The Delegation of **Mexico** shared the views of the preceding interventions expressed concerning Latin America. The region had great needs and had recently experienced a deterioration as regards the representation of Latin American countries on the World Heritage List. It reserved the possibility of making comments in respect of item 9 of the agenda entitled " Global Strategy for the World Heritage List ".
270. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its concern regarding the use of the World Heritage Fund that might endanger the objectives and the spirit of the Fund. It expressed its agreement with the need for a risk analysis assessment and supported the analytical accounting system which would enhance reporting and accountability of the activities of the World Heritage Centre. The concerns expressed by the Latin America and Caribbean region are fully understandable and reflect the growing concerns of the Pacific. Finally, the Delegation expressed its belief that the review was going in the right direction and thanked the Secretariat and other bodies involved in trying to resolve this management and review audit.
271. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the views expressed by Latin America and Caribbean delegations concerning the staffing situation. However, it did not have any reservations concerning the gender of the person to be appointed but rather was more concerned with the quality of the professional to be recruited and hoped that this person would have adequate knowledge and expertise in Caribbean heritage. The Delegation was very happy to acknowledge the progress made concerning the Main Andean Road, but had seen no progress concerning the Slave Route.
272. The Delegation of **Venezuela** supported the views expressed by the Latin American countries. It raised two questions. The first concerned the fact that it thought that an Assistant Director-General post for Latin America and the Caribbean existed formerly. The second was to know what would be the mechanisms used for the recruitment of this person.
273. The Delegation of **Chile** reiterated its support for an Assistant Director-General post for the Latin America and Caribbean region.

274. In response to the Delegation of Venezuela, the **Assistant Director-General for Culture** indicated that the post would be submitted to the normal recruitment procedures.
275. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** observed that there had been 22 interventions with responses from the World Heritage Centre, Bureau of the Budget and the Assistant Director-General for Culture. During these exchanges, the observation of the Delegation of Canada, reiterated by Brazil, to omit the last sentence of paragraph 3 “including the World Heritage Fund” had been noted. She then declared paragraph 1 of the Draft Resolution adopted.
276. Concerning Paragraph 2 of the proposed Resolution, the Delegation of **Italy** indicated that the result-based plan was actually more based on the Committee’s Decision than on the outcomes of the Management Audit.
277. The Delegation **Brazil** said that it did not refer to Decision **31 COM 19** and stated that it would agree to a new drafting, which should read as follows: “*Also notes Decision 31 COM 19, adopted at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee*”. It was of the view that a new paragraph should be added.
278. The Delegation of **Italy** supported the amendment submitted by the Delegation of Brazil. An additional paragraph is included between paragraph 1 and former paragraph 2.
279. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the former paragraph 2 (new paragraph 3) adopted.
280. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commented on paragraph 3 with regard to the terminology “operational flexibility” and referred to paragraph 1 which mentioned the delegation of authority for “administrative flexibility”. It raised the question about the right terminology and wondered what the difference was between the two terms.
281. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the terminology applicable was “administrative flexibility”, as stated in the French version.
282. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** recalled that the Delegation of Canada requested that the end of the sentence of former paragraph 3 be omitted, request reiterated by the Delegation of Brazil. She then declared former paragraph 3 (new 4) adopted.
283. The **Rapporteur** took the floor to explain that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada should now be inserted after the current paragraph 4 and should read as follows: “*Requests the Director-General to prepare, for consideration of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, a risk analysis explaining the potential of the proposal to use the World Heritage Fund for permanent posts to be permanently funded by extra-budgetary funds.*”
284. The Delegation of **France** remarked that the proposal for the new paragraph 5 made by the Delegation of Canada, must be modified due to the omission of the last sentence of former paragraph 3.
285. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of France as there had been a lively reaction on the part of several delegations regarding the use of the World Heritage Fund for posts. It hoped that a risk analysis would be undertaken.

286. To avoid all ambiguity on the issue between permanent posts and extra-budgetary funding, the **Legal Advisor** proposed that the following formulation be used “ *use the World Heritage Fund as a guarantee for the creation or abolition of permanent posts* ” and that the remainder be omitted because this analysis would go beyond that required by the World Heritage Fund, and also demonstrate what financial and legal risks the Organization might encounter when creating permanent posts.
287. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that, in the decision, the phrase should be stopped after the words: “*use the World Heritage Fund*”. This would be sufficient to give the Director-General enough information.
288. The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of **Canada**, felt that something more far-reaching than an evaluation for the proposal of the use of the World Heritage Fund should be envisaged and that the amendment should read as follows after the mention of the Legal Advisor: “*an assessment including a risk analysis about the potential impact of the proposal of the use of the World Heritage Fund*”.
289. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the new paragraph adopted as amended.
290. The Delegation of **France** expressed the fact that the analysis undertaken by the Evaluation Service was very useful as it identified certain lacunae. It hoped that the Director-General of UNESCO would pursue the implementation of the Action Plan and the other recommendations of the Audit and proposed the following amendment to add at the end of the former paragraph 4: “ *taking into account the analysis made by the Evaluation and Audit Service* ”.
291. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the new paragraph adopted as amended.
292. The **Rapporteur** clarified a proposal submitted in writing by the Delegation of **Norway** concerning the following addition: “*Requests that the World Heritage Committee be kept informed about the implementation of the Action Plan and that a progress report be submitted to the 17th session of the General Assembly in 2009*”.
293. The Delegation of **Norway** added that it wished to add the following addition to the amendment which should include: “*Requests that the World Heritage Committee also be kept informed of the implementation*”.
294. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the new paragraph adopted as amended, and declared Resolution **16 GA 5** adopted as amended.

**Resolution: 16 GA 5**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/5*,
2. Taking note of Decision **31 COM 19**, adopted at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Takes note of the results-based Action Plan to implement the main recommendations of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre;
4. Welcomes the proposals of the Director-General of UNESCO to improve the administrative flexibility of the World Heritage Centre, clarify its organizational structure, and create posts, on an experimental basis, by combining multiple sources of financing;
5. Requests the Director-General to prepare, for consideration at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, an assessment, including a risk analysis, about the potential impact of the proposals to use the World Heritage Fund as a guarantee for the creation or abolition of permanent posts;
6. Urges the Director-General to pursue the implementation of this Action Plan and other recommendations of the Management Audit; and taking into account its analysis by IOS;
7. Requests that the World Heritage Committee be kept informed about the implementation of the Action Plan and that a progress report be submitted to the 17th session of the General Assembly in 2009.



## DAY 2

### FOURTH MEETING

25 October 2007

3.00 – 7.00 pm

#### 3.A ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE - REFLECTION ON ELECTION PROCEDURES OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS TO ENSURE AN EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES OF THE WORLD (continued)

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/3A,*  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3A*

295. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested the Permanent Delegate of Japan, H.E. Mr Kondo, to present the non adopted points of Resolution **16 GA 3A**.
296. **H. E. Mr. Kondo, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO, Chairperson of the Working Group** presented the text as the best possible compromise. This text proposed to create an informal open-ended Working Group chaired by Ms Cameron in her capacity as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. He then proposed to agree on the working process of the Working Group.
297. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** indicated that Ms Cameron had requested not to chair the Working Group. Consequently, she proposed to omit the first part of the new paragraph 7 relating to the chairing of the Working Group and to retain the second part of this new paragraph 7. She proposed that at its first meeting the Working Group elect a chairperson amongst its members. The first part of the new paragraph 7 would read as follows: “the *Working Group would elect its chairperson at its first meeting*”; the rest of the paragraph remained unchanged.
298. Supported by the Delegation of **Indonesia**, the Delegation of **Kenya** proposed that the Ambassador of Japan would be the Chairperson of the Working Group and called the first meeting of the Working Group.
299. The Delegation of **Mauritania** evoked material issues that might prevent some States Parties from participating in the meetings of the Working Group, due to lack of means. It proposed that the Working Group comprise a limited number of countries, and the costs be covered by the World Heritage Centre. The “open” character of the Group is a good idea but of uncertain feasibility.
300. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed for election the Permanent Delegate of Japan as Chairperson of the Working Group, who was elected by acclamation.

301. The Delegation of **Algeria** proposed, for more effectiveness, that the Working Group be limited – 18 members – and composed with respect to regional geographical distribution (as the drafting group of C4 and C5).
302. The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the Permanent Delegate of Japan on its election as Chairperson of the Working Group and supported the proposal of the Delegation of Algeria for a regional representation. It was in favour of a Working Group as broad as possible, and asked whether the first meeting of the Group would be called by the World Heritage Centre or by the Chairperson of the Working Group.
303. The Delegation of **Japan** said that the Working Group should be open-ended. It suggested first adopting the text; the working modalities would come later.
304. The Delegation of **Argentina** proposed to adopt the text but the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly do not foresee the creation of a Working Group nor its functioning modalities, the periodicity of the meetings, or whether it was possible to use electronic mail as a working tool. It was in favour of an open-ended Working Group.
305. The Delegation of **Hungary** supported an open-ended Working Group.
306. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested the Chairperson to ask if any delegation was against paragraph 6.
307. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** read out paragraph 6 which was approved. She then declared the new paragraph 7 adopted as amended (first line).
308. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed both French and English as the working languages of the Working Group.
309. Supported by the Delegation of **Egypt**, the Delegation of **Argentina** questioned the functioning modalities of the Working Group.
310. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked if the Permanent Delegate of Japan, Chairperson of the Working Group, could convene the Working Group and make proposals on its functioning.
311. The **Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO** suggested that the working procedures would be settled at the first meeting of the Working Group which would be convened in early 2008. The second meeting would then be convened at the World Heritage Committee meeting in Quebec, with a third meeting organized after the Quebec Committee session. He added that he would require the support of the World Heritage Centre for the organization of the meetings.
312. The Delegation of **France** questioned the composition of the Working Group, and whether it would not necessarily be the same as at its first meeting.
313. The Delegation of **Kenya**, referring to paragraph 7, mentioned that the World Heritage Centre should give the necessary support to the Working Group.
314. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed that H.E. Mr Kondo, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO, make a concrete proposal, following which the debate could be closed.
315. The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that the debate was going round in circles. The General Assembly had accomplished what it had set out to achieve and the



Chairperson of the Working Group and the World Heritage Centre should be left to work out the functional and operational details.

316. The **General Assembly** expressed its agreement by acclamation.

**Resolution: 16 GA 3A**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Documents *WHC-07/16.GA/3A* and *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.3A*,
2. Recalling Resolution **15 GA 9**, adopted at its 15th session (UNESCO, 2005), requesting to initiate a “ process to discuss possible alternatives to the existing system of elections to the World Heritage Committee ” before its 16th session,
3. Keeping in mind the discussions held during the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007) and during the 16th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention* (UNESCO, 2007),
4. Reiterating the need to ensure a more equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world, as well as a fair rotation in the composition of the Committee,
5. Emphasizing the need to envisage a less complex and less time-consuming voting method to better focus on other important issues for discussion,
6. Decides to intensify the examination of all possible alternatives to the current election system and to this end establishes an open-ended working group in order to make recommendations thereon, to inform the World Heritage Committee of its work, and to deliver its final report to the 17th session of the General Assembly in 2009;
7. Requests **H. E. Mr. Kondo (Japan)** to chair this working group in his personal capacity and the World Heritage Centre to give the necessary support to the working group;
8. Calls upon the World Heritage Committee to examine at its upcoming sessions the progress achieved by this working group and to make possible recommendations on it;
9. Further decides to inscribe this item on the agenda of its 17th session (October-November 2009) to examine possible modifications to its Rules of Procedure.

317. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared that from now on the question was in the competent hands of H.E. Ambassador Kondo, until a proposal was formulated. She indicated that the Delegation of Gabon had requested the floor and asked whether it still wished to intervene, in view of the fact that the General Assembly had already expressed its agreement by acclamation.

318. The Delegation of **Gabon** indicated that its voice had not been heard often in the Assembly and it would speak once the proposal of Mr Kondo was formulated.



## 6. ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE ADVISORY BODIES' ACTIVITIES

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/6*

322. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** passed to item 6 of the agenda, and asked the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the Document *WHC-07/16.GA/6*.
323. The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the working document, recalling that it responded to a request made during the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007). He highlighted the fact that the document concluded that the Advisory Bodies had conducted their activities in rigorous respect of the *Convention*.
324. The Delegation of **Indonesia** indicated its support for the Draft Resolution and asked for clarification of the references in paragraphs 32 and 33 to work towards the improvement of the working relations between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and in particular if this had posed any difficulties in terms of the assessment.
325. The Delegation of **Algeria** indicated that this point was of the highest interest to the southern hemisphere countries. The *Convention* has been in force for over 30 years, and at this point lessons should be learnt regarding its implementation. The document retraced the work of the Advisory Bodies but the result of this work had proved throughout World Heritage Committee sessions almost “damageable” to the heritage of certain southern hemisphere countries that have scarcer means to prepare nomination files and in this way are at a disadvantage. It recalled that the task of the States Parties is to preserve the heritage of all the regions. The work carried out with the Advisory Bodies must try to rectify these injustices. It requested that reflection should continue, with some delegations, on this issue.
326. The Delegation of **Norway** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the working document, noting that it was pleased to see emphasis being placed on clarifying respective roles and responsibilities. It commended the Advisory Bodies for their work noting that their work in respect of nomination dossiers and conservation issues had been undertaken with rigour and professionalism. It expressed concern that at times during the World Heritage Committee sessions; the pressures of lobbying could overrule the very serious and conscientious recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. It was important that the newly-elected members of the Committee – to whom it extended its congratulations – base their decisions on the criteria for inscription and the *Operational Guidelines*, rather than become embroiled in political issues. To do so undermined the credibility of the *Convention* and the Committee.
327. The Delegation of **Canada** supported these remarks, recalling that the Committee had long asked the Advisory Bodies to be strict in applying the criteria for inscription. The Committee should continue to respect that. Speaking as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Cameron said that her current responsibilities meant that she saw a lot of the very good and timely work of the Advisory Bodies in relation to International Assistance requests. Referring to an evaluation of IUCN that she had undertaken, she congratulated it on its response to the tough recommendations she had made and noted that ICOMOS too was undergoing a process of review, which reflected a seriousness of purpose.
328. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Norway and proposed an amendment to the Draft Resolution in relation to the Management

Audit of the World Heritage Centre to the effect that the protocols currently being developed should be presented to the Committee before 2009.

329. The Delegation of **China** highlighted the very important role of the Advisory Bodies in the preservation of World Heritage and in capacity building in particular. These three Organizations, and notably ICCROM must remain the privileged partners of the *Convention* with regards to training in favour of the preservation and restoration of cultural properties.
330. The Delegation of **Brazil** also praised the work of the Advisory Bodies and looked forward to a constructive and close relationship with them during its tenure on the Committee. The Committee should take the Advisory Bodies' views into account as part of its decision-making process, but ultimately it was for the Committee to make its own decisions.
331. The **Director-General of ICCROM** recalled that this Centre had been created fifty years ago to reinforce capacity building and training in cultural heritage. In November 2007, a ceremony would be held, in cooperation with the Government of Italy, to mark its first fifty years and to look forward to the next fifty with an ever-increasing membership. Even greater emphasis would be placed on the training needs of mid-career managers, curators and conservators of all types of cultural heritage – tangible and intangible.
332. Continuing in French, **Director-General of ICCROM** informed the Assembly that he had launched several initiatives, such as: scientific committees of ICCROM to coordinate the activities of the Organization, because the problems are enormous as regards the protection of cultural properties. Close links had been created with ICOMOS and more concrete contacts with IUCN have been established, as the problems today call for a global approach. With regard to the “Africa 2009” initiative, ICCROM hopes to receive more support from donors following the example given by the Nordic countries. A programme on Latin America, a region that until now had not benefitted from assistance for training, had also been developed. The Arab region benefitted from collaboration of ICCROM with ALECSO and the Getty Foundation for the training of conservators, notably for mosaics. ICCROM continues its conservation courses in stone (Venice), wood (Norway), paper (Japan); and since 2006 ICCROM recommenced its global orientation courses: archaeological training, architectural conservation, decisions on conservation issues, etc. ICCROM has also signed an agreement with the Tongji University in Shanghai for the training of conservators for the Asia-Pacific region. Finally, the “CollAsia 2010” initiative with eleven Asia Pacific countries extends until 2010 with the objective of improving conditions for the conservation of moveable heritage. He concluded by saying that the role of ICCROM was to continue to ask fundamental questions concerning the protection and conservation of cultural heritage. He was pleased that a prominent French newspaper had today reported the words of the Director of the World Heritage Centre concerning the properties in danger and the importance of preserving them.
333. The **Representative of ICOMOS** thanked the General Assembly for the confidence it had expressed in the work of the Advisory Bodies. It accepted them not as laurels but as an on-going challenge to continuously improve the service it offered to the *Convention* and to the Committee and to cultures of all countries. In recent times it had reformed its Scientific Committees and was seeking to increase the representation of different types of expertise on evaluation teams.
334. The **Representative of IUCN** stated that the Union was very honoured and pleased to work on World Heritage conservation and the ever more challenging tasks to

accomplish. It was in the process of implementing the “Cameron review”, expanding its membership and involving local committees and experts. It was very conscious of how much needed to be done in terms of capacity building in spite of a very limited budget. It recalled the two resource manuals which had been presented to the 31st session of the Committee and which will be published in cooperation with the other two Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Along with ICCROM and ICOMOS, it looked forward to continuing its collaboration on World Heritage.

335. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** put the Draft Resolution **16 GA 6** for adoption by the General Assembly.
336. The **Rapporteur** noted that an amendment had been put forward by the Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegation of **Saint Lucia**. The Delegation of **Brazil**, supporting this amendment, also suggested presenting it as a stand alone paragraph.
337. Following an expression of support from the Delegations of **Hungary** and **Indonesia** and some repositioning of the new amendment, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared Resolution **16 GA 6** adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 6**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/6*,
2. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to report at its 17th session in 2009, on the progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 Management Audit, in relation to the work and relationships with the Advisory Bodies;
3. Calls upon the World Heritage Committee to review the proposed protocols of roles and responsibilities indicated in the Management Audit and submit its comments on them to the General Assembly at its 17th session in 2009.

**7. EXAMINATION OF THE STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND, INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE STATES PARTIES' CONTRIBUTIONS**

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/7*,  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.7*

338. Introducing item 7 of the agenda, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller of UNESCO to present Document *WHC-07/16.GA/7*.
339. Following a brief presentation by the **Secretariat**, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the Resolution **16 GA 7** adopted without discussion.

**Resolution: 16 GA 7**

The General Assembly

1. Having examined the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period ending 31 December 2005 approved by the Comptroller (see Section I of the Document *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.7*) in conformity with the Financial Regulations of the World Heritage Fund that stipulate that the accounts of the Fund shall be submitted to the General Assembly of the States Parties to the *Convention* (Article 6, paragraph 6.4),
2. Approves the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period ending 31 December 2005 (see Section II of the Document *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.7*);
3. Takes note of the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2007, established by the Comptroller (see Section III of the Document *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.7*).

**8. DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 16 OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/8*,  
                      *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.8*

340. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** then invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller to present item 8 of the agenda.
341. Following a brief presentation by the **Secretariat**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested that its intervention be recorded in the Summary Records of the session and noted that the information presented in Document *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.8*, in relation to the Netherlands, was incorrect and should be amended.
342. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that this would be verified by the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Sector for Administration (ADM/DOC).
343. The Delegation of **Kenya** announced that, like other African countries, it wished to show the example and had therefore contributed USD 32,000 to the African World Heritage Fund. It also clarified that the arrears recorded in *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.8* had now been cleared.
344. The Chairperson of the General Assembly declared Resolution **16 GA 8.1** adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 8.1**

The General Assembly,

1. Decides to set at one per cent of the contribution to the regular budget of UNESCO for the calculation of the amount of the contributions to be paid to the World Heritage Fund by States Parties for the financial period 2008-2009.

345. In relation to Draft Resolution **16 GA 8.2**, the Delegation of **Brazil** commented that it would be more appropriate for a Resolution issuing from the General Assembly of States Parties to be addressed to States Parties, rather than to the Director-General of UNESCO, and proposed drafting amendments accordingly.
346. The Delegation of **Israel** supported these but requested that it become a separate paragraph, thus making a distinction between the issue of arrears and additional voluntary contributions.
347. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared the Resolution **16 GA 8.2** adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 8.2**

The General Assembly,

1. Recalling Decision **31 COM 20A** of the World Heritage Committee, which urges States Parties in arrears to pay their overdue contributions to the World Heritage Fund,
2. Encourages States Parties to make voluntary donations to the World Heritage Fund in addition to their contributions;
3. Takes note of Document *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.8* on the Statement of compulsory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund.

**9. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

Documents      *WHC-07/16.GA/9*,  
                       *WHC-07/16.GA/INF.9*

348. Continuing in French, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** passed to item 9 of the agenda and requested the Secretariat to present the documents.
349. The **Secretariat** introduced document *WHC-07/16.GA/9* by referring to the Global Strategy adopted in 1994 as one of the most important documents in the last twenty years of the *Convention*. It recalled that it was derived from the 1992 Strategic Orientations and is embedded in the Budapest Declaration of 2002 and the Committee's Strategic Objectives (5 Cs). The Global Strategy work has largely contributed to the recognition of the interaction between people and their environment and the role that communities can play. Work undertaken by the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to analyse the List and identify gaps was spearheaded in the last ten years to address issues such as the representivity of heritage on the World Heritage List, its credibility, the balance between natural and cultural heritage and the application of Outstanding Universal Value. Reference was made to the Periodic Reporting exercise, and meetings and activities (*WHC-07/16.GA/INF.9*) developed to provide support to under-represented regions of the world. Reference was also made to the preparation of a document on serial transnational nomination initiatives for the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2008. A summary of the statistical analysis

of the List and Tentative Lists over the period 1994-2007 was also presented showing that the regional breakdown of the List was unlikely to be modified in years to come, insofar as two-thirds of the properties would be situated in the European and North American region. In terms of category breakdown, the Tentative Lists show greater balance than the current World Heritage List. This is due to a revision process by States Parties, who have been increasing the number of natural sites on their Tentative Lists. Revisions and their effects on the balance of the List could be attributed to the impacts of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision. However, comparison between the regional and categorical breakdown of the World Heritage List from 1994 to 2007 show no major changes in trends, except for the fact that an increase was noted in the number of cultural sites in the European and North American region which raises questions about the effectiveness of the Global Strategy.

350. The Delegation of **Nigeria** thanked the Chairperson of the General Assembly and all contributors for the work provided through this document. It spoke in favour of capacity building measures required to take the work of Global Strategy forward and called on UNESCO offices and representatives in each region to strengthen support in this regard. Emphasis was also placed on the difficulties sometimes presented in distinguishing between the cultural and natural values of sites, stating that many sites are demonstrations of the inter-linkages and inter-dependency of people and places. It gave the example of a site in Nigeria where the element of human intervention is tangible. It called on States Parties and on the Committee to keep an open mind on the subject when putting forth and examining new nominations.
351. The Delegation of **Mexico** considered that it was imperative to nominate a chief for the Latin America and Caribbean section, especially since the analysis of this region was a cause for concern. In its view, the Global Strategy should reflect that which prevailed in the regions and also have a regional strategy. Representivity was not only a geographical issue, it was also typological. Only 19 properties in this region have been inscribed in seven years for a continent of 33 countries. The Delegation asked what the flaw was in the system and why it existed. It hoped that all this would be reflected in the Resolution. It added that in 2001, 20 sites were inscribed in Europe-North America against four in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Africa region inscribed six properties in 2006, while Europe-North America inscribed five in that same year. It concluded by affirming that the vision of the so-called "Cairns" decision had not been applied.
352. The Delegation of **Norway** underlined the concerns raised by the Committee during its 31st session in Christchurch when this statistical information was provided to them. Unfortunately, despite efforts made, it concluded that the impacts of the Global Strategy were insufficient. There are still countries without properties and while the results of the Tentative Lists might show some improvement for the future, the issue of imbalance between North and South, between nature and culture and thematic repartition would remain. The number of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger also lacked in regional balance and work undertaken under Global Strategy needed to be enhanced and sacrifices made to be able to spend more resources on priorities if the noble objectives set by the Global Strategy were to be reached.
353. The Delegation of **Lithuania** shared the concerns of other delegations and thanked the Secretariat for its contribution to this work. It drew attention to the work ahead and emphasized the need for an analysis of the impacts of International Assistance on nominations. It was of the view that too many nomination proposals that had received support from the World Heritage Fund that did not meet the requirements of the Committee and that an in-depth look into the impacts of preparatory assistance was needed in order to properly deal with the problem.



354. The Delegation of **Indonesia** drew attention to the fact that one of the primary objectives of the Global Strategy was to redress the imbalance between cultural and natural properties on the World Heritage List. It emphasized the importance of climate change in this context and the relevance of the *World Heritage Convention*, notably as regards natural heritage. The Delegation called for the International Community to safeguard the planet. This could be achieved through a reinforcement of cooperation between the UNESCO Science and Culture Sectors.
355. The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Secretariat and expressed support for the work done on the analysis of the Tentative Lists aiming for a more balanced World Heritage List. It pointed to the Advisory Bodies' research on thematic categories which, it felt, the Committee should reflect upon as a way of addressing gaps within the List. It also stressed the importance of international cooperation through the preparation of serial nominations and the need to reinforce sub-regional capacity-building initiatives that are effective in assisting with the preparation of nominations. Reference was made to the existence of high standards of guidance developed by the Advisory Bodies which needed to be widely circulated amongst States Parties. The Delegation also noted that an assessment of the International Assistance, called for by the Delegation of **Lithuania**, had already been requested.
356. While recognizing that the Delegation of **Brazil** had not been involved in the work of the Committee since 1991, it spoke of the successes Brazil had achieved in preparing nominations of sites that had been inscribed. It informed the Assembly on cooperation and assistance provided to other countries in the past and stated its willingness to continue providing guidance and support in this way. Acknowledgement of the limited resources available and lack of capacity should pave the way towards a redeployment of efforts in this field. It reaffirmed Brazil's intent to contribute and invited other States Parties to also work in this direction.
357. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the intervention from the Delegation of Mexico and thanked the Delegations of Norway and Lithuania for their statements. It reiterated the need for an evaluation of the funds allocated to preparatory assistance and a close examination of the results generated through this type of assistance. It called for care in seeking guidance from the Advisory Bodies on preparing nominations as this could generate a conflict of interest. It requested clarification about the opening of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision that was made during the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee in New Zealand notably as pertains to the balance between cultural and natural site nominations.
358. The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with other delegations and congratulated the Secretariat for the work accomplished. It stated that Africa has been one of the major beneficiaries of the Global Strategy and while four new African sites were inscribed in 2007, only one site was proposed for inscription in the region in 2008. This illustrates the need to continue to strengthen efforts underway. It also thanked UNESCO for its support in developing capacity-building initiatives and also recognized the contributions of Norway in this regard. It also noted with interest the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil. It concluded its intervention by calling on a culturally balanced analysis of the Global Strategy, which should take into consideration the voices, local languages and sites that are embodied in the evolving spirit of the *World Heritage Convention*. Drawing attention to the fact that the *Convention* was originally designed with a western approach to heritage, it stated that it is now more representative and includes less monumental notions of heritage such as cultural itineraries.

359. The Delegation of **Barbados** lent its support to comments made by others and took the opportunity to highlight the preoccupations of the Caribbean region, notably as concerns the representivity of sites.
360. The Delegation of **Hungary** made several points relating to the need to fine-tune the Global Strategy in particular as regards a realistic interpretation of the balance between natural and cultural sites, which it felt was not about statistics. It also called for a better assessment of properties within regions as while some regions were considered over-represented, sub-regions within may in fact be under-represented. It recalled that the Global Strategy was not carved in stone and could also take intangible heritage elements into consideration. Furthermore, increasing the number of new nominations would not solve the issue. Greater emphasis should be placed on the quality of conservation practice at sites.
361. The Delegation of **Sri Lanka** congratulated the Committee for its valuable contribution to this work and for a quality document. It further expressed its support of the Draft Resolution and called for more self discipline in ensuring the state of conservation of properties.
362. The Delegation of **Belgium** considered that it was necessary to go beyond the global framework and have a more regional approach, even sub-regional.
363. The Delegation of **India** expressed its support in favour of the statements made by the Delegation of Kenya and wished to provide some clarification to the Delegation of Saint Lucia regarding the modification of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision during the 31st session of the Committee in Christchurch, New Zealand. It was concerned with a possible contradiction between information presented in paragraph 23 of document WHC-07/16.GA/9, about the positive effect of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision and the information presented in Christchurch by the Secretariat, which it felt had influenced the Committee to amend the Suzhou-Cairns Decision to allow States Parties to put forward two cultural nominations in the same year cycle. It furthermore noted that, while the evaluation shown presented a sharp increase in figures for the Asia Pacific region, it felt it to be misleading as the number of properties in the Pacific had only increased by one during the period of the evaluation. It reiterated the fact that no progress was in sight for the forthcoming year as only one new nomination was to be examined for Africa and none for the Pacific region and introduced an amendment to the Draft Resolution to express the General Assembly's great concern.
364. The Delegation of **Venezuela** stated that the cultural heritage was the expression of social will and that the recognition of a property was commensurate with the recognition of the people who live there.
365. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the Global Strategy was a pillar of the World Heritage programme, involving States Parties and other donors in its implementation. However, thematic divisions and issues of geographical representation were not sufficient to address the problem and he called for a reinforcement of capacities to make the Global Strategy more effective. He added that the World Heritage Centre provided constant assistance to countries to that effect, through International Assistance, whether for the preparation of nominations, or for training activities. On the point raised concerning the balance between culture and nature, he also referred to work done to create better links between culture and nature, notably by merging the ten criteria. He also noted the need to focus on the long term impacts of the Global Strategy and the application of tools developed and promoted through resource manuals in preparation with the Advisory Bodies. Furthermore, he called for cross links and more systematic use of all heritage-related conventions as a means of

ensuring better coordination and federating more support in favour of key issues. In response to the Delegation of India regarding the Suzhou-Cairns Decision, he clarified that the analysis shown in the working document and reference made, notably in paragraph 23, was limited to information concerning the Tentative List and did not apply to other statistical aspects of the World Heritage List.

366. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** gave the floor to the Delegation of **India**, which commented that the previous answer given by the Secretariat concerning the Cairns-Suzhou Decision was contradictory to the text proposed in the document.
367. The **Secretariat** further explained that the number of natural World Heritage properties had actually increased, but that the numbers indicated only reflected the inscribed properties, and not nominations submitted, some of which were either deferred or incomplete.
368. After this explanation, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** moved on to the Draft Decision. The Delegation of **Norway** proposed to show the text of the four proposed amendments on the screen, in order to avoid multiple interventions with similar proposals.
369. No comments having been made on paragraph 1, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested comments on paragraph 2.
370. The Delegation of **India** proposed to insert "*Notes with concern the limited progress*".
371. With the support of the **Chairperson of the General Assembly**, the Delegation of **Norway** repeated its request to show the text on screen as it felt that this point was in fact also proposed for the next paragraph 3.
372. The Delegation of **Mexico** wished to propose an amendment to paragraph 2; however, having listened to the Delegation of Norway, it would agree to analysing all its proposals for amendment first of all, and take the floor later if need be.
373. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested clarification from the Delegation of Norway as to whether this new paragraph 3 was a replacement of the old.
374. The Delegation of **Norway** replied that the new paragraph was proposed between the old 2 and 3 of the Draft Decision, so it was not a replacement.
375. The **Secretariat** indicated that the proposals of Mexico, Norway and India were similar and it was necessary to chose between the three paragraphs.
376. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked the Assembly whether it could accept the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway, to which the Delegation of **Brazil** responded that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Mexico was more acceptable.
377. The Delegation of **Mexico** explained that this amendment took note of the report on the Global Strategy of the World Heritage Centre and expressed its concern given that the results obtained were very limited.
378. The Delegation of **India** commented that it agreed to the amendments proposed by both Delegations (Mexico and Norway).

379. At the request of the **Chairperson of the General Assembly**, the Delegation of **Norway** replied that the point had been picked up, but it wanted to add “*Expresses its deep concern*”.
380. **The Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked whether, with this addition, the old paragraph 3 was still relevant.
381. The Delegation of **Brazil** remarked that the decisions taken by these Intergovernmental Bodies should be readable for the general public, but that the current language was not clear, for example concerning the concept of harmonization of Tentative Lists.
382. At the request of the **Chairperson of the General Assembly**, the **Secretariat** replied that the concept of harmonization of Tentative Lists was in the *Operational Guidelines* and that, although it might be obscure for a general audience, it had been the jargon for years and should thus be maintained.
383. The Delegation of **Hungary** stated that it was in favour of using this language as it was already in practice in regional workshops as such, and that it hoped that the Delegation of Brazil would accept.
384. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** moved on to the adoption of paragraphs 3 and 4, with an amendment for a new paragraph 4 proposed by the Delegation of Mexico, which was read out by the **Rapporteur**.
385. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** then requested whether it would be possible to merge the proposals made by the Delegations of Norway and Mexico.
386. The Delegation of **India** wanted to add to the proposal from the Delegation of Mexico: “*specifically for non- and little-represented regions*”.
387. The Delegation of **Brazil** welcomed the proposal from the Delegation of Mexico and requested it be put on the screen to clarify whether this point should be added to, or receded from, paragraph 4. If receded, it asked to add “*specifically taken into account for*”, so that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India could build on the Mexican proposal.
388. The **Secretariat** suggested inserting a new paragraph after the old paragraph 3.
389. The Delegation of **Norway** was satisfied with the text that was put on the screen, but outlined the need for actions to address the imbalances and proposed to insert “*a series of possible actions*” next to “*analysis*”.
390. The Delegation of **Mali** requested the addition of “*an in-depth analysis*” between “*requests the World Heritage Committee*” and “*representation of regions*” to avoid any misunderstanding.
391. The **Secretariat** suggested simplifying the second part of paragraph 9, proposed by the Delegation of Norway, by way of a merger. The Delegation of **Norway** responded positively, provided it was put at the end of the proposal made by the Delegation of Mexico.
392. The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed to put “*World Heritage Centre*” instead of the Committee, as well as “*under-represented cultures*”, to which the Delegation of the **United States of America** further suggested including the Advisory Bodies.

393. The Delegation of **France** considered the text very long, and the workload, it imagined, very heavy for the World Heritage Committee as well as for the World Heritage Centre. It added that it was too soon to draw conclusions or make decisions and requested that an in-depth analysis be undertaken, reserving conclusions for successive stages.
394. The Delegation of **Brazil** concurred with the Delegation of France and further recommended that the possible actions to be taken would be reported “*at its 33rd session*”.
395. The Delegation of **Italy** supported the Delegation of France and suggested splitting the paragraph in two parts, as otherwise it would become too long. This was supported by the Delegation of **Norway**, who also proposed inclusion of “*urges the World Heritage Committee, based on the analysis in paragraph 3, to...*”
396. The Delegation of **Nigeria** recommended “*concrete actions*” instead of “*possible actions*”, which was supported by the Delegation of **Norway**, and that the **Secretariat** split the paragraph in two.
397. The **Representative of ICOMOS** underlined that the imbalance noted within the World Heritage Committee reflected the imbalance within ICOMOS, given that some countries did not yet possess a national committee (of ICOMOS). It called upon the States Parties to support ICOMOS in their respective countries to achieve a balance so that ICOMOS might provide better services.
398. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked whether the new paragraphs 4 and 5 could be adopted, and then requested to proceed with the other paragraphs, the texts of which could be cleaned up in order to avoid repetitions.
399. The Delegation of **Italy** recalled that the Global Strategy and the 4 C’s had always been supported by Italy, which gave huge support for it especially with regard to Capacity Building, and thus proposed to insert into the new paragraph 5: “*...and take into account the spirit of the World Heritage Convention*”.
400. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked whether paragraph 4 was acceptable, and declared it adopted. She then moved to paragraph 5, to which the Delegation of **Brazil** wanted to change “*share their national experiences*”, which was adopted subsequently.
401. For paragraph 6, the Delegation of **Brazil** proposed an amendment, which was read out. Having received no objections, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared it adopted.
402. The **Secretariat** explained that paragraph 7 was now redundant, as its contents had already been included in the previous paragraphs 4 and 5.
403. The Delegation of **Norway** clarified that these previous paragraphs requested reporting back to the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee, while this paragraph proposed to report back on strategy and a concrete action plan to the next General Assembly.
404. The Delegation of **Mexico** clarified that its request for an amendment to paragraph 5 did not concern an action plan but a series of concrete actions and requested that “*on the implementation of the...*” be added in paragraph 7 of the original document.

405. The **Secretariat** then suggested keeping this paragraph 7, although it would make the overall Draft Decision a bit redundant and the earlier elegance of the text proposed by the Delegation of Mexico would be lost.
406. The Delegation of **India** supported paragraph 7 as amended by the Delegation of Mexico and observed it would give it a conclusion.
407. The Delegation of **Indonesia** suggested replacing the word “*record*” by “*report*”.
408. The Delegation of **Brazil** reminded the Assembly that the emphasis in the analysis was on the period 2004-2007, and that in paragraph 7, the Advisory Bodies could not be asked to report back to the General Assembly. The World Heritage Centre would take their contributions into account, as well as the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee, and subsequently report to the General Assembly. It further suggested the preparation of a discussion document.
409. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Delegation of Brazil and suggested an element related to the Global Strategy be included, so it would not be deleted.
410. The **Secretariat** suggested that paragraph 7, as it stood, reflected the General Assembly’s discussion and proposed to move on, to which the Delegation of **Norway** objected. The latter suggested, in paragraph 10, to enhance the issue of development cooperation and asked whether the Delegation of **India** could accept that its proposed section be deleted.
411. The **Secretariat** observed, however, that this could not be left as it was, as a last paragraph.
412. The Delegation of **Norway** agreed, but asked where to put the deleted section of the proposal made by the Delegation of India.
413. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to include in Paragraph 11 “*with the evaluated strategy*”.
414. Taking into account the time, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** requested whether a conclusion could be reached.
415. The Delegation of **Mexico** responded that paragraph 4 as amended was not clear. The amendment proposed by the Delegation of India for this paragraph took into account the concerns of the Delegation of Norway concerning sub-Saharan Africa and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and called upon the Delegation of Norway to maintain it as it was.
416. The Delegation of **Norway** responded that it was necessary for the focus to be on the specific actions in the sub-Saharan and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) regions, and could this be added to paragraph 4.
417. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that paragraph 11 was redundant with the initial paragraph 7, and proposed a simplification at this level.
418. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked the Delegation of Norway if it could withdraw its proposed paragraph 11, to which the Delegation of **Norway** responded negatively, as the issue was actually not covered in paragraph 7.

419. The **Secretariat** read out paragraphs 7 and 11 and suggested a merger, to which the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** added that she did not want to re-open debate on paragraphs already adopted.
420. The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification on whether paragraph 5 was already adopted and then accepted the Secretariat's suggestion for a merger.
421. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** concluded the debate by saying the Secretariat had proposed to clean up the text and subsequently declared Resolution **16 GA 9** adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 9**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/9*,
2. Takes note of the progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List from 2003 to 2007 presented in this document, and expresses its deep concern for the limited results achieved so far;
3. Calls upon the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other partners to significantly increase their support to States Parties, particularly in less developed countries, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties as well as the harmonization of their Tentative List taking into account the existing studies;
4. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, to prepare an in-depth analysis of the representation of the regions in order to identify the obstacles and challenges for achieving the objectives of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage List;
5. Encourages having a special focus on the need for action in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS), and also exploring the possibilities of strengthened development cooperation;
6. Urges the World Heritage Committee, at its 33rd session in 2009, based on the analysis described in paragraph 4 and taking into account the spirit of the *Convention*, to recommend concrete actions that might be taken to redress the present imbalance to be examined by the General Assembly at its 17th session in 2009;
7. Requests the World Heritage Centre to compile all reports from sub-regional meetings and thematic studies and to make them available on a specific web page of the World Heritage Centre's website;
8. Invites the States Parties to share their national experiences concerning the preparation of Tentative Lists with other countries, in particular in the harmonization of Tentative Lists;
9. Calls upon States Parties to cooperate with other States Parties which so request on the preparation of nominations for the World Heritage List, and especially encourages South-South and North-South-South cooperation initiatives;

10. Requests the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to develop additional technical and policy guidance for Serial and Transboundary nominations and in particular for their identification and management;
11. Requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to provide to the next session of the General Assembly in 2009 a report on the implementation of this Resolution.

## 10. POLICY DOCUMENT ON THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/10*

422. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** introduced item 10 of the agenda recalling that at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the Committee had requested the World Heritage Centre to create a working group comprising experts to examine the nature and extent of the risks of climate change and this in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. She emphasized that, since that date, the Committee had been very active and had convened several meetings and produced documents that dealt with the issue. She also recalled that the challenges linked to climate change were also the subject of a thematic debate at the 177th session of the Executive Board of UNESCO (Document 177 EX/INF.6) and were the subject of a consultation at the last General Assembly of the United Nations. She finally asked the **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** to present to the General Assembly Document *WHC-07/16.GA/10*, prepared by the Secretariat.
423. Introducing the document, the **Secretariat** recalled that the past year had been a landmark in terms of the evolution of the subject of climate change and that public opinion had finally caught up with science. There was recognition now, more than ever, that climate change was affecting every aspect of social and economic life. The Secretariat recalled the three landmark reports produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), stating that the Stern report produced in 2006 in the United Kingdom on the economic impact of climate change highlighted the consequences of not addressing climate change. The Secretariat further said that the topic of climate change occupied the centre stage of all major political discourses around the world. The Executive Board had also held a thematic debate on 1 October 2007, which was addressed by the Chairperson of IPCC, to which the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize had just been awarded for its work on climate change. The Secretariat mentioned that a review of the work going on within UNESCO in the field of Climate Change was being carried out, as a contribution to the UN strategy. The General Assembly was further informed that, in 2005, the World Heritage Committee having realised the importance of the climate change issue, requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to establish an expert group to prepare a report on this topic and to also prepare a strategy for assisting States Parties in managing properties in the face of climate change. The report and the strategy, presented and endorsed by the Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), have been published in the World Heritage Series No. 22 and have been widely disseminated. A compilation of case studies had also been published for raising general awareness on the subject. At its 30th session, the Committee requested that a Policy document on the subject be presented in 2007. Accordingly, this draft Policy document was prepared to address some strategic issues in terms of implementation of the *Convention* and aspects that have to be considered in addressing climate change and World Heritage. The Secretariat recalled that the Committee had specifically mentioned that its intervention



would be at site level adaptation, rather than on mitigation, which was being addressed by other conventions. The focus of the work done by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had been on assisting States Parties in undertaking vulnerability assessments and on proposing adaptation measures. While some mitigation could be undertaken at the site level, mitigation of greenhouse gases had to be addressed at global level through the UN Framework Convention on climate change. The Secretariat informed the General Assembly that the document under discussion outlined the kind of synergies that can be developed with international organizations and bodies working in the field so that the World Heritage community can influence those bodies to undertake work in relation to World Heritage sites. The Secretariat further added that the Policy Document would also propose to mainstream the concerns of climate change in all aspects of site identification; nomination, reviewing the state of conservation, etc., and that this would have an impact on the *Operational Guidelines*.

424. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre for his very clear presentation and opened the debate, reminding the delegations that time was short and it was preferable to be brief in its interventions.
425. In its intervention, the Delegation of **India** strongly supported the adoption of the Policy Document and said it looked forward to the formulation of the *Operational Guidelines* and also hoped that, once they are formulated, efforts would focus on capacity-building. It was proud that the IPCC was headed by a Chairperson from India who had been honoured with a Nobel Peace Prize.
426. The Delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre for the presentation of the excellent document, highlighting the great value of its three main parts, the synergies to be developed with other ongoing exercises concerning the impact of climate change, the legal aspects and finally the research needs. In the field of environment and climate change, it indicated that Belgian experts had noted that all current work at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the World Bank, OECD and UNEP already provided clear and concrete recommendations for immediate application to World Heritage. Whereas the representatives of the General Assembly rightly attempted to identify the most effective policies that their governments could implement to best protect the cultural and natural heritage from climate change. It questioned whether this aspect of the issue could be emphasized, but realized that the World Heritage Centre lacked staff and the means to carry out that analysis and prepare a synthesis document of all the work prepared by the twenty or so international organizations already working on this subject. It also wondered whether the Advisory Bodies, especially ICOMOS as regards cultural heritage, perhaps had available the means and expertise to assist the World Heritage Centre in extending work to present existing recommendations that States Parties could already apply in their national policies.
427. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** presented the Draft Resolution and proceeded with the adoption of the paragraphs one by one, with special attention to the amended ones. Paragraph 1 was adopted as it stood. Paragraph 2 had two amendments presented by the Delegations of India and Norway. She pointed out that the two amendments were not contradictory and they could be contained in one paragraph. She gave the floor to the Delegation of Norway.
428. The Delegation of **Norway** regretted the cumbersome voting procedure the General Assembly had to go through and the fact that the General Assembly had to deal with this very important topic at such a late stage in the meeting. It went on to mention that UNESCO had to play a central role in all aspects of Climate Change in years ahead in all fields of its competence. It added that climate change had been high on the

Agenda at the Executive Board two weeks previously and commended the Director-General for his proactive work in the field. The Executive Board is also now working on the plan and the strategy for the Organization in this field and took for granted that World Heritage would be included in the plan. The World Heritage Centre was active in making this happen. The Delegation congratulated the World Heritage Centre for its work on the impact of climate change in World Heritage properties. It emphasized that considering that a significant number of sites were affected and that the number would increase exponentially in the coming years, adaptation, mitigation and prevention should be focused upon as the health of cultural and natural heritage was seriously at stake. In wishing luck to the new incoming Committee in this endeavour, it called for closer cooperation with other UN Agencies – the IPCC in particular, and other UNESCO sectors. It recommended that UNESCO actively participate in preparations towards the meetings in Bali, Indonesia in December 2007 and in Denmark in the Spring of 2008 to discuss the successor to the Kyoto Protocol. It strongly endorsed the climate change policy presented and hoped that the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre would implement it proactively. It added that it had new paragraphs to add to the Draft Decision and had delivered these to the Secretariat.

429. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** read out the merged amendment.
430. The Delegation of the **United States of America**, in thanking the World Heritage Centre for the Report, mentioned that the United States of America participated in the discussions and drafting of the Document and believe that it is an important statement on the role of the World Heritage Committee in dealing with this issue. The Delegation pointed out that the Committee decision on the document adopted during the 31st session in Christchurch contained a problematic provision in paragraph 15 as it decided to include for future sessions of the Committee in its working document on the state of conservation reporting a section of those properties most affected by climate change, and that the Committee gave no direction to the Secretariat on the manner in which it was to be determined which properties were most affected by climate change. This issue should be clarified at future Committee sessions. It added that it believed that many World Heritage properties were likely to be affected to some degree by climate change, and any State Party should be encouraged to include in its State of Conservation reports any pertinent information on this topic, and that the role of the Secretariat should be to compile and summarize these for the working documents without making any judgement of its own regarding what sites may or may not be affected by climate change.
431. Turning to the recommendations, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** called upon the Delegation of Norway to submit its proposed amendments to the resolution, to which the Delegation of **Norway** responded that the proposed changes had already been submitted to the Secretariat.
432. In a brief intervention, the Delegation of **Brazil** expressed support to the amended paragraphs submitted by the Delegation of India.
433. An agreement was reached to merge the decisions taken by the Committee at its 31st session in Christchurch and the decision taken by the General Assembly as reflected in Decisions **30 COM 7.1** and **31 COM 7.1**. The paragraph order, as proposed by the Delegation of Norway, was thus adopted.
434. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** summarized the proposal of the Delegation of Brazil; she then moved to the adoption of paragraph 2, then paragraphs 3 and 4, unchanged. She read out the new paragraph 5 presented by the Delegation of Norway.

435. After having given the floor to the Delegation of **Norway** to provide clarification regarding this paragraph, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** proposed the adoption of the last three paragraphs in the order proposed by the Delegation of Norway and declared the Resolution adopted in its totality.

**Resolution: 16 GA 10**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/10*,
2. Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7.1** and **31 COM 7.1**, adopted respectively at the 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions of the World Heritage Committee,
3. Taking into account the relevant issues identified in the recent Thematic Debate of the Executive Board on UNESCO's role in addressing climate change within its mandated areas of competence and also noting the upcoming meetings on climate change in Bali in December 2007 (Thirteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (COP 13) and the third meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 3), Bali, Indonesia, 3 to 14 December 2007) and in Denmark in 2009 (Fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC (COP 15) and the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 5), Copenhagen, Denmark, 30 November 2009 - 11 December 2009);
4. Adopts the "Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties" and strongly recommends its use by all concerned, together with the report on "Predicting and Managing the impacts of climate change on World Heritage" and the "Strategy to Assist States Parties to Implement Appropriate Management Responses" contained in World Heritage Paper No: 22;
5. Encourages UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to disseminate widely the Policy Document, the Report and Strategy, referred to in paragraph 2 above, and other relevant publications to all concerned, including the general public, and promote their application;
6. Requests the World Heritage Committee to institute a mechanism for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to periodically review and update the Policy Document, and other related documents, so as to make available the most current knowledge and technology on the subject to guide the decisions and actions of the World Heritage community.
7. Urges the States Parties to participate in the United Nations climate change conferences with a view to achieving a comprehensive post-Kyoto agreement, and to fund and support the research needs as identified in the adopted Policy document.
8. Further requests the Director-General and the World Heritage Committee to strengthen its relations with all organizations working with climate change particularly the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) secretariats, and specifically with regards to the effect of climate change on World Heritage properties, with a view to delivering as one UN.

## 11. REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A REVISED RECOMMENDATION ON THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/11*

436. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** introduced item 11 of the agenda (Document *WHC-07/16.GA/11*). She recalled the context in which this item was inscribed, and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the Report on the Development of a revised recommendation on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes, prepared by the Secretariat.
437. In its introduction, the **Secretariat** stressed the growing concern by the World Heritage Committee for threats brought to historical conservation by new developments and modern architecture, and more generally by transformations of the surroundings and interiors of historic cities. The Vienna Memorandum was a document that identified the importance of the urban landscape as a feature that has to be preserved. The role of contemporary architecture and the need to consider cities as economic assets, and their development, were considerations to be taken on board when looking at urban change.
438. The **Secretariat** went on to inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the Declaration on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes by the 15th General Assembly in 2005 had generated an important debate within the conservation community, particularly in ICOMOS and other partners. They were trying to refocus the existing text of the conservation of urban areas by taking into consideration the modern challenges, which was asked for by the General Assembly and the World Heritage Committee. Many cases have come to the attention of the World Heritage Committee, such as Dresden, Cologne, Vienna, London, some of which were discussed during the 31st session of the Committee in Christchurch, New Zealand. Two initiatives were foreseen for 2008: the technical conference on buffer zones and the adoption of the management guidelines for cultural landscapes. The Secretariat added that it was working in cooperation with partners and had developed an action plan for the next two years to bring these elements together and come up with a proposal, which the Director-General could present to the General Conference in 2009 for consideration by the General Conference in 2011. The Secretariat also informed the General Assembly that there would be an important meeting in Brazil in November 2007 and other meetings were foreseen in 2008 and 2009. It was hoped that these would be supported by the World Heritage Committee and would lead to the development of updated texts and, more importantly, an effective system of resolutions and policies for the conservation of urban heritage.
439. The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its thanks for the Secretariat's presentation and confirmed the report presented by the World Heritage Centre by informing the General Assembly that a regional conference had been planned in Olinda, Brazil from 12 to 14 November 2007 on Historic Urban Landscapes in the Americas, hosted by the Historical Heritage National Institute. The conference, which would convene experts from all over the world, would reflect on the implementation of the Vienna Memorandum and the follow-up of this process.
440. The Delegation of **Mexico** was satisfied with the convening of the meeting to be held in Olinda. It wished to remind that an Ibero-American Forum on Urban Landscapes had already been held and resulted in three important conclusions. It indicated that the concept of urban cultural landscapes did not replace the concept of historic cities, all cities possessing their own cultural landscape. The urban landscape is an insufficient component to comprehend urban organization that comprises several elements, such

as anthropology, economy, etc. The term urban cultural landscape is, on the one hand an operational concept that may assist in the analysis of the reality of cities and, on the other, a methodology that can contribute to the safeguarding and conservation of cities.

441. Seeing no objection, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** declared Resolution **16 GA 11** adopted.

**Resolution: 16 GA 11**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/11*,
2. Welcomes the information provided on the development of a revised recommendation of the conservation of historic urban landscapes;
3. Invites the Director-General of UNESCO to inform the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, at its 17th session in 2009, on the further activities undertaken and progress made with regard to this initiative.

**12. OTHER BUSINESS: PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS, CONSERVATION TOOLS AND PROMOTION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

Document *WHC-07/16.GA/12*

442. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** moved on to item 12 of the agenda, concerning management and protection plans as conservation tools and promotion of World Heritage properties (Document *WHC-07/16.GA/12*). She presented the item, citing an extract from the *Guidelines* whilst indicating that a large number of properties did not yet have adequate protection or management plans, indispensable for their long-term conservation. She then gave the floor to the Secretariat to present the document before opening the debate.
443. The **Secretariat** presented Document *WHC-07/16.GA/12*, and recalled the objective of the management systems, referring to paragraph 96 of the *Guidelines*: a management system must “ensure *that the Outstanding Universal Value, the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription are maintained or enhanced in the future*”. A management system must also ensure that other values of the property are preserved and that the objectives of conservation are determined in function and harmony with the other existing development problems and the legitimate needs of the local communities, to ensure its overall sustainability. The Secretariat indicated that due to the vast variety of World Heritage properties, and their cultural context, a property could be managed according to a traditional management system based on the practices and traditional knowledge or according to a classic management plan. The Secretariat recalled that, whatever the name given to the management system, there were common elements for effective management, as mentioned in paragraphs 111 and 112 of the *Guidelines*, including community participation. Among these elements, the Secretariat emphasized the first, which was fundamental: “*a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders*”, meaning that the

preparation of the value of the property had been discussed and shared with all the partners concerned in the framework of a nomination file and that the statement of value shall be the basis for the management system, whatever it is. The Secretariat also recalled that, in the framework of the reflection on Periodic Reporting, some States Parties whose nomination files dated prior to 1998, were requested to establish this statement of Outstanding Universal Value where it did not exist. At the 31st session of the Committee in Christchurch, it was also requested to establish the statement of Outstanding Universal Value for all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Secretariat concluded its presentation by recalling that at its 31st session, the Committee warmly welcomed the new series of publications, four titles of which will be Manuals to assist in the preparation not only of nomination files, but also for both cultural and natural properties, and also for cultural landscapes.

444. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Secretariat for its presentation and invited comments on the Draft Resolution.
445. In its intervention, the Delegation of **Brazil** proposed an additional paragraph to the resolution, in which it called for further cooperation between States Parties in the formulation of management plans.
446. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** presented the Resolution as amended by the Delegation of Brazil and adopted the Resolution, indicating that Mme Cameron, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, wished to take a little time to convene an extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee at the end of the General Assembly. She then gave the floor to the Secretariat.
447. The **Secretariat** indicated to the General Assembly that it had received an amendment to item 12, submitted by the Delegations of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, the Russian Federation, Moldavia and the Ukraine, that had been distributed in the room and concerned the translation and publication of the *Guidelines* into the official languages of the Organization, including Russian. The Secretariat indicated that the Russian version of the *Guidelines* already existed and it just required revising. Nevertheless, the Secretariat suggested to refer to the electronic version of the document for the time being, in view of the Committee's decision to revise the *Guidelines* and to have a new version printed in January 2009.
448. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Secretariat and gave the floor to the Delegation of the Russian Federation.
449. The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** emphasized the importance of having the document translated into the official languages of UNESCO.
450. The **Secretariat** pointed out that following its translation, the document still had to be certified by the competent services of UNESCO and indicated that it would finalize it. Finally, It pointed out that the Committee had already approved the English/French version of the document.
451. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** thanked the Delegation of the Russian Federation and gave the floor to the Secretariat.
452. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the translation work was underway, as was the case for the Spanish version. But as it concerned an official translation approved by the Committee, the legal aspect had to be studied as the working languages of the Committee are only English and French.

453. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** asked if this was the case for the Spanish version and gave the floor to the Delegation of Mexico. She also read out the draft amendment by the Delegation of Saint Lucia.
454. The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its concern with regard to the different language versions of the Basic Texts and notably the *Guidelines*. It stated that only the French and English versions of the *Guidelines* would be revised and made available electronically on 1 January 2008, which could cause a problem to Hispanophone States Parties for, among others, the preparation of a nomination file. It hoped that the Secretariat would establish a system whereby all the language versions would be updated so that as many States Parties as possible could have access.
455. There being no other interventions, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** hoped that the World Heritage Centre would take action on the recommendations made by the members. She further expressed concern that a new draft amendment was being presented at such a late hour, following the finalization of the Agenda of work of the Assembly. The draft amendment concerned the next date of the General Assembly of States Parties, which is usually in conjunction with the Culture Commission. Therefore, the amendment suggested that the Culture Commission be held at the end of the General Conference and the General Assembly just after the Culture Commission. The Chairperson of the General Assembly then asked the Secretariat whether such proposal was feasible.
456. The **Secretariat** indicated that it was feasible to organize the General Assembly in such a way not to clash with other events, and after the Culture Commission. It was a matter of logistics of the entire organization of the General Conference which would also depend on the calendar of the General Conference and should be left as a recommendation.
457. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed that the point could be left as a recommendation and requested the word ... "*if possible*" be added.
458. In clarifying the issue, the **Secretariat** stated that the General Assembly had to be held within the framework of the General Conference and not outside it. There had to be a change in the *Convention* itself to be able to organize it outside the General Conference, but it had to be organized during a period that it would not interfere with the Culture Commission.
459. The Delegation of **Brazil**, following the information provided by the Secretariat, proposed that the recommendations made by several States Parties for it not be held outside the framework of the General Conference should also be taken into account. Several States Parties had indicated that it should not be held during the elections of the Executive Board and the General Assembly should drop the amendment, so it requested Saint Lucia to withdraw it.
460. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that the proposal be left as a recommendation.
461. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the General Assembly could not be held at a date other than that of the General Conference, otherwise the text of the *Convention* would have to be changed, but, however, a more convenient timetable could be found, for example following the convening of the Culture Commission.
462. The Delegation of **Grenada** underlined the fact that the other conventions were held at other times than the General Conference and that it should be possible for the General

Assembly, which seemed to be backed up by the expression “ as far as possible ” contained in the *Convention*.

463. The **Secretariat** brought to the attention of the General Assembly the relevant text (Article 8 paragraph 1) of the *Convention*.

464. The **Chairperson of the General Assembly** concluded that, as proposed by Saint Lucia, the paragraph be left as a recommendation and declared the resolution adopted.

#### **Resolution: 16 GA 12**

The General Assembly,

1. Having examined Document *WHC-07/16.GA/12*,
2. Takes note of the information provided in the above-mentioned document;
3. Welcomes the launching of a new Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals;
4. Invites the Director-General of UNESCO to inform the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, at its 17th session in 2009, on the further activities undertaken and progress made with regard to the Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals;
5. Calls upon States Parties to cooperate with other States Parties which so request on the formulation of management plans for World Heritage properties.

### **13 CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

465. Finally, the **Chairperson of the General Assembly** reiterated the new composition of the World Heritage Committee and the dates of the next session (2 to 10 July 2008), to be held in Quebec, Canada.

466. After having thanked all the participants, she proceeded with the closure of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly



## **ANNEXES**



## Annex 1

### Agenda of the 16th General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, 24-25 October 2007

#### AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
  - 1A. Opening of the General Assembly by the Director-General or his representative
  - 1B. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the General Assembly
2. Adoption of the Agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly and Timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee
  - 2A. Adoption of the Agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly
  - 2B. Adoption of the Timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee
3. Elections to the World Heritage Committee
  - 3A. Reflection on the elections of the members of the World Heritage Committee and distribution of seats ensuring an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world
  - 3B. Elections to the World Heritage Committee
4. Report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on the activities of the World Heritage Committee
5. Implementation of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre
6. Assessment report of the Advisory Bodies' activities
7. Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of the States Parties' contributions
8. Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the *World Heritage Convention*
9. Progress in the implementation of the Global strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
10. Policy document on the impact of climate change on World Heritage properties
11. Report on the development of a revised Recommendation on the conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes
12. Other business: Protection and Management plans, conservation tools and promotion of World Heritage properties
13. Closure of the session



## **Annex 2**

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

**Address  
by  
Mr Koïchiro Matsuura  
Director-General  
of the United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization  
(UNESCO)**

**on the occasion of the sixteenth General Assembly of States Parties  
to the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)**

UNESCO, 24 October 2007

Honourable Ministers,

Mr President of the Executive Board of UNESCO,

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you on the occasion of the 16th General Assembly that brings together the 184 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

Since the last session, four new States Parties have ratified the text of the *World Heritage Convention*: Guinea-Bissau, Montenegro, Sao Tome & Principe and Swaziland. I congratulate them and extend my best wishes to the Republic of Djibouti which, on 2 November next, will become the 185th State Party to the Convention.

During the past two years, the World Heritage Committee has met in Vilnius, in Lithuania, in July 2006, then this summer in Christchurch, in New Zealand, highlighting the specificities of Pacific heritage. Thanks go to Lithuania and New Zealand for their warm welcome and excellent organization enjoyed by the participants.

As I am not able to list in detail all the new inscriptions, I wish to congratulate the States Parties that for the first time have a property inscribed on the World Heritage List: Gabon, Mauritius and Namibia.

I am, of course, saddened, as you all are, regarding the deletion of a property from the World Heritage List for the first time in the history of the Convention. This most unfortunate moment proves that it is not always possible, even with support from the international community, to find means to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of an inscribed site. Through this difficult decision we know that the Committee wished to preserve the credibility of the World Heritage List. This setback that I would qualify as shared, should teach us vigilance and prevention so that this extreme situation is avoided in the future.

I have further noted during these two sessions an impressive rationalisation in the working methods and the effectiveness with which the members of the Committee, with the assistance of the Secretariat, dealt with all the items on the agenda in the allotted time. I wish to congratulate the Chairpersons of these two sessions who have led the debates with admirable rigour and courtesy. Nevertheless, allow me to qualify this very positive remark and to underline that the mechanism has reached its limits. I call the attention of the members of the Committee to focus their discussions on the essential issues such as conservation, monitoring of Periodic Reporting as well as inscriptions on the World Heritage List, in conformity with Decision **30 COM 13** adopted in Vilnius. It is of the greatest of importance that the Committee has all the necessary time to discuss complex matters concerning the conservation of properties.

As you are aware, 2007 has been an evaluation year for the World Heritage Convention. Proof of this is the agenda of the last session of the Committee containing no less than four items relating to evaluation:

- Evaluation of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision
- Evaluation of the results of the implementation of the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee

- Evaluation of the Partnership for the Conservation of the World Heritage (PACTE)
- Report of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre

I shall not examine here the details of all these evaluations, but I shall pause an instant on the evaluation of the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee, the famous 4 Cs, namely:

- Credibility of the List
- Conservation
- Capacity building, and
- Communication

in order to express my satisfaction with regard to the addition of a 5th “C” for “Community”. The fifth objective was proposed by New Zealand to “enhance *the role of communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*”. Indeed, experience has shown that one of the most important factors for the sustainable conservation of a protected area is to be able to count upon the active participation of the communities. Local action concerning heritage is often based on world concepts linking humans with their natural environment. It is also desirable that local populations participate in a direct and significant way in all the important decisions concerning their site.

Moreover, the Committee welcomed with interest the PACTE or the Evaluation of the Partnership for the Conservation of the World Heritage, an initiative created on an experimental basis in 2002 on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Convention, to mobilise new financial, human and technical resources for the conservation of World Heritage. New cooperation models between the World Heritage Centre and civil society have been successfully tested, creating a specialised expert network for World Heritage, universities, private sector non-governmental organizations and the media. Thanks to this network, each and every one works together in support of the World Heritage mission and gives to the partners the appropriate credit and visibility.

The Report of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre certainly constitutes an important step and the new resulting provisions will have consequences on the whole Organization. These were the preliminary observations that I made to the Committee this summer in Christchurch.

On the other hand, the Management Audit emphasized the need to clearly define the management principles, delegation of authority and administrative flexibility for optimal effectiveness and management of the Centre activities. In this respect, innovative solutions to fund posts judged to be indispensable to the functioning of the Centre are being studied. Finally, I wish to add that the introduction of an analytical accounting system which does not currently exist in UNESCO could be considered as a pilot experience for the whole Organization.

Based on the recommendations of the Audit of the World Heritage Centre, a Blue Note concerning the structure and functioning of the World Heritage Centre shall be published after the General Conference.

Furthermore, in order to strengthen intersectoral aspects within UNESCO, I informed, in a private session, the members of the Executive Board of my intention to create an Orientation Committee comprising specifically of the two Assistant Directors-General for Culture and Sciences, as well as the Director of the World Heritage Centre. The said Committee shall

meet in advance of the preparation of each C/5 and the work plans to ensure the complementarity of the orientations pursued by the three entities.

Very shortly, Mme Rivière and Mr. Erdelen will explain to you the programme and operational cooperation project foreseen between their respective sectors.

Mr President,

These evaluations in no way detract from the reflections undertaken within the Committee concerning the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, Periodic Reporting and also the procedures for the election of Committee members. The richness of the discussions proves the vitality of our Convention and the shared concern to improve its implementation.

With regard to the procedures for the election of Committee members, I wish to recall that it is the General Assembly, in its capacity as sovereign body that has the responsibility to decide whether or not to revise these procedures. I have confidence in your wisdom to seek the best solution to ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.

This General Assembly will be the occasion to elect nine new Committee members. I take this opportunity to thank the outgoing Committee members: Benin, Chile, India, Japan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Norway, New Zealand and the Netherlands for their unfailing commitment in support of World Heritage and their remarkable contribution to the work of the Committee.

I present most sincere encouragement to the candidates for this election, who, if elected, shall be as under the wise and learned presidency of Ms Cameron, who I congratulate for her election at the head of the World Heritage Committee.

Thank you for your attention.



## Annex 3

### Report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on its activities in 2006-2007

**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

4.  
Report of the Chairperson  
of the World Heritage Committee  
on the activities of the World Heritage Committee

4.  
Rapport de la Présidente  
du Comité du patrimoine mondial  
sur les activités du Comité du patrimoine mondial



The bottom section of the slide features the World Heritage logo on the left, which includes the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization emblem. To the right of the logo is the text 'World Heritage'. The background of this section is a photograph of a cityscape, likely Brussels, showing a large building and a statue in the foreground.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson, for giving me the floor.

Mr. Chairperson of the 16th General Assembly,  
Director-General of UNESCO, Mr. Matsuura,  
Assistant Director-General to UNESCO for Culture, Mrs Rivière,  
Distinguished representatives of the States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*,  
Fellow members of the World Heritage Committee,  
Members of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and gentlemen,

## **Introduction**

As the newly-elected Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, I have the honour to present to you the report on the World Heritage Committee's activities for the period 2006-2007.

You have received the report (16.GA/4) on the Committee's activities since the 15th General Assembly. This report will also be presented to the General Conference of UNESCO under the number: 34C/REP/13.

The report synthesizes the activities of the Committee that are fully documented in over 400 pages of decisions taken at the 30th and 31st sessions in Vilnius and Christchurch and available on the World Heritage website.

The document is organized according to the Strategic Objectives of the Committee, called the Four Cs, namely:

1. Credibility of the World Heritage List
2. Conservation of the World Heritage properties
3. Capacity Building in States Parties
4. Communication

At the initiative of New Zealand, a 5th C for Communities has been added to the other strategic objectives. It reads as follows: "*to enhance the role of communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.*" This important achievement will be presented to you in a few minutes by my predecessor, Chairperson of the 31st session, Mr. Tumu Te Heuheu.

## **1. Credibility of the World Heritage List**

### **1.1 Status of ratification of the *World Heritage Convention***

Our Convention now counts 184 States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* with the ratification by Guinea-Bissau, Montenegro, Sao Tome & Principe and Swaziland during these last two years. I have the pleasure to inform you that the Republic of Djibouti has ratified our Convention last August. On 2 November it will become the 185th State Party to the Convention. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome them all.



### 1.2 Nominations

Since the 15th General Assembly, the World Heritage Committee has inscribed 40 properties on the World Heritage List. There are now 851 properties on the List. During the past biennium, three States Parties inscribed their first properties on the List:

- Mauritius (*Aapravasi Ghat*)
- Gabon (*Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda*) and
- Namibia (*Twyfelfontein*).

I take this opportunity to congratulate them for their successful nominations.



**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

## The World Heritage List La Liste du patrimoine mondial

<p><b>3</b> States Parties inscribed their 1st property on the List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mauritius</li> <li>• Gabon</li> <li>• Namibia</li> </ul>	<p><b>3</b> Etats parties ont inscrit leur 1er bien sur la liste :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maurice</li> <li>• Gabon</li> <li>• Namibie</li> </ul>
<p><b>43</b> States Parties without property on the List</p>	<p><b>43</b> Etats parties sans bien inscrit sur la Liste</p>




**Patrimoine Mondial**



1.3 Implementation of the Global Strategy

With regard to the implementation of the Global Strategy, the “Cairns-Suzhou decision” was modified by the Committee at its 31st session in Christchurch in 2007: The annual limit of nominations remains at 45, as well as the maximum of 2 complete nominations per State Party each year. While maintaining the principle that at least one of these two nominations should be a natural property, the Committee decided, on an experimental four–year basis, that a State Party would be permitted to decide on the nature of the nomination according to its national priorities, its history and geography.



**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

### GLOBAL STRATEGY : “Cairns-Suzhou” Decision


- Annual limit of nominations: **45**
- Maximum of 2 per State Party per year
- NAT/CLT according to the State Party priorities, its history and geography, for 4 years

**STRATEGIE GLOBALE: Décision de « Cairns-Suzhou »**

- Limite annuelle de propositions d’inscription : **45**
- Maximum de 2 par Etat partie par an
- NAT/CLT selon les priorités de l’Etat partie, son histoire, sa géographie, pendant 4 ans

**World Heritage**



## 1.4 Outstanding Universal Value

Following the discussion during the Expert Meeting on the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value held in Kazan (2005), the Committee has continued to examine the evolution of this key concept within the 1972 Convention.

At its 30th session in 2006, the Committee requested the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to undertake a careful review of past Committee decisions and to create two Compendiums of relevant material (including case studies) and decisions, in the form of guidance manuals on how to interpret and apply discussions of Outstanding Universal Value. At its 31st session in 2007, the Committee examined these drafts from IUCN and ICOMOS and requested the Advisory Bodies to include a reflection on integrity, authenticity and management practices. The final draft will be presented to the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.

## 2. Conservation of the World Heritage properties

### 2.1 State of Conservation

Over the past biennium, the World Heritage Committee examined 294 State of Conservation reports:

- 133 reports in 2006 (99 “normal” and 34 “in danger”)
- 161 reports in 2007 (130 “normal” and 31 “in danger”).

**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

<u>Since 15th GA</u>	<u>Depuis la 15e AG</u>
<b>294</b> State of conservation reports examined	<b>294</b> rapports sur l'état de conservation examinés
<b>9</b> properties removed from the List of World Heritage in danger	<b>9</b> biens retirés de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril
<b>5</b> properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in danger	<b>5</b> biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril
<b>1</b> property removed from the World Heritage List	<b>1</b> bien retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization  
World Heritage

This is the highest number of State of Conservation reports ever examined by the Committee.

During this biennium, 9 properties were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in recognition of the improvement in their state of conservation. They were:

- Tipasa (Algeria)
- Cologne Cathedral (Germany)
- Groups of Monuments at Hampi (India)
- Djoudj Bird Sanctuary (Senegal)
- Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) at the 30th session in 2006, and

- Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)
- Everglades National Park (USA)
- Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)
- Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) at the 31st session in 2007.

While we should all take justifiable satisfaction in this achievement, we must not forget that 30 sites remain on the In Danger List including 5 additional sites that were inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger during this biennium:

- Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany)
- Medieval Monuments of Kosovo (Serbia)
- Niokolo-Koba (Senegal)
- Galápagos Islands (Ecuador)
- Samarra Archeological City (Iraq).

Particular concern for the deteriorating condition of the properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo led the Committee at its 31st session to decide on a comprehensive approach for all five In Danger sites. The decision calls for a high-level meeting as well as international assistance to support corrective measures for improving the state of conservation of these five endangered sites. Measures are underway to implement this decision.



In an overall effort to improve its monitoring capacity and to ensure proper implementation of its decisions, the Committee adopted in Christchurch a reinforced monitoring mechanism for properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. This mechanism can be activated either by the World Heritage Committee or by the Director-General of UNESCO in specific and exceptional cases. The Committee decided to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism, described as a constant cooperative process with the State Party concerned, to



the five properties of the Democratic Republic of Congo, to the Old City of Jerusalem as well as to the Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany.

Sadly, for the first time in the history of the *Convention*, the World Heritage Committee decided with deep regret to remove a property, the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary in Oman, from the World Heritage List. This dramatic moment of the *Convention* reminds us all that protection of World Heritage is a shared responsibility. It is the obligation of States Parties to protect the world cultural and natural heritage situated on their territory; as well, it is the duty of the international community as a whole to assist and to cooperate with States Parties in their endeavour to conserve such heritage. The Committee judged that the property had deteriorated to the extent that it had lost its Outstanding Universal Value, thereby requiring its removal from the World Heritage List in order to maintain the credibility of the List, the Committee and the *Convention*.



## 2.2 Presentation of the Periodic Report

You will recall that in the extension of the first presentation cycle for Periodic Reporting, the Committee launched a year of reflection at its 7th extraordinary session in 2004. In 2006, the Committee decided to accord a further year for this reflection process. During the past two years, four reflection meetings concerning the submission of the Periodic Report were organised to carry out an evaluation of the first cycle.

In addition, the Committee entrusted the revision and simplification of the questionnaire and the establishment of indicators to a small working group. This working group has been very active and, after several meetings, presented to the Committee in 2007, a draft revised questionnaire, together with a timetable for the implementation of the procedure from now on until July 2008. This questionnaire shall also be available electronically. Guidelines have recently been proposed to States Parties to launch trials in the field.

In the framework of an additional initiative, the Committee accepted the offer of the Netherlands Government to hold in 2007 an international expert meeting on benchmarks. The results of these discussions led to a Committee decision, in Christchurch, aimed at the adoption of a monitoring framework for World Heritage properties based on their Outstanding Universal Value, their integrity and authenticity. To implement the monitoring framework, the Committee requested States Parties and the Advisory Bodies to draft Statements of

Outstanding Universal Value for the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and for those where reactive monitoring missions are requested. This represents an important workload in the years to come, but it is an essential step towards the improvement of decision-making.


**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

### Periodic Reporting

- 4 meetings to reflect on Periodic Reporting
- 4 meetings of the Working Group on the revised questionnaire
- Field-testing from January to March 2008
- Presentation at the 32nd session of Committee in 2008

### Rapport périodique

- 4 réunions de réflexion sur le Rapport périodique
- 4 réunions du Groupe de travail sur la révision du questionnaire
- Expérimentation sur le terrain de janvier à mars 2008
- Présentation à la 32e session du Comité en 2008



The bottom of the slide features the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization logo on the left, the World Heritage logo in the center, and a photograph on the right showing a path lined with various national flags.

### 2.3 International Assistance

During the past biennial exercise, following a formal evaluation of International Assistance, the World Heritage Committee undertook a reform of the procedure.

I wish to remind States Parties that the Committee decided at its 30th session in 2006, that International Assistance would only comprise three categories instead of five. The Committee also decided that requests would from then on be evaluated at least twice a year by a panel comprising the Chairperson of the Committee, representatives of the regional units of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.


At its 31st session, the Committee approved the new format for International Assistance requests prepared by the Secretariat, as well as the corresponding amendments in the *Guidelines*. The new format and the modifications can be found on the Web page of the World Heritage Centre.

It was also decided that when funds were limited, to grant requests in priority to the least developed countries (LDC), low income economies (LIE), small island developing states (SIDS) and countries emerging from conflict.



**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

<p><b>International Assistance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3 categories</b> instead of 5:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Emergency assistance</li> <li>✓ Preparatory assistance</li> <li>✓ Conservation and Management assistance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests evaluated at least twice a year by a <b>panel</b></li> <li>• <b>New format</b> adopted at the 31st session</li> <li>• <b>Priority</b> to LDCs, LIEs, SIDS, post-conflict, when funds are limited</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assistance internationale</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3 catégories</b> au lieu de 5:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Assistance d'urgence</li> <li>✓ Assistance préparatoire</li> <li>✓ Assistance pour la conservation et la gestion</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Demandes évaluées au moins 2 fois par an par un <b>panel</b></li> <li>• <b>Nouveau formulaire</b> adopté à la 31e session</li> <li>• <b>Priorité</b> aux PMA, PFRs, PEIDs, post-conflit, si fonds insuffisants</li> </ul>
---	---



### **3. Capacity Building in States Parties**

#### **3.1 Meetings, conferences, workshops**

The World Heritage Committee organized several international meetings to facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Objectives. I cannot enumerate the entire list of these events. They are detailed in the report of the Secretariat each year and available on the World Heritage website.

Important international meetings were organized to discuss climate change and World Heritage, including expert meetings at UNESCO Headquarters in March 2006 and February 2007. This work resulted in the document on climate change and World Heritage for discussion at this General Assembly.

Several meetings were also organized on the notion of Historic Urban Landscapes, which emerged from the Vienna Memorandum and was then adopted by the General Assembly at its last session as “the Declaration on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes”. This topic is also on the agenda of this General Assembly.

**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Meetings and workshops

- Climate change
- Historic Urban Landscapes
- Pacific 2009
- Natural heritage
- Nominations
- Etc...

Réunions et ateliers

- Changement climatique
- Paysages urbains historiques
- Pacific 2009
- Patrimoine naturel
- Propositions d'inscription
- Etc...



Specific efforts were made in the Pacific and African regions.

In the Pacific:

- Five national-level workshops in the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, in October/November 2005 and March/April 2006, resulting in the development of four national action plans and submission of one Tentative List.
- A Pacific regional meeting, as part of the Pacific 2009 Action Plan, in the Tongariro National Park, New Zealand (18 -23 February 2007).

In Africa:

- An inter-agency regional meeting for capacity-building for natural World Heritage in Africa in Nairobi, Kenya from 9 to 10 March 2006.
- The 5th Technical Workshop on the preparation of Nominations was organized within the framework of Africa 2009 in Rwanda from 2 to 28 July 2007.

## **4. Communication**

### **4.1 Publications**

This year, the World Heritage Centre published a comprehensive overview entitled "World Heritage: Challenges for the Millennium". It provides an analysis of more than three decades of implementation of the *Convention*. States Parties may obtain copies of this publication which are available in this room. In addition, nine new volumes have been produced in the World Heritage Papers Series.

**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

**Publications**

Publications



United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

**World Heritage**



**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
 ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

**9** new World Heritage Paper series  
 nouveaux Cahiers du patrimoine mondial



United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

**Patrimoine Mondial**



## **5. Administration**

### **5.1 Management Audit**

In 2006 at Vilnius, the Committee requested a management audit of the World Heritage Centre. On reviewing the audit results at the meeting in Christchurch, the Committee called for a series of measures to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the World Heritage Centre in areas of human resource management and financial accounting. The Director will present a results-based implementation plan during this General Assembly.

### Management Audit

- Results presented at the 31st session of the Committee in 2007
- To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the World Heritage Centre in areas of human resources management and accounting

### Audit de gestion

- Résultats présentés à la 31e session du Comité en 2007
- Améliorer l'efficacité et l'efficience du Centre du patrimoine mondial dans le domaine de la gestion des ressources humaines et de la comptabilité





## 5.2 Revision of Operational Guidelines

States Parties will recall previous efforts to revise the Committee's *Operational Guidelines*, the latest version being the 2005 edition. In light of subsequent decisions related to issues like risk management, climate change, international assistance and so forth, the *Operational Guidelines* are again in need of revision. In order to simplify the process and ensure consistency, proposed revisions will be submitted for approval to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee every autumn, with a view to providing an updated web-based version of the English and French text of the *Operational Guidelines* on 1 January each year. A new version will be posted on 1 January 2008.

16<sup>th</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

### Operational Guidelines

updated **web-based** version  
of the English and French text  
on **1 January** each year



### Orientations

Version mise à jour **en ligne**  
en anglais et en français  
le **1er janvier** de chaque année

The image shows the World Heritage logo, which includes the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization emblem and the text 'Patrimoine Mondial'. The background features a photograph of several domes from a historical building.

## **6. Personal reflections**

I would like to make a few observations about the overall functioning of the *World Heritage Convention*.

World Heritage is undeniably a flagship program for UNESCO, given the level of international participation in its work. This is not only at Committee meetings, where each year there is an increase in the number of people in attendance (a record 900 persons in Christchurch). World Heritage activities also occur within each country through governmental and non-governmental organizations, universities, schools and youth organizations.

As the *Convention* matures, the Committee is providing leadership in adopting and promoting systems to support the sustainability of cultural and natural heritage sites. The decisions on periodic reporting and a monitoring framework demonstrate the success of the *Convention* in nurturing a climate of professional development and exchange of ideas on how best to conserve and manage heritage sites.

Yet there remain issues that continue to challenge the Committee. Its agenda is still unrealistic and unsustainable, despite the fact that the annual meetings have now been extended to nine working days. Even with the time clock introduced in Vilnius and highly disciplined chairpersons, the volume and complexity of decision-making is exhausting. This puts enormous demands on the whole system, including the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties themselves. It may be time once more to consider practical measures to manage the workload.

In terms of improving the representativity of the World Heritage List, the measures adopted in Cairns in 2000 and modified in Suzhou in 2004, known as the "Cairns-Suzhou decision", have not yet yielded significant positive results. It remains to be seen whether the recent modifications to this decision will help to promote a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List.

There is also concern with the increasing politicization of cases coming before the Committee. The *World Heritage Convention* asks countries to choose as their representatives persons qualified in the field of cultural or natural heritage, and such expertise is clearly needed since most Committee decisions are based on the technical merits of the case. However, there are instances when a State Party invests political capital and prestige to achieve a specific outcome. When this occurs, it risks undermining the credibility of the *Convention*.

Finally, and not unrelated to what I have just said, there is a regrettable misunderstanding of the intent of the In Danger listing process. Now perceived by many countries as a negative label, the In Danger listing process was originally meant to give priority for international assistance to the most threatened sites. Most World Heritage Sites have conservation problems; the In Danger List was meant to focus attention and attract foreign aid to the most problematic sites. The Committee's decision at Christchurch to give top priority to In Danger sites for the creation of value statements and determination of proposed corrective measures is a first step in clearly establishing the necessary documentation in order to seek funding. This is a positive development that may help to attract significant support for the conservation of these threatened sites.

## 7. The Committee

As this report nears its conclusion, I wish to share with you the latest information concerning the membership of the World Heritage Committee. A new Bureau was elected during the last session in Christchurch composed of 5 Vice-Chairpersons from:

- Israel,
  - Kenya,
  - Peru,
  - Republic of Korea,
  - Tunisia,
- and myself as Chairperson.

**16<sup>th</sup>** GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION  
ASSEMBLÉE GÉNÉRALE DES ÉTATS PARTIES À LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

**Bureau of the World Heritage Committee**  
**Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial**

<b>Chairperson</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Dr Christina Cameron (Canada)</li></ul>	<b>Présidente</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Dr Christina Cameron (Canada)</li></ul>
<b>Rapporteur</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● 8 EXT.COM</li></ul>	<b>Rapporteur</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● 8 EXT.COM</li></ul>
<b>Vice-Chairpersons</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Israel</li><li>● Kenya</li><li>● Peru</li><li>● Republic of Korea</li><li>● Tunisia</li></ul>	<b>Vice-Présidents</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Israël</li><li>● Kenya</li><li>● Pérou</li><li>● République de Corée</li><li>● Tunisie</li></ul>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Patrimoine Mondial

The Committee decided to elect the Rapporteur of the 32nd session of the Committee once new members of the Committee have been elected during this General Assembly of States Parties. For this purpose, we will hold an 8th Extraordinary Session just after the closure of this 16th General Assembly.

You are all aware of the fact that the terms of office of nine Committee members has come to an end. I would like to sincerely thank these outgoing members for their invaluable contribution to the work of the Committee during these last years. Your experience and wisdom will be missed.

I would like to thank the Secretariat for the quality and quantity of their work, both for the statutory meetings but also throughout the year. I also wish to pay tribute to the professional work of the Advisory Bodies. Their dedication and commitment to the technical aspects of World Heritage work are of a consistently high quality. I also express my appreciation to States Parties who support the ongoing work of World Heritage through bilateral agreements or other means.



Last but not least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude, in my own name and also on your behalf, to the two preceding Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee, Mrs Ina Marciulonyte (Lithuania) and Mr. Tumu Te Heuheu (New Zealand), as well as to Vice-President Ole Briseid (Norway) for their masterful chairmanship of the Committee meetings as well as for their determination and leadership in implementing the Convention. I would also like to thank them for having hosted the Committee in Vilnius and Christchurch. The excellent quality of your organization sets the bar high for the Committee meeting in Quebec, Canada in July 2008.



Before concluding, I have the pleasure to invite our former Chairperson of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Tumu Te Heuheu from New Zealand, to explain to us the rationale of the creation of the 5th C for communities.

(.....)

Thank you very much for your explanation.

I wish this General Assembly every success.

Thank you for your attention.





## **Annex 4**

### **Results of the elections to the World Heritage Committee**

1st round / 1<sup>er</sup> tour

Candidates Candidats  
for the Reserved Seat pour le Siège réservé

Angola	29	Angola
Barbados	57	Barbade
Burkina Faso	28	Burkina Faso
Maldives	17	Maldives
Vanuatu	26	Vanuatu

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides: 158  
Majority required / Majorité requise : 79



2nd round / 2<sup>e</sup> tour

Candidates Candidats  
for the Reserved Seat pour le Siège réservé

Angola	Angola
Barbados	Barbade
Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso
Vanuatu	Vanuatu



2nd round / 2e tour

**Candidates** **Candidats**  
**for the Reserved Seat** **pour le Siège réservé**

<b>Angola</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>Angola</b>
<b>Barbados</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>Barbade</b>
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>Burkina Faso</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Vanuatu</b>

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides : 158  
Majority required / majorité requise : 79



3rd round / 3e tour

**Candidates** **Candidats**  
**for the Reserved Seat** **pour le Siège réservé**

<b>Barbados</b>		<b>Barbade</b>
<b>Burkina Faso</b>		<b>Burkina Faso</b>



3rd round / 3e tour

Candidates  
for the Reserved Seat

Candidats  
pour le Siège réservé

**Barbados**

**Barbade**

~~Burkina Faso~~

~~Burkina Faso~~

Burkina Faso withdrew its candidature  
 Le Burkina Faso a retiré sa candidature



Results of the 1st ballot:

Résultat du 1e tour de scrutin :

<i>Angola</i>	36	<i>Angola</i>
<i>Australia</i>	99	<i>Australie</i>
<i>Bahrain</i>	86	<i>Bahreïn</i>
<i>Brazil</i>	75	<i>Brésil</i>
<i>Burkina Faso</i>	37	<i>Burkina Faso</i>
<i>China</i>	103	<i>Chine</i>
<i>DR Congo</i>	27	<i>RD Congo</i>
<i>Egypt</i>	81	<i>Egypte</i>
<i>Georgia</i>	25	<i>Géorgie</i>
<i>Iraq</i>	51	<i>Iraq</i>

<i>Jordan</i>	62	<i>Jordanie</i>
<i>Malta</i>	30	<i>Malte</i>
<i>Nigeria</i>	65	<i>Nigéria</i>
<i>Poland</i>	52	<i>Pologne</i>
<i>Romania</i>	50	<i>Roumanie</i>
<i>Sweden</i>	72	<i>Suède</i>
<i>Thailand</i>	53	<i>Thaïlande</i>
<i>Togo</i>	27	<i>Togo</i>
<i>Ukraine</i>	30	<i>Ukraine</i>
<i>Vanuatu</i>	28	<i>Vanuatu</i>
<i>Venezuela</i>	36	<i>Venezuela</i>
<i>Yemen</i>	31	<i>Yémen</i>

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides: 155

Majority required / majorité requise : 77



**16<sup>th</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**  
**16<sup>e</sup> ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Candidates for the 2nd ballot:      Candidats pour le 2e tour de scrutin :

<i>Angola</i>	<i>Angola</i>	<i>Nigeria</i>	<i>Nigéria</i>
<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Brésil</i>	<i>Poland</i>	<i>Pologne</i>
<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>Romania</i>	<i>Roumanie</i>
<i>DR Congo</i>	<i>RD Congo</i>	<i>Sweden</i>	<i>Suède</i>
<i>Jordan</i>	<i>Jordanie</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>Thaïlande</i>
<i>Malta</i>	<i>Malte</i>	<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>Ukraine</i>
		<i>Vanuatu</i>	<i>Vanuatu</i>



**16<sup>th</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**  
**16<sup>e</sup> ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Results of the 2nd ballot:      Résultat du 2e tour de scrutin :

<i>Angola</i> 23	<i>Angola</i>	<i>Nigeria</i> 68	<i>Nigéria</i>
<i>Brazil</i> 68	<i>Brésil</i>	<i>Poland</i> 43	<i>Pologne</i>
<i>Burkina Faso</i> 19	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>Romania</i> 33	<i>Roumanie</i>
<i>DR Congo</i> 13	<i>RD Congo</i>	<i>Sweden</i> 64	<i>Suède</i>
<i>Jordan</i> 55	<i>Jordanie</i>	<i>Thailand</i> 37	<i>Thaïlande</i>
<i>Malta</i> 14	<i>Malte</i>	<i>Ukraine</i> 16	<i>Ukraine</i>
		<i>Vanuatu</i> 16	<i>Vanuatu</i>

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides: 131  
 Required majority / majorité requise : 65



**16<sup>th</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**  
**16<sup>e</sup> ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Candidates for the 3rd ballot:

Candidats pour le 3e tour de scrutin :

**Jordan**  
**Poland**  
**Sweden**  
**Thailand**

**Jordanie**  
**Pologne**  
**Suède**  
**Thaïlande**



**16<sup>th</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**  
**16<sup>e</sup> ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Results of the 3rd ballot:

Résultat du 3e tour de scrutin :

**Jordan** 64  
**Poland** 58  
**Sweden** 63  
**Thailand** 44

**Jordanie**  
**Pologne**  
**Suède**  
**Thaïlande**

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides: 133  
Majority / majorité : 67



Results of the 4th ballot:

Résultat du 4<sup>e</sup> tour de scrutin :

<b>Jordan</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>Jordanie</b>
<b>Poland</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>Pologne</b>
<b>Sweden</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>Suède</b>
<b>Thailand</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>Thaïlande</b>

Number of valid votes / Nombre de votes valides: 136

Majority / majorité : simple

