



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

17 GA

Distribution Limited

WHC-09/17.GA/INF.10

Paris, 6 July 2010

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

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

DIX-SEPTIEME SESSION D E L'ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS
PARTIES A LA *CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL CULTUREL ET NATUREL*

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
23 – 28 October 2009

Paris, Siège de l'UNESCO
23-28 octobre 2009

Item 10 of the Agenda: Summary Records of the 17th session of the
General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*

Point 10 de l'ordre du jour : Résumé des interventions de la 17e session de
l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la *Convention du patrimoine
mondial*

17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*

Friday, 23 October 2009

14:10-15:40

ITEM 1A

OPENING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

The General Assembly was opened by the **Director-General**, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, who spoke of his personal association with the *World Heritage Convention*, beginning with his service as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee from 1998 to 1999. He also spoke of the development of the *Convention* over the years and noted with satisfaction the progress made by States Parties towards the objective of protecting World Heritage properties, as well as the activities implemented by UNESCO in response to the increasing expectations of stakeholders.

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a déclaré que cette 17^e session de l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la *Convention* de 1972 célèbre une fois de plus la quasi-universalité de cette *Convention* et témoigne du succès de cet outil de coopération internationale. Elle souligne en outre que cette session sera plus longue que d'habitude en raison de la nature des débats qui doivent s'y tenir, en particulier sur l'avenir de la *Convention*. Ces discussions seront basées sur les résultats de l'atelier qui s'est tenu en février dernier au Siège de l'UNESCO grâce au soutien de l'UNESCO et de plusieurs Etats parties (Australie, Brésil, Israël, Pays-Bas et Suisse). Cette Assemblée générale aura donc plus que jamais un rôle d'orientation stratégique.

D'autre part, la **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a évoqué le fait que cette Assemblée générale décidera peut-être d'amender son règlement intérieur en matière d'élection des membres du Comité. La proposition qui va lui être soumise constitue le fruit d'une réflexion de deux années menée sous la conduite sage et expérimentée de Son Exc. M. l'Ambassadeur Seiichi Kondo.

L'atelier de février 2009 a permis une réflexion enrichissante sur les réalisations menées depuis près de quarante ans pour protéger le patrimoine par le biais de la *Convention*, ce qui amène la **Sous-**

directrice générale pour la Culture à évoquer la mémoire de deux personnes récemment disparues : M. Michel Parent, ancien Président du Comité, et M. Léon Pressouyre, spécialiste de l'archéologie médiévale, Professeur à la Sorbonne, président de la Commission pour la préservation des monuments nationaux de Bosnie-Herzégovine et coordonnateur de l'ICOMOS entre 1980 et 1990. Sa brusque disparition, le 10 août dernier, a suscité une grande émotion. La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** lui rend hommage en rappelant que dans son ouvrage, *La Convention du patrimoine mondial, vingt ans après*, Monsieur Pressouyre avait suscité le lancement de la *Stratégie Globale pour une Liste représentative, équilibrée et crédible*, et qu'il avait en outre légué son intuition des passerelles entre toutes les formes de patrimoines, notamment le patrimoine immatériel. Elle le cite :

« Que deviendrait Marrakech, figée dans la conservation «muséale» de ses murailles, de ses mosquées, de ses palais, si la place Jemâa-el-Fna cessait d'être ce carrefour de cultures vivantes, traversé de musiques et de clameurs, bariolé de couleurs vives, saturé des senteurs de plusieurs mondes, que nous avons le bonheur de connaître? Que serait la ville de Kandy au Sri Lanka sans le pèlerinage qui, chaque année, attire des foules de fidèles, venus vénérer la relique insigne de la dent de Bouddha? Ou encore, que deviendrait le site de Sukur au Nigeria, si la communauté très structurée qui l'habite perdait brusquement les traditions qu'elle conserve depuis plusieurs siècles? »

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** déclare que la complémentarité entre la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* et les autres conventions dans le domaine de la Culture demeure une priorité sur laquelle a insisté la Commission Culture de la Conférence Générale. Elle attire l'attention sur le fait que des liens existent déjà plusieurs niveaux : ainsi, 7 éléments immatériels de la Liste représentative de la Convention de 2003 sont reliés à 7 sites du patrimoine mondial. En outre, lors de la dernière session du Comité intergouvernemental pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel qui s'est tenue à Abou Dhabi (Émirats arabes unis) du 28 septembre au 2 octobre 2009, sur les trois demandes d'assistance internationale formulées dans le cadre de cette Convention, deux ont été motivées par les décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial relatives aux Forêts sacrées de Kayas des Mijikenda, Kenya (bien inscrit en 2008) et à Aapravasi Ghat, Maurice (bien inscrit en 2006).

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a ajouté qu'elle attend beaucoup de la création d'instituts de catégorie 2, car elle espère qu'ils

mettront en œuvre une vision holistique afin de nourrir des actions cohérentes et concertées dans tous les domaines de la Culture. Les instituts pour le patrimoine mondial de l'Afrique du Sud, du Brésil, de Bahreïn et de Zacatecas, Mexique, ont reçu l'appui unanime de la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO ces jours derniers et ouvrent la perspective de nouvelles synergies.

En ce sens, la **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** s'est réjoui également de la fructueuse coopération entre le Secteur de la Culture et le Secteur des sciences. Cette coopération s'est exprimée en 2009 à travers l'« Année internationale de l'astronomie », et va se poursuivre. Elle cite notamment trois domaines privilégiés de cette collaboration : tout d'abord, celui du changement climatique, pour lequel le Centre du patrimoine mondial et la Section en charge du patrimoine immatériel assurent, avec le Secteur des Sciences, le suivi de la réunion sur le « Développement durable en Arctique face au changement climatique mondial ». Ensuite, le Programme marin du patrimoine mondial adopté par le Comité en 2005. En juin 2009, la Commission océanographique intergouvernementale (COI) et le Programme de l'Homme et la biosphère (MaB) ont développé et publié conjointement un *Guide sur la planification spatiale marine* basé sur l'expérience acquise, notamment, dans un site du patrimoine mondial : la Baie d'Ha Long au Vietnam. Enfin, elle évoque l'année 2010, qui va être à la fois l'« Année internationale de la biodiversité » et celle du rapprochement entre les cultures. Les liens entre nature et culture sont particulièrement évidents dans la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* puisqu'elle conjugue la protection du patrimoine culturel et de la biodiversité, de concert, dans un instrument juridique international unique. A cet égard, la **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** informe les Délégués qu'un grand congrès sur la diversité culturelle et biologique est prévu en juillet 2010 à Montréal, au Canada, sous l'intitulé « Diversité pour le Développement - Développement pour la diversité : Congrès international sur les liens entre la diversité biologique et culturelle pour le Développement durable » ; les deux secteurs de la culture et de la science y ont largement contribué.

Terminant son allocution en souhaitant de fructueux travaux à cette Assemblée, la **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a donné la parole à son homologue du Secteur des Sciences exactes et naturelles, M. Walter Erdelen.

The **Assistant Director-General for Natural Sciences** spoke of the importance of biodiversity, ecosystems, education for sustainable development and developing capacity at natural World Heritage sites. He

mentioned accomplishments in World Heritage over the years including links between biosphere reserves and World Heritage sites for sustainable development, through the MaB programme; the UNESCO open initiative on space technologies; and results from partnerships. He also discussed current projects such as the opening of a category 2 centre in Beijing, climate change issues and UNESCO strategies for mitigation and adaptation measures, and the carbon offset programme. He concluded by emphasizing that natural science and World Heritage working together strengthen UNESCO contributions to preservation.

ITEM 1B

ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/1B
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.1B

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a ensuite procédé à l'adoption du premier point de l'ordre de jour (1B), à savoir l'élection du Président, des Vice-présidents et du Rapporteur de l'Assemblée générale, et demandé s'il y avait une proposition pour un Président.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** proposed Mr. Dawson Munjeri, Head of the Delegation of Zimbabwe, as Chairperson of the General Assembly, citing his experience as Director of Monuments for ten years, the fact that he served on the World Heritage Committee from 1997 to 2003, and was Rapporteur at the 24th session of the World Heritage Committee held in Cairns, Australia in 2000.

L'intervention est suivie par acclamation de la salle approuvant la candidature du Zimbabwe. La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a alors demandé s'il y avait des propositions pour les Vice-présidents et le Rapporteur.

La Délégation du **Bénin** a félicité le Zimbabwe pour son élection et proposé la candidature de la Malaisie comme Vice-président.

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a demandé s'il y a une proposition pour le poste de deuxième Vice-président.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed Argentina as Vice-chair to the General Assembly.

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a demandé aux délégués s'ils étaient d'accord avec les deux candidatures proposées pour les Vice-présidents. Elle a obtenu cet accord par acclamation, et demandé alors s'il y avait une proposition pour le Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Poland** proposed Ms Dagnija Baltina of Latvia as Rapporteur, citing her experience as Secretary-General of the Latvian National Commission.

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a demandé aux délégués s'ils sont d'accord avec cette candidature. Elle a obtenu cet accord par acclamation, et invité le Président et le Rapporteur nouvellement élus à prendre place sur le podium.

The **Chairperson** took the floor, expressed his gratitude at being elected Chairperson and suggested speaking more the next day.

Mme Bennanni, de la Délégation du **Maroc** a félicité le Président de l'Assemblée générale pour son élection, ainsi que le Rapporteur et les deux Vice-présidents. S'adressant ensuite au Directeur général, elle a souligné que l'intérêt qu'il porte au patrimoine ne s'est jamais démenti. Il a encouragé, soutenu et suivi une réflexion sur les diverses catégories de patrimoine, permettant ainsi à l'appareil normatif de l'UNESCO d'en sortir particulièrement enrichi. Elle a ajouté que le Directeur général a également soutenu et suivi tout ce que le Comité du patrimoine mondial a accompli pour l'Afrique, y compris la création du Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain et les efforts visant à développer une Liste plus équilibrée. Il a élargi la réflexion car la durabilité du patrimoine ne se limite pas à l'aspect culturel : il est également lié à la durabilité du développement et à celle de l'environnement.

Mme Bennani, de la Délégation du **Maroc** a donc estimé que l'aspect normatif, les efforts pour un meilleur équilibre de la Liste et la réflexion sur la durabilité du patrimoine constituent pour le Directeur général un très riche bilan. Elle a terminé en soulignant que le virus du patrimoine ne va sans doute pas quitter le Directeur général et que leurs chemins vont encore se croiser dans ce domaine, et lui a transmis ses meilleurs vœux de succès pour sa carrière à venir et sa vie familiale.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director-General.

Le **Directeur général de l'UNESCO** a félicité à son tour le Président de l'Assemblée générale pour son élection et remercié la Délégation du

Maroc pour ses paroles. Il a rappelé que son premier voyage officiel en tant que Directeur général en 1999 l'avait mené au Maroc pour participer à la 23e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Marrakech. Auparavant, il avait été Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial pendant presque un an, fonction qu'il avait dû abandonner avant la fin de son mandat pour prendre le poste de Directeur général de l'UNESCO. Lors de son voyage au Maroc en 1999, il avait été touché par l'accueil courtois et chaleureux de Sa Majesté le Roi du Maroc à Rabat. En conclusion, il a déclaré qu'il offrait à la Délégation du Maroc le livre de réflexion qu'il a écrit sur le patrimoine mondial, qui vient d'être traduit en anglais.

Resolution 17 GA 1B

The General Assembly,

1. Elects **Mr. Dawson MUNJERI, Zimbabwe**, as Chairperson of the 17th General Assembly,
2. Elects **Ms. Dagnija BALTIŅA, Latvia**, as Rapporteur of the 17th General Assembly,
3. Elects **Malaysia and Argentina** as Vice-Chairpersons of the 17th General Assembly.

Résolution 17 GA 1B

L'Assemblée générale,

1. Elit **M. Dawson MUNJERI, Zimbabwe**, comme Président de la 17e Assemblée générale,
2. Elit **Mme Dagnija BALTIŅA, Lettonie**, comme Rapporteur de la 17e Assemblée générale,
3. Elit la **Malaisie** et l'**Argentine** comme Vice-présidents de la 17e Assemblée générale.

ITEM 2A

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/2A
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.2A

Resolution 17 GA 2A

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/17.GA/2A,*
2. *Adopts the Agenda included in the above-mentioned Document.*

Résolution 17 GA 2A

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-09/17.GA/2A,*
2. *Adopte l'ordre du jour figurant dans le document susmentionné*

ITEM 2B

ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Document: WHC-09/17.GA/2B.rev

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the proposed timetable.

The **Chairperson** of the General Assembly asked for comments or additional items.

The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested eliminating item 3A from the timetable, or perhaps amendments would be discussed the following day.

The **Chairperson** clarified that indeed amendments would be proposed the following day.

The Delegation of **Argentina** asked why the themes of *Global Strategy* and Future of the *Convention* were merged in item 9 of the agenda. It would have been preferable to have them as two separate items (9A and 9B).

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the decision to submit the question to the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** proposed a casual working group to clarify the item on the Future of the *Convention*, referring to the results from the workshop of the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** suggested that before creating working groups, it might be worthwhile to clarify the purpose for creating them.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Secretariat would like the States Parties to clarify the issue since they participated in the workshop.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a estimé qu'il y avait un problème dans l'organisation des travaux de l'Assemblée générale, car on parle déjà des méthodes de travail avant même d'avoir adopté le calendrier. Elle a demandé s'il serait possible de procéder de manière méthodique, d'autant plus qu'on a dépassé l'heure théorique de la fin des débats depuis déjà 20 minutes.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** clarified that the working group cannot delete items from the agenda.

The Delegation of **Mexico** said it wanted to complain about a missing document.

The **Chairperson** suggested the agenda should be adopted first.

The agenda and the timetable were both adopted.

Resolution 17 GA 2B

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/17.GA/2B.rev,*
2. *Adopts the timetable of the 17th session of the General Assembly.*

Résolution 17 GA 2B

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-09/17.GA/2B.rev,*
2. *Adopte le calendrier de la 17e session de l'Assemblée générale.*

The Delegation of **Barbados** pointed out that Item 9 is scheduled to be held at the end of the meeting but would like the item moved to the schedule of the following day, as the Delegation would have to leave the meeting earlier than others.

The **Chairperson** said the Bureau would discuss it and see how the schedule can be adjusted.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked why Item 9 was at the end of the session and suggested to move it to the next day instead as some Delegations have to leave before Item 9 will be discussed.

The Delegation of **Mexico** asked whether it would be possible to have the hard copies of document INF.5, which related to contributions as it was not received. This piece of information was important in relation with candidatures to the World Heritage Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said the document could be provided the following day, but that it is available on the website in any case.

The Delegation of **Egypt** asked if the questions about the agenda raised by Barbados would be adopted.

The **Chairperson** said that it would be addressed by the Bureau when it meets.

The Delegations of **Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Malaysia, Saint-Lucia, Japan** and **Morocco** objected to this.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested discussing on this issue either at 6pm on the same day or on Saturday 24 October from 9 to 10 a.m.

The Delegation of **Mexico** asked if the Secretariat could do this without a working group.

The **Chairperson** said it was a substantive issue, and it was in the interest of the States Parties to be informed of the content. The Chairperson suggested an incremental process.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked if it would be a working group and if the session should be open to everyone.

The **Chairperson** asked if it is adequate for the Chairperson and the Bureau alone to make this decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and said that it was acceptable for the Chairperson and the Bureau to make a proposal.

La Délégation du **Luxembourg** a déclaré qu'elle était d'accord avec le Mexique. Les questions d'organisation de l'ordre du jour devraient être traitées par le Bureau. Ce dernier, avec l'aide du Secrétariat et en consultant les différents groupes, pourrait préparer une proposition acceptable qui serait adoptée le mardi 27 octobre au matin. La Délégation du **Luxembourg** a estimé qu'il n'était pas nécessaire de créer un groupe de travail pour s'occuper de l'ordre du jour.

The **Chairperson** proposed to meet in Room XII.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson of the General Assembly on his election and agreed with scheduling a meeting from 9 to 10 a.m. on the following morning.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the meeting and adjourned the session at 15.40.

17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*

Saturday, 24 October 2009

10:15-13:25

The **Chairperson** opened the floor by mentioning his fresh experience as Chairperson and his right to make errors. He evoked the history of the *World Heritage Convention* and notably its Preamble, and quoted Mahatma Gandhi "Freedom does not exist if it does not include the right to make mistakes". Then he explained how the *Convention* evolved over time, in particular its *Operational Guidelines* which are currently in their ninth version. According to the **Chairperson**, this constant evolution is a proof of the acceptance that mistakes were made in implementing the *Convention*. The purpose of this General Assembly is to adjust errors and the agenda implores Delegates to be visionary and address the future. This General Assembly's legacy should be to put less energy on procedure and more on substance. Delegations are empowered to become the players of this *Convention*. Thus they should avoid unnecessary meetings. Finally, the Chairperson drew the Delegates' attention on the fact that according to Article 7.2 of the Rules of procedure, he might limit their interventions.

The **Chairperson** reminded that the day before, the General Assembly agreed to have a short meeting prior to the Plenary only to straighten one issue, so that everyone is in the same frame of mind with regard to the Future of the *Convention*. He stressed how important this aspect is. From the contributions from the floor yesterday he considered that it was quite clear that there was a keen interest. However, there seemed to be a number of aspects that need to be clarified. He informed that the Bureau met the previous night and thought that it was more prudent to call in Mr. Greg Terrill who was very much involved in this issue. He requested Mr. Terrill to give the General Assembly some basics. He indicated that one should not be going to go into detail on this issue as a whole as the General Assembly will tackle it in a full session on the following Tuesday. However the General Assembly needs to know the assets. He added that as some countries like Barbados and maybe others may be unable to take part in Tuesday's session, the General Assembly would give them the opportunity to make their inputs not only in oral form but also in any written submission that they would like to leave. He concluded by saying that all those who think that they may not

be available on the following Tuesday are welcome to give written submissions in addition to whatever oral sessions. The **Chairperson** indicated that the full session on the Future of the *Convention* would be held on the following Tuesday, not today. Some countries like Barbados asked to be given the opportunity to give their contribution and input in writing. Thus he decided to give 20 minutes for those willing to give oral comments. He gave the floor to Mr. Terrill.

Mr. Greg Terrill from the Delegation of **Australia** acknowledged the kind invitation and took it that the Chairperson would like him to comment on a possible order of work that one should focus on during this session. If this was the case, he reminded all Delegates present that this discussion here at this General Assembly was another step in a process that had been going on for 18 months. It was commenced in the World Heritage Committee session in Quebec around 18 months ago. With that in mind, he considered that it would seem logical to frame the discussion in the next couple of days during this General Assembly as a continuation of this work and perhaps as a combination of parts of it. Also, it could be a refinement of other parts for further work.

In this context, **Mr. Terrill** considered that the key document which was brought to the attention of the General Assembly on the work that had taken place was Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF9 which has four parts which are probably worth focusing on and could form a possible agenda as follows:

- Firstly on page 3 of Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF9, there is a request for the Chair of the Consultative Group that took place in Seville to report to the General Assembly on the actions undertaken. **Mr. Terrill** was of the view that the first part of the agenda might thus constitute that report back.
- The second part of Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF9, which is Annex 1, commencing on page 3 is a Draft Vision that is brought forward from the World Heritage Committee session in Seville for the consideration of the General Assembly. **Mr. Terrill** considered that looking at that Draft Vision might constitute the second part of the General Assembly's agenda for discussion.
- The third part of Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF9, which is contained in Annex 2 is the Draft Action Plan brought forward from Seville for the consideration of the General Assembly. **Mr. Terrill**

considered that this Draft Action Plan might constitute a third part of the General Assembly's agenda.

- Finally the General Assembly might wish to consider a Draft Resolution on this topic which is contained in Document WHC-09/17.GA/9. This, according to **Mr. Terrill**, might constitute a fourth and final part for the General Assembly's agenda on this topic.

Mr. Terrill recapitulated the four parts of the possible agenda of the General Assembly on the Future of the *Convention*: 1. a report on the work undertaken to date, 2. a consideration of the Draft Vision, 3. a consideration of the Draft Action Plan and 4. a consideration of the Draft Resolution.

The **Chairperson** referred to the Delegation of Australia considering that the States Parties were called upon to be the stakeholders of the *Convention* in a transparent and democratic process rather than confining the debate to the sole Committee. He continued saying that, States Parties were empowered in a participatory process which would be as inclusive as possible.

The Chairperson then referred to Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9 which contains a draft vision on the Future of the *Convention* to debate, according to the General Assembly's input. He insisted that the empowerment is an ongoing process instead of a once and for all debate. The idea would be to have a timeframe coinciding with the 40th anniversary of the *Convention* in 2012 and bring on this occasion a declaration similar to what was adopted in Budapest. This declaration would express the States Parties' vision after 40 years of existence of the *Convention*. The **Chairperson** added that under this Item the General Assembly could also debate about the Draft Action Plan. He concluded by informing the General Assembly that the Future of the *Convention* would be debated all day on Tuesday 27 October 2009.

The Delegation of **Japan** wished to obtain more details on the process. It wished to have some clarifications on the methodology to debate on the vision in order to avoid lengthy debates. It was of the view that one should debate on the Draft Action Plan first and on the vision after, as the former is a more substantive and concrete issue. However it thought that the Draft Action Plan is a long list which does not allow in depth discussion. It requested the Secretariat to select the most relevant and important themes on this list. It enumerated a number of possible important topics such as: under-represented categories, making

Tentative Lists more meaningful, needs in terms of technical cooperation and how to utilize the expertise of ICOMOS before the actual assessment of nominations takes place. It concluded by asking the Secretariat to pick truly substantial issues in order to avoid spending time in choosing them.

The Delegation of **Hungary** acknowledged Mr. Terrill for explaining this possible structure. It stressed the fact that along with Japan and Australia there were many similar ideas. It was of the view that the points made by Mr. Terrill seem a good order and structure for discussion. However, one should not forget that this is not a World Heritage Committee session but the General Assembly. Therefore there is a need to have a global and much more long-term and visionary approach than during the World Heritage Committee sessions. Also, one should not go into small details. One should highlight this vision. Also perhaps the Draft Action Plan has to be considered as the priority. The draft vision should be very ambitious and aim at 2052 instead of dealing with daily business. It was convinced that Mr. Terrill's proposal is a good starting point. One could use the *Budapest Declaration*, with the 5Cs as a basis as well as this Draft vision. Nevertheless the Draft Action Plan was deemed to be a real danger if one goes into small details. Thus one should make a selection of priorities first and leave this work to the World Heritage Committee. It recalled that the operative body for this *Convention* is the World Heritage Committee and *not* the General Assembly. The General Assembly should provide orientations and a visionary approach. It stressed that the fourth point, the Draft Resolution had indeed to be discussed. It suggested combining this Draft Resolution with the Draft Action Plan. In its view, the most important point of this General Assembly is how to reach the results from this very exercise concerning the Future of the *Convention* and make it possible to determine for the next 40 years. This Draft Resolution has to deal with long term. The only short term issue is how to conclude with this exercise and the other elements of discussion to deal with are all long term. It insisted that the most important thing was to have a global and long-term view on the Future of the *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** wished to know which Delegations would like to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Brazil** understood that Greg Terrill's proposal is a very well thought one and accepted this format. It wished to make some remarks about Brazil's view on this exercise. It noted that it is true that it is a process that has started a while ago when some of the current

members of the World Heritage Committee took up their functions and had the initiative of assessing how the *Convention* is operating and how it should be envisaged for the forthcoming years.

The Delegation of **Brazil** appreciated the fact that the Delegation of Hungary has a long term vision until 2052 which coincides with its approach. The *Convention* has been operating for 40 years and should continue for many years. It was of the view that one should have a forward looking vision for not just the coming 40 years but also many more. It is with this forward looking vision that it wished to recommend this General Assembly to take this rare opportunity to tackle important issues with all States Parties members of the *Convention* present.

The Delegation of **Brazil** took due regard to the Delegation of Japan's point about issues contained in the Draft Action Plan. Some of these issues pertain to the realm of the World Heritage Committee itself and others are more typical to the kind of issues to be looked at by the General Assembly of States Parties. It stressed the fact that this is more or less reflected in the time schedule that is attributed to every item showed in the Draft Action Plan and one could look at that framework. The format with which the Draft Action Plan was adopted by the World Heritage Committee states when these subjects need to be discussed. Some of them refer to the World Heritage Committee's forthcoming sessions, some to the General Assembly and some to both bodies of the *Convention*. So it considered that the Delegation of Japan was very right to differentiate between attributions and priorities left to the General Assembly and those for the World Heritage Committee itself. It was of the view that these items should not take long discussions as this is a very rough first Draft Action Plan. It agreed with the Delegation of Japan on the fact that the General Assembly should go straight into the Draft Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Brazil** continued saying that Brazil's objective is to prepare for the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the *Convention*. This is the landmark that one should look at in order to build a conceptual and operational framework for the *Convention* for the next decades. It added that one needs to keep in mind that we should not try to do something for immediate ripping advantages but rather more something that would last for the years to come. It agreed that it is always useful to take stock of what has been done and once in a while try to update something that is not atone with its time. However one should not forget what has been accomplished. It considered that the problem is that at least up to now the General Assembly has done very

little in this regard as this topic is mostly in the hands of the World Heritage Committee. It considered this as a rare opportunity that the General Assembly has as full constituency of this *Convention* with all its stakeholders to take stock and look forward of what one could accomplish.

The Delegation of **Brazil** confirmed that Brazil was prepared to work on the basis of the workplan and order prepared by the Delegation of Australia and took into account the comments made by the Delegations of Japan and Hungary in order to proceed on this basis. It called for the attention of the General Assembly that there was a formal opportunity of interacting about this issue in the February 2009 Seminar in Paris. Although it was an initiative by the World Heritage Committee itself, this event was open to the participation of experts of every States Parties. It counted a very good participation of over 70 States Parties. With a view to the forthcoming discussion, it invited States Parties to refer to Document WHC-09/33COM/14 A. It invited Delegates to bring a copy of this Document submitted in the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009). Those Delegates who were absent would refresh their minds about the contents of the February workshop and compare those with the results of formal discussions held in Seville during early morning meetings before the session started. The Delegation of **Brazil** concluded saying that this was a vision and workplan which are a rough first draft. It recommended looking at it as such and perhaps not going very much go into details of analysing it for the moment, as the next General Assembly would be an opportunity to go deeper into it.

The Delegation of **Argentina** acknowledged the Delegation of Australia and confirmed its agreement with its proposals. However it wished to discuss the working methods of the General Assembly and asked whether this discussion would be included in the framework which was just presented. It stressed that even if everything is already in the agenda and timetable, a memento would be appreciated.

The **Chairperson** agreed that there seemed to be a general acceptance of the format for discussion as presented by the Delegation of Australia and asked whether there might be additional elements.

The Delegation of **Australia** recognized that important points were made. It took note of the last request made by the Delegation of Argentina on the working methods. This reminds the General Assembly of the agenda as adopted which refers to that in the Global Strategy.

Both points are included in the various elements of the Report, the Draft vision and the Draft Action Plan and can also be incorporated in the Draft Resolution.

With reference to the interventions of the Delegations of Brazil and Japan on the nature of the vision, the Delegation of **Australia** agreed that the vision should be based upon results or upon the Draft Action Plan. It considered this possibility as logical and within the ability of the General Assembly to construct its discussion.

The Delegation of **Australia** continued mentioning other important points made which could all be incorporated in the debate. As a next step, it suggested to the Chairperson that prior to the opening of Agenda Item 9 a presentation be provided for all States Parties. This would allow them to have a more detailed picture about the way the discussion would take place, in order to have a clear sense of the discussion beforehand. It suggested presenting this document on Monday 26 October 2010. This would allow States Parties to have an opportunity to reflect prior to the discussion.

The **Chairperson** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre whether there was a possibility to encapsulate everything proposed during the last interventions.

The **Director of the World Heritage** Centre confirmed the possibility to deliver a simple scheme on suggestions made during this morning, despite the fact that Monday was not an easy day with the elections. However, he would find time and make a special effort to reflect all comments made.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Barbados.

The Delegation of **Barbados** wished to make the following statement which should be put on record: *"I want to use this opportunity to say first and foremost how much we appreciate the efforts being made to improve the quality and the procedures with respect of the General Assembly both on the part of the Bureau and the Secretariat."*

We are aware of this and we are very pleased to see this moving forward. Nevertheless, there are some issues that we need to address. Let me first just reiterate the Chairperson's words this morning. He said this is meant to be a fully participatory process although he meant it in the context of this meeting, but I think I should assume in broader

parameters. He also said it was meant to be as inclusive as possible. Unfortunately, the 17th General Assembly will fail significantly in this regard and I must say this is a great disappointment for Barbados since due to the late change in the scheduling of this event timeframe, we are unable as professional people, to simply change our agenda at the last minute. We also feel that the General Assembly has failed to engage the attention of many small Delegations, small States being amongst the most vulnerable, they are also amongst those least represented at global for a such as this one. The result is this: their votes are not cast, their voices are not heard, their needs are not felt and their aspirations are not addressed. The broader result is that the Convention does fail to achieve its targets in terms of the 5Cs: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication and, not least, in terms of Community.

Mr. Chairperson, as I said before, Barbados is not unaware and is certainly grateful for the efforts made by the Bureau and the Secretariat in trying to address a number of the issues and complaints that we and others have raised over the past years and indeed it is clearly evident that some improvements should be celebrated. Nonetheless these efficiency gains are significantly overshadowed by strategic losses. I should not have to spell these out for you but perhaps I should speak out on this so that we have a clear record and I hope it will be taken up as part of the Future of the Convention as a need to urgently address these.

Credibility claims about the desire to be inclusive, are not really actually being addressed. If those most disadvantaged are unable to participate on an equal basis, in one of the most important processes for the States Parties, voting, both in terms of the elections and in terms of the amendments of rules of procedures related to this.

Conservation, not necessarily a direct link perhaps, but for us, there is a clear linkage between Member States understanding and hearing and having the opportunity for a review of the results gained over the last two years and the input in terms of the focus of the Convention and the Committee's work over the next two.

Capacity-building for me, Mr. Chairperson, both my interest and knowledge of World Heritage were first developed through my attendance at a General Assembly, made possible because it was held during a General Conference. I regret that this is not being possible for many new States.

Communication: communication of the change of dates unfortunately came too late for Delegations like ours, to change our plans. I unfortunately must return to my home country because I have consultants on the ground and I have plans at both the national and international level to address. So I cannot be with you and I cannot participate as fully as I would like. Communication also of the documents also related to this meeting, for some reason has been rather importantly obscured in a significant way. I do not know why this is the case, but I have had requests from people to know about where the documents are, how they can receive them. I have had to send documents to them. This should not be the case.

Finally, Community. We spoke with great pride earlier about the achievement of virtually complete representation of the UNESCO conventions in cooperation of States Parties. But I question how many of these are going to be able to fully participate in this meeting. The result is that it is not a community in terms of its decision-making processes and I think that this is a significant failure that must be addressed.

Chair, I have taken up too much time already but I would just want to say how much I regard this as a very important process, how much I would have liked to have participated as the Chairperson of the Finance Group at the Committee meeting in Seville, to have participated in an active way in the examination of the accounts and in the determination of how we move forward with our programming. And I would have liked to have actively participated in the Item that we have just been addressing, the Future of the Convention. I have some specific views on this. My colleague also. He will do his best to represent our interests. But I feel we have failed to take this on board and Chair, having said all this, I do want to wish everyone well during the course of this meeting. I am sure it will be a very important meeting but I just feel that we do have some important things to address. Thank you. »

ITEM 3A

AMENDMENTS OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE *CONVENTION* FOLLOWING THE REFLECTION ON THE ELECTIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ENSURING EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES OF THE WORLD (*Discussion continued*)

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/3A
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3A

Ambassador Kondo introduced the item and explained that following the Resolution adopted by 16 GA he had convened a working group meeting four times between 2008 and 2009. He expressed his gratitude towards this working group who presented a report and stressed that the results of it are a big step towards a more equitable distribution of the World Heritage Committee.

A final recommendation was completed by the working group on 19 May 2009. All meetings were open-ended, progress was made at every step of the 2-year process and this recommendation provides solutions for an equitable representation in the Committee.

Ambassador Kondo continued evoking the historic context of elections to the World Heritage Committee. He mentioned past records of discussions, measures already taken and their impact on the following elections. He concluded by saying that all possible solutions were examined. Ten items were examined at the first meeting and the working group realized how difficult a task it was to make as many States Parties as happy as possible and do no harm to anyone.

The recommendations made by the working group are three:

- Amend the *Convention*
- Introduce a so called moratorium
- Introduce a reserved seat to States Parties not represented on the World Heritage List.

Furthermore there are five other recommendations contained in this report:

- Introduce a four-year gap between two mandates
- Voluntarily reduce the World Heritage Committee mandates from four to two years

- Reserve a seat for the electoral group risking to be un-represented in the following Committee in the same manner as in UNESCO Executive Board election system.
- Streamline the voting method by adopting a principle of absolute majority in the first round of ballot and simple majority at the 2nd round.
- Draw lots in case of tie break, however only upon the 2nd round.

Ambassador Kondo admitted that there are mathematical possibilities that a number of States Parties obtain an equal number of votes. He presented a simulation chart and said that the possibility of having an equal number of votes was unlikely to happen.

Ambassador Kondo insisted on two other important issues which are mentioned in the Draft Resolution:

- The importance of capacity-building for World Heritage Committee Members
- The importance of Observers' role in World Heritage Committee sessions.

Ambassador Kondo recognized that these recommendations may not satisfy every State Party. He warns the General Assembly that a tiny change in this proposition may cause an overall imbalance of the whole construction. He acknowledged Mr. Gabor Soos, Rapporteur of this Working Group, the Secretariat of the World Heritage Centre and the Legal Advisor of UNESCO.

Ambassador Kondo concluded by making a simulation which takes into account the recommendations formulated by the Working Group.

The **Chairperson** of the General Assembly acknowledged Ambassador Kondo for his clear and lucid presentation. He opened the floor for discussion. He wrapped up the recommendations enumerated by Ambassador Kondo. He added that all meetings of this working group were open-ended and had a good geographical representation. Furthermore, the Legal Advisor of UNESCO attended every meeting of the Working Group. He believed a consensus was reached. Finally, he recognized that making a decision on these issues is a heavy responsibility for the 17th General Assembly.

33 Delegations having asked the floor, the **Chairperson** decided to limit the time of speakers to 3 minutes according to Rule 7.2 and pointed out that he would be reluctant to give the floor twice to the same State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany** acknowledged Ambassador Kondo and his colleagues for the excellent report produced by the Working Group. However it considered that the issue of elections is not a one shot only issue. It attended two of the meetings of the Working Group and was impressed. He commended the report as a beautiful piece of work. However, Articles 14.8 and 14.10 raise a question as there is a contradiction in 14.8 which should be about absolute majority. In Article 14.10, there is a lack of consistency: it refers to the 1st or 2nd round of ballot and the type of majority is different in each of these rounds. Furthermore, the simulation made does not reflect the formulation of the proposals made.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** congratulated the Chairperson for his election and expressed its gratitude to Ambassador Kondo. It considered that reducing the mandate from 6 to 4 years is wise, as is the proposed 4-year gap in between two mandates. It supported the two reserved seats for the un-represented electoral group and for States Parties with no property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson for his election and thanks Ambassador Kondo for his work. It requested a clarification from the Legal Advisor about Article 13.2 which can be interpreted in two ways in the following sentence: "Members of the Committee may stand for election *only* four years after the end of their mandate" (or may not). Also, concerning Article 14.1b, if one imagines that three regions are un-represented in the World Heritage Committee, should one create as many additional seats as un-represented regions?

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** congratulated Ambassador Kondo and fully supported the proposals made by the Working Group. However, it raised the issue of States Parties who have never been elected at the World Heritage Committee. It was of the view that a seat should be reserved for States Parties who are in this situation. It believed that these States Parties could greatly contribute to the success of the *World Heritage Convention*.

Ambassador Kondo acknowledged the speakers for their comments and contributions. With regard to Article 13.2 on the 4-year gap in between two mandates, he wished to consult the Legal Advisor later. He remembers the proposal made by Afghanistan in the Working Group, to reserve a seat for States Parties which have never been elected at the World Heritage Committee and recalled that this proposal was not

accepted and thus withdrawn. For what concerns the consistency and drawing lots, some States Parties insisted in putting in place a majority system which would simplify the process. He added that there are little chances to have to draw lots as soon as upon the first round of elections. Thus drawing lots would be only after the 2nd round of elections. Responding to Germany, he stressed the fact that even if one does not say "absolute" majority, the word majority means above 50%. However, he wished to clarify the legal definition of absolute majority as well by consulting the Legal Advisor.

The **Legal Advisor** responded to Kenya by saying that it is right, the issue is to know whether the 4-year gap in between two mandates is compulsory or voluntary. The word "only" could be confusing. It could mean that States Parties may only stand again at elections to the World Heritage Committee after four years and not after eight years or more. The right wording should be therefore "at the earliest" instead of "only".

Secondly, responding to Ambassador Kondo, the **Legal Advisor** says that in English, the simple majority means more than half of States Parties present. Absolute majority means that it is more than half of a voting group but not half of the voters. This may cause some confusion. Therefore the correct definition of absolute majority should be "more than 50% present and voting".

The Delegation of **Colombia** stresses the importance of a fair rotation system.

The Delegation of **Norway** supports the Working Group proposals but it is reluctant about the new voting mechanism which it considers too complicated and unnecessarily time consuming. Furthermore it believes that it does not provide a better representation. For instance, one or two representatives for Africa would not be an equitable representation. There could be some unforeseen consequences and thus sustainable mechanisms should be sought. It compares this system with other conventions where there exists an electoral group mechanism providing an equitable distribution before the voting system. Qualified experts should be part of the World Heritage Committee. As there seems to be no consensus, the Delegation of **Norway** concludes by saying that it would like to read a declaration after a decision is made on this item. This declaration should be integrated in the Summary Records of this session.

Le **Sénégal** a considéré que le système électoral est excellent et permet de gagner en temps et en efficacité. Articles 13.1 b) et d) : cet Etat soulève le cas éventuel où tous les représentants d'un groupe électoral ont fini leur mandat, et aucun candidat de ce groupe n'est élu. Il a suggéré à propos du point d) que l'élection ne précède pas le vote, mais se fasse après, pour permettre que la question des sièges soit revue.

Le **Président** demande à cet Etat de fournir au Secrétariat un amendement écrit.

La **Belgique** a espéré que le rapport pourrait être adopté. Elle a souscrit au principe de rotation (article 13.2) exprimé par le Conseiller juridique.

The Delegation of the **Libyan Arab Jamahiriya** respected the rotation principle, the 4-year gap between two mandates and the reduction of mandates from 6 to 4 years. It approved the limitation to two rounds of ballot. With regard to geographical distribution of the World Heritage Committee, it considered the proposed solution better than the previous one but there are still improvements to be made. A certain proportion should be respected between elected members of the World Heritage Committee and the States Parties which ratified the *Convention* within the same electoral group.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** a félicité l'Ambassadeur Kondo pour l'excellent travail et les décisions courageuses prises. Elle a appuyé les mécanismes et les amendements proposés qu'elle juge pertinents.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** a félicité le Président pour son élection, ainsi que le groupe de travail. Elle s'est réjoui que l'Assemblée générale soit sur le point d'adopter des amendements qui sont le fruit d'un consensus et du grand pas vers une représentation plus équilibrée. Elle a approuvé le siège réservé pour un groupe électoral non représenté qui renforcera la légitimité du Comité du patrimoine mondial, ainsi que le siège réservé pour les Etats parties sans bien inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle a estimé que l'écart de 4 ans entre deux mandats est satisfaisant pour une meilleure représentation. La Délégation de la **Serbie** a souligné l'importance de l'amendement visant à rationaliser l'élection, ainsi que la nécessité de renforcer les capacités.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** a remercié le groupe de travail et l'Ambassadeur Kondo. Elle a estimé que le rapport Kondo est un progrès significatif vers une meilleure rotation et appuie l'ensemble des amendements. Le Viet Nam soutient l'Afghanistan quant au siège

réservé aux Etats parties n'ayant jamais siégé au sein du Comité du patrimoine mondial, à savoir 66 pays, soit 33% des Etats parties. Sur les 32 États parties qui sont candidats, 12 Etats parties n'ont jamais siégé au Comité; 38 n'ont aucun bien inscrit : il serait souhaitable de leur donner un siège. Pourquoi ne pas appliquer la même procédure aux Etats parties n'ayant jamais siégé ? Enfin, la Délégation du **Vietnam** a estimé que le tirage au sort n'est pas approprié.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated the Chairperson for his election and approved the proposed amendments, except for the drawing lots. It did not wish the chance to rule and would prefer to find a solution which provides the World Heritage Committee a greater legitimacy.

The Delegation of **Oman** congratulated the Working Group for its excellent recommendations. With regard to Article 14.10 on drawing lots, this Delegation asked whether States Parties which lose the elections may or may not participate in the 2nd round. For what concerns Article 14.11 b) about the reserved seat for an un-represented electoral group, the Delegation of **Oman** would like to know whether the decision would be postponed until 2011.

The **Chairperson** summarized the fact that 3 States Parties raised the same issue on drawing lots and gave the floor to Ambassador Kondo on this issue.

Ambassador Kondo responded that a country which was not elected at the first round is eligible for the second. In order to put an end to the past endless rounds, the second round should thus be decisive. He also responded to the question about the mechanism of drawing lots – despite various constraints about this method, it is a historical way as well as a fast solution.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the Kondo Working Group report, with two reservations: Firstly on Article 13.2 if one introduces the mention "at the earliest" then the previous mention 'only' becomes unnecessary. Secondly, it raised the issue of drawing lots and in the case when two States parties would get the same number of votes, the selection should be made on the technical capacity of candidates and not through drawing lots.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated the Working Group and the Secretariat. It supported the proposed amendments, including the drawing lots as it wished a more equitable representation and rotation.

One should not lose momentum in modernizing the election procedures. It concluded by saying that the reflections made by the Working Group are valuable, notably for capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated the Working Group and supported the proposed amendments and recommendations which are resulting from a consensus. It paid tribute to the great *World Heritage Convention* and its principles of universality. With regard rotation and equitable distribution of seats, it supported the principle of a four-year mandate, four-year gap in between two mandates and representation of Group II, as well as a simplified electoral procedure consisting in two rounds. The Delegation of **Spain** supported the Delegation of Australia on its proposal in case of an equal number of votes for two States Parties.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported the proposed amendments and agreed with the proposals made by the Legal Advisor.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the results of the Working Group as well as the Draft Resolution including the clarifications already made.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated Ambassador Kondo for the excellent work and supports the proposed amendments while mentioning that already in 2001 one already debated on the issue of an equitable representation.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the Working Group and Ambassador Kondo. It was in favour of simplified election procedures and fully supported the recommendations made in the report. It wished a proper implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and a greater role for Observers which should be discussed in more detail in the future.

The **Chairperson** recalled on this occasion that Observers in 33rd Committee in Seville were given the floor to express their views however still more profit shall be given to the Observers.

The Delegation of **Egypt** acknowledged Ambassador Kondo and supported the proposals made. However it expressed its reservations on Article 14.10 and supported the Delegation of Australia. The question of majority should be clearly defined and it should not be considered just as a footnote. According to the Delegation of **Egypt**, the issue of absolute majority became more confused after listening to the Legal Advisor. Also, it was of the view that during their mandate, the States Parties counting

World Heritage Committee members should not be allowed to submit nominations during their mandate.

The **Chairperson** marked that the question whether a State Party that is a member of the World Heritage Committee can or cannot submit nominations during their mandate is not to be discussed during the current debate.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a remercié l'Ambassadeur Kondo et fait part du privilège d'avoir les deux versions linguistiques projetées sur écran. Elle a souligné l'importance du renforcement des capacités et du rôle des observateurs. Mais elle s'est demandé en quoi ce renforcement des capacités faciliterait le processus électoral.

Ambassador Kondo recalled that the Working group during the 33rd Committee meeting discussed the issues about the capacity building and the important role of Observers. The debate about the very role of the Observers is the best summarised in Document 33COM/14B, par.39.

The **Chairperson** reminded the General Assembly that there were still 11 speakers on the list. He considered that there was a consensus in favour of the proposed amendments on procedures, except for certain States Parties which made some reservations about drawing lots and whether it should be done on the second round only.

La Délégation de la **France** a remercié pour les deux écrans bilingues et souligné l'inconfort de la salle XII. Elle a également remercié le groupe de travail et souscrit aux conclusions du rapport. Au sujet du délai de 4 ans : elle a approuvé la mention « au plus tôt » tout en soulignant que « après 4 ans » est bien clair en français. La Délégation de la **France** a préféré réserver le tirage au sort pour le second tour et mentionné que le système électoral pourrait être ajusté au cours des années.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** a soulevé une motion d'ordre : L'assemblée générale continue-t-elle le débat d'ordre général ou a-t-elle déjà commencé l'examen du projet de décision?

The **Chairperson** responded that the General Assembly is having a general debate.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported the Legal Advisor on the wording of Article 13.2 and the proposed amendments.

The **Chairperson** said that after the Delegation of Brazil, the floor would be given to the Rapporteur of the Working Group who will capture the spirit of the discussion.

The Delegation of **Brazil** acknowledged Ambassador Kondo and the Working Group. It expressed its frustration on a number of issues but says that it is ready to accept the amendments. As the Delegation of Norway stressed, it wished to make a declaration later. Furthermore, it was of the view that one should find a better solution to represent all electoral groups and give them a "share" of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** was of the view that this is only the beginning of a long process.

The **Rapporteur of the Working Group** summarized the issue of tie breaking explaining that there was a general consensus except for tie break. He considered that there are two issues at stake: firstly, the question is about when to break the tie, after the absolute majority or after the simple majority? According to him it should not be after the first round but after the second. Secondly, the question lies in how to break the tie: if there is a tie after the second round (and not the first), should there be an extra ballot? He was of the view that the answer is both yes and no and concludes by recommending the drawing of lots.

The Delegation of **Poland** wished to have more discussion on this issue in the future.

The Delegation of **Sudan** agreed on the content, with one exception, the issue put forward by the Delegation of Afghanistan of having a reserved seat for those States Parties which never sat at the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation of Sudan said that it had tried to settle this issue over the eight previous years.

The Delegation of **Algeria** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Germany and insisted on the role of capacity-building of the World Heritage Committee. Furthermore, it was of the opinion that Observers should play a bigger role. It concluded by saying that the 2003 and 2005 conventions would have a better system for geographical representation in the future.

The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed doubts about the tie break system. Referring to Article 14.10 it proposed an amendment which was

drafted and remitted to the Secretariat. This amendment consists in organizing a new round of elections before drawing lots.

The Delegation of **Iran** (Islamic Republic of) congratulated Ambassador Kondo as well as the Working Group and the Secretariat. It welcomed the well presented report and supports the proposed recommendations. However it expressed some reservations about the geographical representation, professionalism of elected members and tie break system.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported a fair geographical representation and rotation. However, it deemed difficult to solve this complex issue. It stressed the fact that there needs to be a strong political will to provide the possibility of being elected for small countries. It supported the 4-year gap between two mandates and accepts the amendment proposed by the Legal Advisor. A geographical rotation is needed. It concluded by accepting the proposition made by the Delegation of Germany for drawing lot after the second round.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated Ambassador Kondo. It was of the view that this issue is an evolutionary process. As the proposals made solve most of major concerns, it asked the floor whether one should try the proposed system for a few years and then assess it. It supported the views expressed by the Delegation of Australia and the Legal Advisor on Article 13.2. Furthermore it suggested to continue the discussion about the role of Observers later during the Session under Item 9.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** congratulated the Chairperson and Ambassador Kondo. It was of the opinion that a significant step has been made and a fair solution has been reached. With regard to the drawing of lots (Articles 14.8 and 14.10), it supported the Delegation of Australia. It complained about the poor quality of translation and editing into Arabic. It concluded by saying that a better attention should be given to the Arabic version of documents and offered its assistance on this issue.

The **Chairperson** stressed the fact that the working documents are drafted in two languages. He acknowledged the 34 States Parties which took the floor and requested the General Assembly to make a decision. He asked Ambassador Kondo to comment on the draft decision.

Ambassador Kondo explained the amended text of the draft decision and said that the 4-year gap in between two mandates is now clearer

legally. Similarly, the tie break issue is also better defined. According to him, the only possible ambiguity that remains could be on Rule 13, par. 2. as it could imply that Members of the World Heritage Committee may run for election again only 4 years at the earliest after the expiration of their mandate. The new Article 14.9 consists in solving the possible equal scores on the first round. Those who have lost on the first round may run for elections again on the second round. About Article 14.10 **Ambassador Kondo** pointed out a possible ambiguity as in case of equal score upon the second round, a third round or a drawing lot might be organized. This remained to be decided.

The Delegation of **Grenada** wished to have some clarifications on the first amendment. It asked whether according to Article 14.9 only those States Parties with the same number of votes will go for the second round or whether only those who lost the first round would be able to go for elections in the second.

The **Chairperson** responded that those who have lost at the first round may participate in the second.

The Delegation of **Grenada** supported Argentina. It considered this as a policy decision. Campaigning for elections at the World Heritage Committee is hard and it requires high professional and technical capacities. Thus in case of tie break, it would be in favour of organizing a third round. If there is another tie break after the third round, then only one may proceed to drawing lots.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its dissatisfaction on this working method. Where does Article 14.1 come from? Article 14.8 qualifies the majority. Now the same problem is being introduced in Article 14.10. It was of the view that one is now mixing two issues: firstly who is taking part in the elections? And secondly what is the majority? Is it "present and voting", that is "Absolute majority of States Parties present and voting"?

The **Legal Advisor** recommended reflecting in the Rules of Procedures (14.8 and 14.9) the referred majority: is it absolute or simple? He repeated that there is no problem for the definition of absolute majority means the majority of those present and voting. He recommended putting the definition of absolute majority in brackets in the text in order to solve the problem.

The Delegation of **Argentina** approved this suggestion and was of the view that Article 14.9 is a good proposal which provides a logical sequence. However it disagreed with the last sentence on the second round. It should read "additional round" or "separate round". It stressed the fact that this is a political decision and semantics should be taken into account. It added that even if there is a tie break on the first round, as it is with absolute majority, there should be no need for those States Parties in this situation to go for a second round. The second round should be exclusively for those who have not reached an absolute majority on the first round.

La Délégation du **Luxembourg** a introduit un point d'ordre. Au lieu que chaque Etat partie présent émette des commentaires, il s'agirait d'examiner chaque paragraphe de la décision en commençant par le par. 1. Sinon on aboutira à une confusion. Elle a soutenu les Délégations de l'Allemagne et du Maroc.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the Delegation of Luxembourg.

The **Chairperson** started with paragraph 1 which was adopted. He continued with par. 2 which was also adopted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a demandé en quoi le renforcement des capacités encourage le processus électoral? Le renforcement des capacités est tout aussi important que l'expertise.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Morocco to submit a written amendment.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** was also in favour of capacity-building and raised the same question as the Delegation of Morocco.

The **Chairperson** suggested the two States Parties to submit a common written amendment.

Ambassador Kondo was of the view that capacity-building could contribute to a better rotation and representation within the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Hungary** was of the opinion that although capacity-building is important, this paragraph should be deleted as capacity-building is not relevant in this context and as this issue will be discussed on Tuesday.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed on the issue of capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Honduras** suggested deleting Article 3 which is problematic.

The Delegation of **Morocco** insisted that it has nothing against this paragraph, which is just a clarification.

The Delegation of **Germany** submitted a point of order. This Resolution should be adopted paragraph by paragraph. The Delegation of Afghanistan made a point. The question now is to know whether the Delegation of Afghanistan is satisfied with the reply to this point or not. The Delegation of **Germany** suggested skipping this paragraph and coming back to it after other or next paragraphs are adopted.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a été en faveur du renforcement des capacités et du rôle des observateurs. Elle a ajouté qu'elle se demande en quoi le renforcement des capacités peut encourager le processus électoral.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** submitted a point of order. How can the Secretariat revise a text which the General Assembly is supposed to adopt today? How is it possible to have the elections next Monday?

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested printing this text within a few minutes and distributing it in order to reflect over the week-end and make a decision on Monday.

The **Chairperson** explained that interpretation services will stop in a few minutes.

The Delegation of **Barbados** seconded the Delegation of Germany and wished to move on to the next paragraph in order to avoid wasting time. Paragraphs 3 and 4 would be examined at the end.

The Delegation of **Germany** submitted a point of order. This Resolution should be adopted today in order to have elections on Monday. One should skip paragraph 3 for the moment and move on to paragraph 4.

The **Legal Advisor** informed the Chairperson that following a point of order, he should make a decision immediately.

The **Chairperson** decided to move directly to paragraph 4. As five speakers were listed and the technical reality of interpretation did not make this debate feasible, the General Assembly should continue this debate next Monday.

The Delegation of **Barbados** insisted in skipping paragraphs 3 and 4 as they deal with the same issue.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that this is a serious problem. The General Assembly cannot run the elections as long as paragraphs relating with the elections are not adopted. If this is not done, the General Assembly will not be capable to hold the elections on Monday.

The **Chairperson** deplored the fact that one is moving back and forth without result.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recommended continuing on Monday. The elections would not take place until this Draft Resolution is adopted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** submitted a point of order: he was of the view that the session should be closed, the Delegations should reflect over the week-end and meet again on this issue on Monday.

The **Chairperson** agreed.

The Delegation of **Andorra** raised a point of order stressing the fact that it would be difficult for it to participate in the elections right away. It needed to consult with its national authorities.

The **Chairperson** was of the view to make a break and study this Draft Resolution. The core business of this Draft Resolution is paragraphs 13 and 14. He declared the meeting adjourned at 1.25 pm and the Item 3A suspended.

**17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
to the *World Heritage Convention***

Monday, 26 October 2009
10:15-13:30

ITEM 3A

**AMENDMENTS OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
FOLLOWING THE REFLECTION ON THE ELECTIONS OF THE
MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND
DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ENSURING EQUITABLE
REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES
OF THE WORLD (*Discussion continued*)**

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/3A
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3A

The **Chairperson** opened the session by recalling that Draft Resolution 17 GA 3A was to be adopted if possible by mid-day and that the text had been revised following the deliberations held on Saturday 24 October 2009. The revised text would be distributed to the Delegates shortly.

The **Rapporteur of the Working Group** presented the deliberations from the Bureau held in the morning and underlined that the only issue remaining for discussion following the previous Saturday session was the issue of the “tie break”. He proposed that the first round requires absolute majority (more than half of votes of those present and voting) for all seats (reserved seats included). If necessary there could then be a second round of voting. In case of a tie break/threshold in the first round, those candidates would become candidates for the second round. The second round would not require an absolute majority but the candidates receiving the most of the votes. If there still happens to be a tie break after the second round, then it would be necessary to draw lots. This procedure had been considered by the Bureau as the best solution to achieve representation and save time.

The Delegation of **India** stated that if a change was to be proposed, even if it concerns only a technical issue it should be submitted to the General Assembly for decision.

The **Chairperson** clarified that this was foreseen and gave the General Assembly the opportunity to the floor for no more less than 3 minutes.

La Délégation de l'**Égypte**, ayant soutenu la proposition de l'Inde, a demandé une réponse à la question suivante : s'il y a une égalité de voix au premier tour, le deuxième tour sera-t-il ouvert à tous ou seulement aux candidats ayant obtenu l'égalité de voix au premier tour?

The **Rapporteur of the Working Group** clarified that the presentation was only to show a proposed structure, and that the text on the procedure was to be distributed shortly during the session. He also mentioned the question of options 1 and 2 which would be considered once the new text has been distributed. He added that all States Parties who will have scores above the threshold on the first round would be eligible to go for the second round.

The Delegation of **Germany** confirmed that the subject of the decision to be taken is the Draft Resolution concerning the tie-break mechanism which would happen *only* after the second round rather than after the first round.

The Delegation of **India** requested the Rapporteur's presentation to be shown again on the screen, and requested the Legal Advisor to clarify if it was legally correct.

The **Legal Advisor** explained that the matter before the General Assembly was not a legal issue but a policy issue. Thus it is for the General Assembly to decide. On Saturday, the General Assembly debated on the possibility to have a tie break after the first round.

The **Chairperson** clarified that it was up to the General Assembly to decide on the most appropriate policy.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that the Rapporteur had not presented the proposal as an option and appreciated that the Chairperson presented it as an option. The option of the Bureau presented by the Rapporteur was if there is a tie break-threshold in the first round, "keep all candidates which remained beyond the elected" for the second round but the other option to which India consented was to "keep a couple of candidates F, G and H", even from the same electoral group for the second round.

The **Chairperson** gave a coffee-break to the session. (10:45-11:00) In the meantime, the proposed Amendments (as of 26 October) to the Draft Resolution 17 GA 3A would be distributed to the General Assembly.

Ambassador Kondo reassured that the submitted proposal of the Bureau and the text met the approval of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Spain** commended that the submitted text was a good compromise of different opinions even if it does not reflect everyone's opinion. The procedure had been worked upon for two years and the tie break issue is a hypothetical case. Despite the fact that nothing is perfect, in order to have a better representation of regional groups, there should be a vote now. The result should be included in the text submitted by the Kondo Working Group.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that currently there were two scenarios. He gave one minute to each State Party wishing to speak further on the procedure.

La Délégation de **l'Egypte**, soulignant que l'Inde a proposé deux options, a suggéré d'afficher les deux options sur l'écran, afin de faciliter le travail sur le texte. Elle a proposé de revenir, après l'adoption du texte, à la discussion à partir du paragraphe 3 par lequel la séance du Samedi 24 octobre s'est terminée.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with the Delegation of Spain that a decision should be taken now and that the General Assembly needed to vote on the two options. It commended the Rapporteur on his presentation which presented a clear outcome of the debate which took place on Saturday. It underlined that it was not threatened by the proposal.

The Delegation of **India** insisted that as a non-Bureau member it had not been informed of this. The matter being a question of procedure it could not support last minute changes. Paragraph 14.9 and options 1 and 2 did not seem to follow the correct legal procedure. The second round of vote should be reserved to those who are in tie break but who have attained the threshold. The General Assembly should not make radical changes at the last minute.

The **Chairperson** recalled that there had been general consensus on this matter on Saturday.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the Delegation of India for having raised concerns. It underlined that Ambassador Kondo and the Working Group had done an excellent work. He stressed that once Article 14.9

was being discussed these two options should be inserted in the draft text. Then the session should discuss the concrete text of the options in order to move ahead with the Draft Resolution.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked the Bureau and Rapporteur for their good work and seconded the Delegation of Kenya to go straight to the adoption of the Draft Resolution including the proposed amendment.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la Délégation de l'Espagne et propose de voter si nécessaire sur les deux options. Cette question constitue un point résiduel et improbable selon elle, car il ne s'est jamais produit. Soulignant que le travail a été déjà validé en mai 2009, elle a proposé d'adopter le texte.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the Delegation of India on the fact that there should be two options clearly shown on the screen, and that there should be transparency to all States Parties concerning the proposals and that things should move on.

The Delegation of **Germany** mentioned that enough discussions had taken place and that if it is necessary to vote this should take place quickly.

The **Chairperson** agreed that the session would move forward on the Draft Resolution and that when it would come to 14.9 a vote would take place.

The Delegation of **India** wishes to bring to the attention of the General Assembly a contradiction that if Article 14.9 is to be decided then Article 14.11 should be deleted.

The **Chairperson** came back to the text of the Draft Resolution and recalled that 17 GA 3A 1 and 2 were already adopted on Saturday. He gave the floor to the Delegation of Afghanistan who had showed concerns on 17 GA 3A 3.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** read the full text of its proposed Amendment to 17 GA 3A 3 for agreement by the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** clarified that he had proposed to the Delegations of Afghanistan and Morocco to agree on their proposed amendment on paragraph 3, and regretted that this had not taken place. He proposed to the Delegation of Afghanistan that its draft Amendment should be given

to the Secretariat in writing to see how this text would fit in within the whole context.

The **Chairperson** went on with paragraph 4 of the Draft Resolution of 17 GA 3A which was adopted.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a suggéré d'ajouter un nouveau paragraphe pour remercier le Groupe de Travail pour le travail accompli.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the proposal and asked for a new paragraph 5 thanking Ambassador Kondo and the Working Group to be inserted.

The Delegation of **India** was not in agreement with the idea of a four-year gap in between two mandates. It wished the original text of the Working Group on Rule 13.2 to be kept, and suggested that the mention "at the earliest" be deleted and the word "only" be kept.

The **Legal Advisor** mentioned that on Saturday the session had shown that the word "only" was considered to be optional and therefore the text improved by "at the earliest" in order to make it more clear. The word "only" means that States Parties could be candidates only after 4 years but no later. This is why he suggested "at the earliest". However, at this stage this text would need to be adopted by consensus.

The Delegation of **India** proposed the wording "at least" instead of "at the earliest". It stressed that it needed to consult its capital authorities and that this issue was never adopted on Saturday. It underlined that it felt that "at the earliest" is problematic and that this rule cannot become compulsory.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Legal Advisor in order to know if "at least" might cause problems.

The **Legal Advisor** understood that the Delegation of India wished to keep the content of the concerned paragraph as voluntary instead of compulsory. Therefore the wording "only" or "at least" would bring a different meaning to "at the earliest". He asked the General Assembly if it agreed with this suggestion.

La Délégation de la **France** a jugé qu'il s'agit d'un faux problème car ceci ne modifie pas la *Convention*. Cette disposition concernant un intervalle

de quatre ans lui paraît déjà tout à fait claire. On ne pourrait être candidat que quatre ans après la fin de son dernier mandat.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the Working Group for its good work. It proposed to keep the amended text of “at the earliest”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** also congratulated the work of the Working Group. It added another suggestion “no sooner than”, following the suggestion made by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported "at the earliest".

The Delegation of **Kenya** wished to maintain the draft amended text. If the content of the paragraph was to be voluntary, there should be no need for “only” nor “at least” or any words.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the Working Group for its work. It supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of India to adopt the wording “at least”.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** questioned which text was the original to be referred upon, the one with the wording “only” or the amended version of this day.

La Délégation de la **République centrafricaine** demande que l'Assemblée générale se décide. Les Etats parties ont bien compris qu'ils ne se présenteront que quatre ans après la fin de leur précédent mandat.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la proposition de la Délégation du Kenya qui lui paraît plus consensuelle et lui convient mieux.

The **Chairperson** recognized that although there were many visions, the General Assembly should conform to the spirit of this paragraph. Thus the proposal is to stick to the original proposal or agree with the Legal Advisor. In any case, the General Assembly had to agree on one of the options. He started by proposing the original Kondo text examined on Saturday 24 October with the wording “only”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the word “only” was already cancelled on Saturday after considering its legal implications, so either the Assembly should opt for “at the earliest” as in the Amended version

or to have the text without any wording of “only” or “at the earliest” in order to make it of a voluntary nature.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stressed that States Parties which were absent on Saturday now object to what was a consensus last Saturday. It emphasized that time should not be wasted and that the mention “at the earliest” was what was agreed on Saturday after a lengthy discussion. Thus it should be adopted.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported the Delegation of The Netherlands that the wording agreed on Saturday should be kept in respect of the Legal Advisor's recommendation. It supports the consensus expressed on Saturday.

The **Chairperson** agreed that on Saturday there was a consensus but no adoption of "at the earliest" or 'only" was made. Therefore it suggested creating another small working group. However following objections from the floor, he asked for guidance from the General Assembly.

The **Legal Advisor** had no legal objections on the word “only” if that was agreed upon, but it was only that the wording might create confusion in the interpretation.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that the words “only” or ‘thereafter” were no legal problems.

La Délégation de la **France** déclare que les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial ne peuvent se présenter *qu'à l'issue d'un délai de quatre ans* après l'expiration de leur mandat.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any objections.

The Delegation of **Kenya** clarified that now the content of the text was mandatory, not voluntary.

The **Chairperson** announced that discussion on Article 13.2, taking the French suggestion “... stand again for election, after a gap of four years after the expiry of their mandate” was closed and suggested to move to Article 14.

The **General Assembly** adopted Articles 14.1 a) b) c) and d) with no objection. Articles 14.2 to 14.7 were not subject to changes for discussion at the General Assembly.

The **General Assembly** adopted Article 14.8.

The **Chairperson** announced that the General Assembly would move on to Article 14.9 for which two options were presented on the screen.

Option 1) as in the Amendment of 26 October.

Option 2) The amendment presented by the Delegation of India

La Délégation de la **Belgique** a souligné qu'en français, le texte indique "ayant obtenu le même nombre de voix". Elle a également soutenu l'Option 1 car elle ouvre davantage de possibilités de participation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** understood that there was no need for the option 2 in order to ensure the representation of under-represented regions which will have been settled after the first round of voting. If however, the representation was not achieved then Option 2 could be needed. He also stressed that only the highest number of votes should be taken into account.

The **Chairperson** clarified that indeed since there would be first the round for countries with no sites, then for countries of under-represented region, representation would be ensured.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported Option 2 as it would eliminate countries with a very low number of votes.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** made a point of order that voting should take place immediately.

The **Chairperson** suggested moving ahead to vote for Article 14.9, Options 1 or 2.

The Delegation of **India** raised a point of order emphasizing the importance of having a discussion before any voting takes place: since Option 2 had never been presented to the General Assembly until now it was on the screen, it wished to have a debate on the Option 2 and listen to what colleagues had to say.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** raised a point of order to support the Delegation of India. It considered that it was not possible to vote for something which has not been discussed before.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Advisor to explain whether the point of order raised by the Delegation of the Netherlands aimed at closing the debate (cf. Article 9.1 of the Rules of Procedure). In this case, the vote should take place immediately. If the General Assembly decides to continue the debate, it will continue to discuss.

The **Legal Advisor** advised that now it had to be clarified whether to close the debate for voting or to continue the debate.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked for the immediate closing of the debate arguing the Option 2 was already discussed on Saturday.

The **Chairperson** asked the floor who was in favour of closing the debate. 84 Delegates voted in favour of closing the debate, 28 voted against and 11 Delegates abstained.

The Delegation of **India** opposed that this voting should take place and asked for a secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Kenya** seconded the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Egypt** seconded the Delegations of Kenya and India to have a secret ballot on Option 2.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested clarification from the Legal Advisor on the procedure whether a secret ballot is possible.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly did not foresee secret ballots.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that States Parties had the right to ask for secret ballots.

The **Legal Advisor** explained that according to the Rules of Procedure (14.1) secret ballots only concern “elections” and that voting now should be undertaken on the two options, starting from option 1 then option 2, by counting the raised hands of States Parties.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the voting by showing of hands. He counted the raised hands for Option 1: 65 States Parties and 62 for Option 2 with 7 Abstentions.

The Delegation of **India** did not agree with the voting which took place through a show of hands and requested a secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** suggested proceeding to a role call vote as he thought the voting was in doubt.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the General Assembly as a whole had to consider the interests of the *Convention* and its respective States Parties. The Delegations of India and the Netherlands had to come to a compromise in order to move forward.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** a introduit un point d'ordre. Elle a demandé un vote sous la forme d'un appel nominal, ce qui requiert le soutien de deux Etats parties.

Les délégations de l'**Algérie**, l'**Argentine**, l'**Afrique du Sud**, le **Koweït**, la **Tunisie**, la **Jordanie** et l'**Ouganda** appuient ce point d'ordre.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to a role-call Delegation by Delegation.

The Chairperson announced the result: 71 had voted for Option 1 and 71 for Option 2 with 8 abstentions.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated that in the future if a State Party asked for a secret ballot there should be a secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** announced that the General Assembly would resume at 3 p.m. in the same Room and adjourned the session at 1.30 pm.

**17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
to the *World Heritage Convention***

Monday, 26 October 2009
15:20-23:30

ITEM 3A

**AMENDMENTS OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
FOLLOWING THE REFLECTION ON THE ELECTIONS OF THE
MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND
DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ENSURING EQUITABLE
REPRESENTATION OF THE DIFFERENT REGIONS AND CULTURES
OF THE WORLD ((*Discussion continued*))**

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/3A
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3A

The Delegation of **India** proposed that voting should start for the elections themselves and that the proposed Article 14.9, which was the subject of continued debates, was no longer necessary after the extensive consultations made during lunch time.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** a appuyé la Délégation de l'Inde et signalé qu'il faudrait procéder aux élections le plus rapidement possible.

The Delegations of **Sweden, Hungary, the Netherlands, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Brazil and Kenya** seconded the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal of the Delegation of India with reservations.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was a consensus to proceed to the vote.

The **Rapporteur of the Working Group** clarified that Article 14.9 was to be deleted as well as the revised Article 14.9 with its two options. Deleting Article 14.9 means for him that there is a slight possibility of a legal void regarding the first round and he wished to obtain the Legal Advisor's conformation on this issue.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that after the consultations during the lunchtime the contested two options do not exist anymore and the General Assembly was to adopt the Draft Resolution without Article 14.9. If necessary, States Parties might come back to this issue in some other occasion.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that there were no legal problems concerning the proposal made by the Delegation of India.

The **Chairperson** noted that Article 14.10 becomes 14.9. The General Assembly adopted it.

The **Chairperson** noted that 14.11 becomes 14.10 and 14.12 becomes 14.11. The General Assembly adopted both articles.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** recalled the initial Ambassador Kondo's proposal consisting in solving a situation if there is a tie break on the 2nd round or the 3rd round by drawing of lots. But what would happen if a tie break happens on the first round? Has a scenario been made in this eventually?

According to the **Legal Advisor**, there is very little chance that the ballots are equal at the first round, and therefore this issue has not been addressed legally.

The **Chairperson** noted the adoption by the General Assembly of the original text of 14.9 (17 GA 3.A 14.9 as of 17 September) and the Amended 14.9 was deleted.

The **Chairperson** moved onto paragraph 3 of DR 17 GA 3A and asked if the text on the screen was acceptable.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** contested that its amendment submitted in writing for paragraph 3 was not at all reflected in the text on the screen. It noted that this amendment consisted in affirming that capacity-building would enhance the expertise of States Parties.

The **Chairperson** read the proposal made by the Delegation of Afghanistan to the General Assembly for ease of reference.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that repeating paragraph 4 would lead to an increase of candidates.

The Delegation **of India** reminded the General Assembly that the Delegations of Morocco and Afghanistan were asked in the morning to come back with a joint paragraph to be adopted. If paragraph 5 was adopted, the full text of the Kondo Working Group would be adopted as well.

The **Chairperson** announced that the General Assembly had adopted 17 GA 3A 3 as amended by the proposal made by the Delegation of Afghanistan.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed to adopt the text on the screen.

The Chairperson declared that *paragraphs 5 and 6 adopted* and therefore the entire *Resolution 17 GA 3A was adopted* by the General Assembly. He then gave the floor to the Delegations of Norway and Brazil for their statements on this adoption.

Resolution 17 GA 3A

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-09/17.GA/3A and WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3A,*
2. *Recalling Resolutions **15 GA 9** and **16 GA 3A**, adopted respectively at its 15th and 16th sessions, requesting to initiate a « process to discuss possible alternatives to the existing system of elections to the World Heritage Committee » and to establish an open-ended Working Group in order to make recommendations on this issue,*
3. *Noting that capacity building would enhance expertise of the States Parties and would encourage the latter to present their candidature to the Committee,*
4. *Recognizing that a greater role for State Party Observers in the work of the Committee would facilitate their potential candidature for a seat in the Committee in the future,*
5. *Thanking H.E. Ambassador Kondo and the open-ended Working Group for the reflection on the procedures of election of World Heritage Committee members for the work accomplished,*

6. Decides to amend its Rules of Procedure as follows (amendments are underlined):

Rule 13 – Procedures for the presentation of candidatures to the World Heritage Committee¹

13.1 – The Secretariat shall ask all States Parties, at least three months prior to the opening of the General Assembly, whether they intend to stand for election to the World Heritage Committee. If so, its candidature should be sent to the Secretariat at least six weeks prior to the opening of the General Assembly.

13.2 Members of the World Heritage Committee may stand again for election after a gap of 4 years after the expiry of their mandate;

Rule 14 - Election of members of the World Heritage Committee

14.1 a) 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.

b) In case one or more electoral group(s), as defined by the UNESCO General Conference at its most recent session², might have no State Party in the composition of the next Committee³, one seat per such electoral group(s) shall be reserved.

c) Notwithstanding, at each election, one seat shall be reserved for States Parties with no property on the World Heritage List.

d) Ballot(s) for reserved seat(s) shall precede the ballot(s) for

¹ Resolution 13 GA 9 (paragraph 6) invites the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, to voluntarily reduce their term of office from six to four years.

² It being understood that "Group V" shall consist of two separate groups for the African and Arab States.

³ "That is to say, that either there is no State Party in the composition of the Committee from a given electoral group at the beginning of the ordinary session of the General Conference, or that the term of office of all States Parties from a given electoral group expires at the end of the ordinary session of the General Conference.

the remaining seats to be filled. Unsuccessful candidates in a ballot for any reserved seat shall be eligible to stand for election in subsequent ballot(s).

The following Rules remain unchanged: 14.2; 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7.

14.8 In all ballots, the candidate(s) obtaining in the first round, an absolute majority (more than half of the valid votes cast by States Parties present and voting) shall be declared elected in the sequential order of the number of votes obtained from the highest to the lowest, up to the number of seat(s) to be filled. If there still remain seat(s) to be filled, there shall be a second round.

14.9 In the second round, the candidate(s) obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seat(s) to be filled, shall be declared elected.

14.10 If in the second round, two or more candidates obtain the same number of votes, and, as a result, the number of these candidates is greater than the remaining number of seats to be filled, there shall be an additional round of voting restricted to those candidates who obtained the same number of votes. If in this additional round of voting, two or more candidates obtain the same number of votes, the Chairperson shall decide by drawing lots among them in order to allocate the remaining seat(s).

14.11 After each round, the Chairperson shall announce the results.

The texts of present rules 14.9, 14.10 and 14.11 are deleted

Résolution 17 GA 3A

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné les documents WHC-09/17.GA/3A et WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3A,*

2. *Rappelant les résolutions 15 GA 9 et 16 GA 3A, adoptées respectivement à ses 15e et 16e sessions, demandant d'initier un « processus de discussions sur de possibles alternatives au système actuel des élections au Comité du patrimoine mondial » et d'établir un groupe de travail ouvert en vue de faire des recommandations à ce sujet,*
3. *Notant que le renforcement des capacités accroîtrait l'expertise des Etats parties et les encouragerait à présenter leur candidature au Comité,*
4. *Reconnaissant qu'un plus grand rôle pour les Etats parties Observateurs aux travaux du Comité faciliterait leur candidature potentielle à l'avenir,*
5. *Remerciant l'Ambassadeur Kondo et le Groupe de travail ouvert de réflexion sur les procédures d'élection des membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, pour le travail accompli,*
6. *Décide d'amender son Règlement intérieur comme suit (les amendements sont soulignés):*

Article 13 – Procédures pour la présentation des candidatures au Comité du patrimoine mondial⁴

13.1 – Le Secrétariat demande aux États parties, au moins trois mois avant l'ouverture de l'Assemblée générale, s'ils ont l'intention de se présenter à l'élection du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Dans l'affirmative, la candidature doit être envoyée au Secrétariat au plus tard six semaines avant l'ouverture de l'Assemblée générale.

13.2 - Les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial ne peuvent se représenter à l'élection qu'à l'issue d'un délai de 4 ans après l'expiration de leur mandat.

Article 14 - Élection des membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial

14.1 -a) L'élection des membres du Comité du patrimoine

⁴ La résolution 13 GA 9 (paragraphe 6) invite les États parties à la Convention du patrimoine mondial à réduire volontairement la durée de leur mandat de six à quatre ans.

mondial se fait au scrutin secret lorsque cinq délégations au moins ayant le droit de vote le demandent ou si le/la Président(e) le décide.

b) Au cas où un ou plusieurs groupes électoraux, tel(s) que défini(s) par la Conférence générale de l'UNESCO à sa plus récente session⁵, est/sont susceptible(s) de n'avoir aucun État partie dans la composition du Comité suivant⁶, un siège sera réservé par groupe(s) électoral(aux) concerné(s).

c) Néanmoins, à chaque élection, un siège doit être réservé aux États parties n'ayant aucun bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

d) Le(s) scrutin(s) pour le(s) siège(s) réservé(s) doit/doivent précéder le(s) scrutin(s) pour les autres sièges à pourvoir. Les candidats n'ayant pas été élus au scrutin des sièges réservés pourront se représenter au(x) scrutin(s) suivant(s).

Demeurent inchangés : 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7.

14.8 À tous les scrutins, le(s) candidat(s) obtenant au premier tour la majorité absolue (plus de la moitié des votes valides des États parties présents et votants) sera/seront déclarés élu(s), après une allocation séquentielle du nombre de voix reçues, du plus grand au plus petit, dans la limite du nombre de sièges à pourvoir. S'il reste encore un/des siège(s) à pourvoir, il y aura un second tour.

14.9 Au deuxième tour, le(s) candidat(s) obtenant le plus grand nombre de voix, à concurrence du nombre de sièges à pourvoir, sera/sont déclaré(s) élu(s).

14.10 Si lors du deuxième tour de scrutin, deux ou plusieurs candidats obtiennent le même nombre de voix et que, de ce fait, le nombre des candidats est supérieur au nombre de

⁵ Étant entendu que le « Groupe V » est constitué de deux groupes distincts représentant l'Afrique et les États arabes.

⁶ « En d'autres termes, soit il n'y a aucun État partie appartenant à un groupe électoral donné dans la composition du Comité au début de la session ordinaire de la Conférence générale, soit le mandat de tous les États parties appartenant à un groupe électoral donné expire à la fin de la session ordinaire de la Conférence générale. »

sièges restant à pourvoir, il sera procédé à un tour additionnel limité aux candidats ayant obtenu le même nombre de voix. Si lors de ce tour additionnel, deux ou plusieurs candidats obtiennent le même nombre de voix, le/la Président(e) procédera à un tirage au sort entre eux afin d'attribuer le(s) siège(s) restant(s).

14.11 A l'issue de chaque tour de scrutin, le/la Président(e) proclame les résultats.

Les textes de 14.9, 14.10 et 14.11 sont supprimés.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its concern and made the following statement: *“Although the adopted election mechanism for the World Heritage Convention is a step in the right direction, it will not properly ensure, in a sustainable way, an equitable representation of the various regions and cultures of the world. In addition, the adopted model is still unnecessarily complicated, unpredictable and time-consuming.*

An alternative model is to distribute the number of seats, on a permanent basis, to the 6 regional groups in an equitable manner. This is the system accepted and used in more or less all other subsidiary bodies of UNESCO. Such a system will safeguard the required representativeness. Besides, the voting procedures will be more simplified, less time-consuming and more predictable.

Provision of a seat to a country without a site on the World Heritage List can easily be accommodated in such a model. The same will apply to the voluntary reduction of terms, the gap between mandates and the Convention's requirement as to the necessary expertise in the Committee”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** fully supported the statement made by the Delegation of Norway.

The Delegation of **Venezuela** seconded the Delegation of Norway, mentioning in particular that the current voting mechanism does not guaranty fair representation and that drawing lots after the first round was problematic as it does not guaranty an equitable representation.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** seconded the Delegation of Norway and wished that a more democratic and equitable way of voting should be re-

discussed in the future. Providing the same chance to all States Parties is considered very important for the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **India** paid tribute to Ambassador Kondo and thanked the Working Group for its hard work. It fully supported suggestions made by the Delegation of Norway and reminded that according to the Legal Advisor, it was not possible to amend the procedures of election without amending the *Convention*. This would mean that every State Party should have to endorse or ratify the new Convention.

The Delegation of **Iceland** supported the Delegation of Norway, and hoped that one day the debates would get one step further.

La Délégation du **Mali** s'est félicitée du processus engagé, même si l'objectif visé n'a pas été atteint, car le mécanisme actuel n'assure pas une représentation équitable des cultures et des régions. Cependant, elle a espéré qu'il serait un jour possible de réformer ce système d'élections pour une participation plus efficace de tous les membres de la *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) wished that a more equitable way of election be studied in the future. It felt that the most democratic idea would be the idea promoted by the Delegation of Norway. However this idea if adopted should be implemented on an experimental basis.

The Delegation of the **Solomon Islands** agreed with the Delegations of Norway as well as itself being a Small Island Developing State (SIDS), it favored also the concerns raised by Afghanistan.

The Delegation of **Syria** seconded the Delegation of Norway and requested that its statement be put on official record.

The Delegation of **China** found that a lot of discussions could have been avoided. It thanked Ambassador Kondo, supported the Delegations of Norway, Afghanistan and the Solomon Islands and asked for reform of the *Convention* which should adapt to a constantly changing world. Furthermore, it suggested that the number of Committee members so to ensure fairer representation should be increased from 21 to more, no matter how long the discussion might take in future years.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** seconded the Delegation of Norway and the previous statements.

The Delegation of **Argentina** acknowledged the Kondo Working Group, and called for the implementation of a more effective *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** appreciated the written suggestion made by the Delegation of Norway, and gave the floor to Ambassador Kondo, Chair of the Working Group.

Ambassador Kondo felt very pleased that the General Assembly had achieved such a great progress on a long-standing issue, aiming at reflecting the spirit of the *Convention*. He was honored to have been Chair of this Working Group and acknowledged his wonderful team. He also commended the courage of delegates for the sake of consensus. He felt fortunate to be surrounded by many supportive delegates and enjoyed working with them over the last two years. He concluded by saying that he was now looking forward to the Copenhagen meeting.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 3A and proceeded to Item 3B.

ITEM 3B

ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: *WHC-09/17.GA/3B*
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.1
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.2

The **Chairperson** announced that the first seat to be elected should be for a State Party with no property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested to elect the United Arab Emirates by acclamation as it was the only candidate with no World Heritage site on the World Heritage List.

The **General Assembly** elected the United Arab Emirates by acclamation.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the United Arab Emirates for its election.

The Delegation of the **Libyan Arab Jamahiriya** congratulated the United Arab Emirates for its election, and requested to have a complete list of candidates and respective mandates before proceeding with the voting.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the list of candidates would be distributed by the Secretariat before the election. The second round was to elect a State Party from a regional group which was not represented in the World Heritage Committee, i.e. in this case Group II.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the names of the six candidate States Parties from Group II: Bosnia-and-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary and the Russian Federation.

The **Chairperson** gave instructions to proceed to the elections and initiated the distribution of ballot papers. With reference to the question raised by the Delegation of Norway on this issue, he confirmed that at this stage only one State Party was to be elected.

The Delegation of **Syria** asked if the un-elected five States Parties could run again for election during this General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** referred to the rules of procedures and confirmed that they could.

The Delegation of **China** asked if while collecting the ballot papers the General Assembly would continue with other items.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that Items 4 to 8 of the Agenda were still to be discussed. He added that all delegates should be back in Room II by 17:45 for the announcement of the results of the second round.

ITEM 4

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

Document: WHC-09/17.GA/4 (35C/REP/13)

The Delegation of **Norway** complemented the quality of the report and that it included a lot of useful information. It commended the World Heritage Committee to have taken the decision to delete a property from the World Heritage List. It considered this decision as necessary for the credibility of the World Heritage List. If a site on the World Heritage List does not have the OUV any more, it does not belong to the List and therefore has to be deleted. Besides, it pointed out that the number of

African properties inscribed on the World Heritage List during the last biennium was still very little in comparison with that of Europe. In comparison only 4 new sites from Africa were inscribed on the World Heritage List during the 2008 – 2009 biennium while Europe succeeded 18 new inscriptions. Furthermore it noted that Africa had received only 20% of the approved International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund during the 2008 – 2009 biennium and that efforts have to be increased to assist Africa in the next biennium. For planning this it suggested that an analysis might be carried out about the priorities in the next biennium so that they can be discussed during the next General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Kenya** called upon the General Assembly to support Africa to be able to meet the challenges to implement the *Convention*. It recognized the increased attention given to Africa in this report yet more needs to be done. Responding to the Delegation of Norway, it considered that the African World Heritage Fund is operational and should address this anomaly. Despite the fact that it is not satisfied yet with the achievements and that Africa should be the top priority, the Delegation of **Kenya** concluded by saying that the work accomplished is commendable and should be continued in an inclusive manner to make the *Global Strategy* work.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Delegations of Norway and Kenya as well as complimented the work done by the African World Heritage Fund. It stated that the state of conservation issue was important to be highlighted in order to implement the *Global Strategy* this included also the development of more media activities. General Assemblies should include more information on activities on their agenda in order to bring forward ideas and policies to the World Heritage Committee. Lastly, the Delegation of **Israel** deplored the fact that the World Heritage Committee Report to the General Assembly is lacking evaluation and analysis regarding the state of conservation which would constitute important indicators for the discussion on the *Global Strategy* and allow Member States to better understand main challenges and opportunities.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** met l'accent sur l'importance de soutenir le Fonds africain du patrimoine mondial et les efforts de renforcement des capacités en Afrique. De surcroît, lorsque cela est possible, il conviendrait d'éviter de faire appel à des consultants d'autres régions. Un corpus d'experts devrait être établi pour traiter des activités concernant les propositions d'inscription et le retrait de la Liste du

patrimoine mondial. La Délégation du **Sénégal** conclut en disant que le pourcentage de biens africains sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial est de plus en plus petit en raison de l'absence de ressources.

The **Chairperson** added that the African World Heritage Fund received the status of a Category 2 Centre during the 35th session of the General Conference.

The Delegation of **Barbados** seconding the Delegation of Israel supported the importance of the issue of the state of conservation. It expressed critique that during the last two Committee sessions too little time was spent on State of Conservation reports. This indicates a need to make some special actions to bring these issues in attention to the Committee. In this sense the World Heritage Committee Report to the General Assembly should be more critical. It hoped that in the future this issue will be addressed also by the General Assembly in order to draw more attention to it. It wishes main challenges in implementing Decisions by the Committee to be discussed more in-depth.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) agreed with the Delegations of Norway, Kenya, Israel and others about the poor representation of African sites on the World Heritage List. Also it emphasized that next to this Africa also has the highest number of World Heritage sites in danger. It hoped that the African World Heritage Fund now as a UNESCO Category 2 Centre will enhance the strengthening of the capacity of African experts.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** acknowledged the Delegation of Norway for its comments concerning Africa and recalled that equal attention should also be given to post-conflict countries for what concerns capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Thailand** agreed with the Delegation of Norway about Africa. It suggested that there should be more private funding for the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) and informed that a private Thai company had donated some funds for the AWHF.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that a pre-condition for nominating a property was to develop a management plan. However many developing countries lack expertise to draft the requested site management plans. Thus capacity-building is a key issue for countries to nominate future properties.

The Delegation of **Brazil** explained that the category 2 Institute being established in Brazil was not only for Latin American and the Caribbean countries but also for all States Parties including African countries.

The **Chairperson** announced the adoption of Item 4.

Resolution 17 GA 4

The General Assembly,

3. *Having examined Document WHC-09/17.GA/4,*
4. *Takes note of the report of the Intergovernmental Committee for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on its activities (2008-2009).*

Résolution 17 GA 4

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-09/17.GA/4,*
2. *Prend note du rapport du Comité intergouvernemental de la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel sur ses activités (2008-2009).*

The Delegation of **Spain** mentioned that comments could be added online to the Report through the website and acknowledged the World Heritage Centre for its work.

The **Chairperson** informed that Spain has committed itself to contribute up to 1.5 million dollars to the African World Heritage Fund, in particular in the domain of capacity-building.

ITEM 5

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

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/5
WHC-09/17.GA/5INF

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and to the Comptroller.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** excused a typo mistake in the Draft Resolution – instead of “2007” it was “2009”.

The **Comptroller** reported on the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund in 2006 – 2007, on compulsory and voluntary contributions as well as on the updated financial situation of the World Heritage Centre.

Item 5 was adopted without discussion.

Resolution 17 GA 5

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period ending 31 December 2007 approved by the Comptroller (Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Sections I and II) 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 2007 (Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Sections I and II);*
3. *Takes note of the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2009, established by the Comptroller (Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Section III).*

Résolution 17 GA 5

L'Assemblée générale,

- 1. Ayant examiné les comptes du Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'exercice financier prenant fin au 31 décembre 2007 approuvé par le Contrôleur financier (voir document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Sections I et II) conformément au Règlement financier du Fonds du patrimoine mondial qui stipule que les comptes du Fonds doivent être soumis à l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la Convention (article 6, paragraphe 6.4),*
- 2. Approuve les comptes du Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour l'exercice financier prenant fin au 31 décembre 2007 (voir document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Sections I et II) ;*
- 3. Prend note des comptes du Fonds du patrimoine mondial pour 2009, établis par le Contrôleur financier (voir document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.5, Section III).*

ITEM 3B

ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: *WHC-09/17.GA/3B*
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.1
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.2

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the first ballot to elect a State Party from a regional group which was not represented in the World Heritage Committee, i.e. in this case Group II.

In total 160 ballots were casted out of which 3 were invalid and 157 were valid. The majority required was 79.

Results of the first ballot were:

Bosnia and Herzegovina	26
Bulgaria	27
Croatia	19

Estonia	29
Hungary	34
Russian Federation	22

None of the candidates had reached the threshold of 79.

The **Chairperson** announced the second election round to elect a State Party from a regional group which was not represented in the World Heritage Committee, i.e. in this case Group II. In this round there would be no threshold. At this point no State Party had withdrawn from the election.

ITEM 6

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-09/17.GA/6
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.6

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the item by emphasising the risks of the exchange rate fluctuations as well as arguing for the necessity to carry out a feasibility study to increase the World Heritage Fund as the number of World Heritage sites continues to increase.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested the elaboration of the subject brought up by Israel before, which referred to the identification of additional funding possibilities for the implementation of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that the English translation of paragraph 3 differed from the French text and requested it to be edited.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** revised the text.

The **Chairperson** declared paragraph 2 adopted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to further improve the text for clarification reasons.

The Delegation of **Israel** acknowledged the importance of discussing the issue on currency fluctuations and asked whether that would be possible to report back and come up with recommendations during the next General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** followed up what was said by the Delegation of Israel and inquired what action the World Heritage Centre had taken to protect the World Heritage Fund and regular budget from losses through currency fluctuations.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded that the contributions are being paid in both Euros and Dollars thus creating less impact through currency fluctuations. However this doesn't apply to the World Heritage Fund; instead a budget line of 10% is drawn up to protect the contracts with the Advisory Bodies from currency fluctuations.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commented on paragraph 3 in connection with the expectation towards the World Heritage Committee. It highlighted that double assessment in dollar and euro is too costly and asked the Secretariat to report how exactly the fluctuations affected the account.

The Delegation of **Spain** recalled that possible solutions and alternatives had been already discussed during the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009).

The Delegation of **United States of America** emphasised that also voluntary contributions need to be studied and results of such a study reported back to the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Mexico** underlined the need to make a reference to Decision 33 COM 16B in paragraph 3.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** a remarqué qu'au paragraphe 3, il est demandé au Comité du patrimoine mondial de présenter « une analyse de toutes les options ». Elle a fait valoir que ces analyses ont déjà été effectuées, aussi ajouter cette mention lui paraît superflue. Il conviendrait donc de parler d'options et non d'analyses.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that “all” can be removed.

The Delegation of **Mexico** summarized the ongoing discussion that the World Heritage Centre needs to study this and report to the World Heritage Committee offering as many options to solve this issue as there will be.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** a réitéré sa demande de biffer le mot "analyses" car elles ont déjà été effectuées et ce mot n'a donc pas sa place ici. Le paragraphe devrait se lire « présente des options possibles » au lieu de « une analyse des options possibles ».

The Delegation of **India** expressed its reservations on using "analysis" in paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Israel** – suggested deleting "deal" in paragraph 4 and replacing it with "manage".

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the text has a logical sequence.

The Delegation of **Israel** made a remark about the length of the text and suggested not to repeat information already provided in paragraph 1 also in paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** interlinked paragraph 1 and 3.

The Delegation of **India** deemed the wording appropriate. However it wished the connection between paragraphs 1 and 3 to be made visible. It expressed the term "options" to be further specified.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed not to enter into the World Bank area of action, but continue to deal with the management of World Heritage.

The Delegations of **Saint Lucia** and **India** agreed with the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Kenya** questioned whether currency fluctuations are per se negative and suggested introducing the term "possible remedial measures" instead of "mechanisms".

The **Chairperson** concurred that currency fluctuations can have both positive as well as negative impacts.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a été d'avis que l'esprit [de la *Convention*] est déjà là et que le Centre du patrimoine mondial ne peut pas suivre les fluctuations monétaires ou y faire face puisqu'il n'en est pas responsable.

The **Chairperson** considered the comment made by the Delegation of **Senegal**.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its satisfaction about the revised version of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared the adoption of the decision.

Resolution: 17 GA 6.1

The General Assembly,

1. *Decides to set at 1% the percentage for the calculation of the amount of the contributions to be paid to the World Heritage Fund by States Parties for the financial period 2010-2011.*

Resolution: 17 GA 6.2

The General Assembly,

1. *Takes note of the decisions of the Committee concerning the contributions of States Parties and of their status of implementation;*
2. *Also takes note of Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.6 on the status of compulsory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund;*
3. *Requests the World Heritage Committee to submit all possible options for equitable additional voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund to the General Assembly at its 18th session, as requested in Decision **33 COM 16B**;*
4. *Further requests the World Heritage Centre to report to the 18th session of the General Assembly about the impact of currency fluctuation on the World Heritage Fund and further report on possible remedial measures to cope with this issue.*

Résolution 17 GA 6.1

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Décide de fixer à 1 % le pourcentage relatif au calcul du montant des contributions à verser au Fonds du patrimoine mondial par les Etats parties pour l'exercice financier 2010-2011.*

Résolution 17 GA 6.2

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Prend note des décisions du Comité concernant les contributions des Etats parties et de leur état de mise en œuvre ;*
2. *Prend également note du document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.6 sur l'état des contributions obligatoires et volontaires au Fonds du patrimoine mondial ;*
3. *Demande au Comité du patrimoine mondial de présenter toutes les options possibles pour des contributions volontaires équitables additionnelles au Fonds du patrimoine mondial à l'Assemblée générale lors de sa 18e session en 2011, conformément à la Décision **33 COM 16B** ;*
4. *Demande en outre au Centre du patrimoine mondial de faire rapport à l'Assemblée générale lors de sa 18e session en 2011 de l'impact des fluctuations de devises sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial et de faire rapport sur les mesures possibles pour gérer cette question.*

ITEM 7

FOLLOW UP IN THE IMPLEMENTATIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

Document: WHC-09/17.GA/7

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the *Progress Report on the implementation of the Recommendations of the Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre* for a better understanding where reforms and improvements can be applied. He pointed out that most of the audit recommendations are ongoing and implemented.

The Delegation of **Norway** appreciated the efforts of the World Heritage Centre in the implementation of the recommendations. Yet it commented that the working procedure between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies laid out in the report still needs to be better worked out, especially regarding contracting procedures as referred to in the recommendation 2e. Finally, it commended the good division of tasks and highlighted the importance of cooperation.

The Delegation of **Canada** questioned the human resources of the World Heritage Centre and whether it was at all possible to undertake all the mentioned actions. It referred to the recommendation 3b and commented that still no conclusion could be drawn from the study on the adequacy of the World Heritage Centre human resources or their effectiveness as this was not a real recommendation, but rather an analysis. It stressed the issue of job security in this context and asked to be informed about the guidelines ruling the missions at UNESCO.

The Delegation of **India** took note with satisfaction that according to the Progress Report many projects had been achieved so far. It called upon the World Heritage Centre to continue implementing the recommendations made and report to the next General Assembly accordingly. In conclusion, it criticized the lack of geographical balance among the staff of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** extended its praise to the World Heritage Centre and agreed to the concerns expressed by Canada with regard to job security. It questioned what the ALD contracts were and furthermore also requested to receive a copy of the procedures manual when it will come out in 2010.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed to the remarks made by the Delegation of **India** and supported the introduction of a “Partnership Agreement” in 2010.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the recommendation 3b is planned to be followed up by discussing an action plan. Explaining the mission guidelines he clarified that they are based upon recommendations made by the Director-General of UNESCO and sent out in an internal note. He promised to put the mission guidelines on Intranet for broader access. Furthermore he explained that the ALD (Agreements of Limited Duration) contracts were contracts for up to 4 years which had the same level of job security as regular contracts. He pointed out the limited capacities to succeed in reaching geographical balance within short time.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested replacing temporary / supernumerary contracts (currently 57% of the professional staff at the World Heritage Centre) by ALD (Agreements of Limited Duration) contracts to grant at least some degree of job security. However, it understood that the large number of temporary arrangements reflects the dynamism of the Organization.

The Delegation of **India** regretted that the geographical balance amongst the staff is left to the discretion of the Director-General. It underlined the significance of cultural diversity for UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** appreciated the excellent implementation of the recommendations. It strongly supported the establishment of a Steering Committee as recommended in 2d in order to address climate change issues in cooperation between the Science and Culture Sectors. Additionally it questioned whether it would have been possible to improve links with the Education Sector regarding heritage education issues.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** emphasized that not all the given recommendations have been firmly implemented yet, especially the ones regulating the relationship with Advisory Bodies. It recalled that initially it was expected to discuss the roles and responsibilities between the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies already during this session.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that staff security is paramount in order to foster staff performance and asked for this point to be added to the proposal made by the Delegation of India regarding the geographical balance.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** s'est jointe aux autres Etats Parties en remerciant le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour les progrès réalisés. Elle a également exprimé son souci à propos des ressources humaines (point 3c) et demandé plus de transparence sur la prolongation des contrats, ainsi que sur les critères sur lesquels les contrats sont proposés (cf. point 5a) « ... Etats membres »). Elle a suggéré de présenter des solutions visant à mieux gérer les ressources humaines pour la mise en oeuvre des programmes et exprimé son accord avec les amendements proposés par la Délégation de l'Inde.

The Delegation of **Israel** reminded of the financial implications of improved staff security.

The Delegation of **Spain** joined the congratulation. Yet it expressed its concern about the high percentage of temporary contracts and therefore large number of temporary staff leaving the Organization and the expertise then being lost in that context. As an achievement it mentioned that following up the recommendation 3a some permanent positions had been filled.

La Délégation de **France** a dit reconnaître le travail considérable de l'audit auquel cette Assemblée générale a accordé beaucoup d'attention il y a deux ans. Elle a considéré ces recommandations comme un instrument de référence et aussi comme une feuille de route pour améliorer le fonctionnement du Centre du patrimoine mondial. D'autre part, elle a été d'avis qu'il est prématuré d'extraire des conclusions parce que le processus est encore en cours. Elle conclut en exprimant son accord avec le nouveau paragraphe 3.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** s'est dit d'accord avec la Délégation de la France. Il s'agit d'un processus évolutif et non pas d'une démarche conclue.

Pour répondre à la suggestion de la Délégation du Vietnam, il a manifesté son accord pour la constitution d'un comité de pilotage qui inclurait notamment l'éducation. Il a expliqué que le Centre du patrimoine mondial met déjà en oeuvre un programme d'éducation conjointement avec le secteur de l'éducation. Il s'est dit d'accord pour constituer ce comité et définir son fonctionnement avec la nouvelle Directrice générale.

D'autre part, en ce qui concerne les missions, il a expliqué qu'il a préparé une note interne qui peut être passée au Comité du patrimoine mondial une prochaine fois, ainsi qu'affichée sur le site Internet. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial pourrait alors proposer des orientations s'il le souhaite. Des règles précises existent, elles sont reflétées dans cette note. Il est vrai que le Comité n'a pas été consulté mais il a proposé de le faire la prochaine fois si les Etats parties le souhaitent.

Sur le point 4 (relations entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives), il a noté que des échanges fréquents de documents régulent les relations entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives. Des réunions de coordination sont organisées trois fois par an et les consultations informelles sont fréquentes. Un débat sur les relations entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives est prévu lors de la 34e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Brasilia en 2010.

Pour ce qui a trait aux demandes de transparence, le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** s'est dit d'accord pour faire parvenir aux Etats parties des documents sur le fonctionnement du Centre du patrimoine mondial, même s'ils peuvent être parfois un peu arides. A l'avenir, des éléments pourraient aussi être ajoutés qui permettraient d'avoir une vision stratégique pour tout ce qui concerne l'administration et la gestion du Centre du patrimoine mondial.

En conclusion, le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** s'est dit d'accord avec la Délégation de la France sur le fait qu'il s'agit d'un processus continu. Il a déclaré que la fenêtre était ouverte à tous ceux qui voudraient savoir comment est organisé et géré le travail complexe demandé par le Comité.

The Delegation of **India** while acknowledging the good staff of the World Heritage Centre once again emphasized the importance of geographical balance and the need to reach out for different regions of the world.

ITEM 3B

ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/3B
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.1
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.2

The **Chairperson** read the results of the second round of elections to elect a State Party from a regional group which was not represented in the World Heritage Committee, i.e. in this case Group II. In total 158 ballots were casted out of which 4 were invalid and 154 were valid. There was no threshold.

The results of the second round were:

Bosnia and Herzegovina	20
Bulgaria	23
Croatia	9
Estonia	35
Hungary	13
Russian Federation	54

The **Chairperson** declared the Russian Federation elected and pointed out that the five other States Parties could still be elected in the general round. The candidates of the general round were announced. There were no withdrawals from Group II.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** a annoncé les candidats au Comité du patrimoine mondial par ordre alphabétique en français: Afghanistan, Afrique du sud, Arabie saoudite, Bolivie, Bosnie-Herzégovine, Bulgarie, Cambodge, Colombie, Croatie, Estonie, Ethiopie, France, Hongrie, Indonésie, Iran (République Islamique d'), Irak, Irlande, Mali, Mexique, République démocratique du Congo, République-Unie de Tanzanie, Sénégal, Soudan, Suisse, Thaïlande, Togo et Yémen.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that Malawi was not considered.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that Malawi had withdrawn and informed about the possible delay of the session due to fact that there would be no translation after 9p.m. In this connection he asked the Legal Advisor whether the voting needed to be continuous or not.

The **Legal Advisor** informed that there was no rule on whether the voting needs to be continuous or not. He confirmed that it is up to the General Assembly to decide whether the vote should continue or not.

The **Chairperson** asked the General Assembly to decide whether to continue or to stop.

The Delegation of **India** was of the opinion that no interpretation was needed to announce the results of the vote and argued for continuing the session without translation. It saw some danger in suspending this event and coming back tomorrow. In the sake of democracy and transparency it requested to continue at all stake.

The Delegation of **Afghanistan** supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of India to continue with the elections today.

The Delegation of **Germany** argued for continuing the session.

The Delegations of **Yemen, Jordan** and **Palau** supported the proposal by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Brazil** strongly supported the continuation of the elections.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested some clarification about the proposal made by the Delegation of India and suggested suspending the vote as many Delegations had already left the Room.

The **Chairperson** asked the General Assembly whether there were any States Parties opposed to the continuation of the elections.

La Délégation du **Cap Vert** s'est dite en faveur de la proposition de la Délégation de l'Inde. Elle a expliqué qu'il était préférable de continuer les élections aujourd'hui car certaines délégations partiront dès le lendemain.

The Delegation of **India** asked the Delegation of Kenya to understand. It argued strongly for continuing the session bearing in mind the early departure of numerous delegates and asked for support from the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Kenya** did not want to accept the reasons provided by the Delegation of India. However it agreed to do what would serve the purpose best.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the Delegation of India to continue voting once the elections have started. However it was of the opinion that it would be better to continue on the next day.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** s'est dite en faveur de la suggestion proposée par la Délégation de l'Inde. Elle a expliqué que le processus étant amorcé, il ne devrait pas être arrêté. Elle a accepté de travailler sans interprètes s'il le fallait.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** summarized the different options. He provided the following timetable: If the General Assembly starts voting again now, 45 minutes should be sufficient for the vote. Then another 30 minutes would be needed for counting the results. This would lead the General Assembly to listen to the scores by 8.45 p.m.

If there would be a 2nd round it would mean another hour and therefore the last results would be by 10 p.m. or perhaps later.

If the General Assembly would decide to postpone until tomorrow, it would start voting at 10 a.m. and the end of the elections would be planned for 1 p.m.

The **Chairperson** declared that the General Assembly decided by consensus to continue the session and the elections according to the proposal made by the Delegation of India.

ITEM 7

FOLLOW UP IN THE IMPLEMENTATIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

Document: WHC-09/17.GA/7

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked for the concordance to be made between the English and the French versions of the Resolution.

The Delegation of the **Solomon Islands** recalled that the staffing issues in the World Heritage Centre had been discussed already beforehand over and over again not bringing precise enough response to this. It

suggested that personnel requirements needed to be developed for the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Kenya** returned to the point of job security.

The Delegation of the **Solomon Islands** argued that human resources and personal requirements are the same yet the personnel requirements need further improvements.

The Delegations of **Morocco** and **France** expressed the need for better wording in French version.

The **Chairperson** declared that Item 7 was adopted.

Resolution: 17 GA 7

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/17.GA/7,*
2. *Takes note with satisfaction of the progress achieved so far in implementing the main recommendations of the management audit of the World Heritage Centre;*
3. *Calls upon the World Heritage Centre to continue to implement the recommendations of the management audit;*
4. *While noting the positive efforts made in addressing the recommendations of the audit, calls upon the World Heritage Centre to continue to address the issues for further improvements in personnel requirements, taking into account geographical representation, and report back to the General Assembly at its 18th session.*

Résolution 17 GA 7

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-09/17.GA/7,*
2. *Prend note avec satisfaction des progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des principales recommandations de l'audit*

de gestion du Centre du patrimoine mondial ;

3. *Demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de poursuivre la mise en œuvre des recommandations de l'audit de gestion ;*
4. *Tout en notant les efforts pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations de l'audit, demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de poursuivre l'amélioration de la réponse à apporter aux besoins en matière de personnel en prenant en compte la représentativité géographique et de faire rapport à l'Assemblée générale lors de sa 18e session en 2011.*

ITEM 8

PROGRESS ON THE SERIES OF WORLD HERITAGE RESOURCE MANUALS

Document: WHC-09/17.GA/8

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to move on to discuss Item 8.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the *Progress on the Series of World Heritage Resource Manuals*.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** referred to ICOMOS Manual which was circulated at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee and asked for an update on the consultations.

Le représentant de l'**ICOMOS** est d'avis qu'il faudrait vérifier le calendrier mais qu'il lui semble que les consultations sont terminées. Si un Etat partie s'intéresse à ce processus, l'ICOMOS se dit heureux de recueillir son avis, mais il convient de respecter les délais imposés.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated the usefulness of ICOMOS Manual and recommended its wide dissemination.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** a été d'avis que ces manuels sont d'extrême importance car ils contiennent des informations très utiles ainsi que des analyses plus complexes. En particulier, elle a considéré qu'il serait

intéressant de mener des études sur le tourisme dans deux directions : premièrement à propos de l'impact sur les industries locales et sur les sites du patrimoine mondial. Deuxièmement, il serait aussi important d'avoir un manuel de bonnes pratiques en matière de tourisme.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out some inconsistencies between the English original and the French translation in the Resolution.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** lit le paragraphe 4 en français et considère qu'il s'agit d'une bonne traduction.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed the need to further address this question more strategically as it is a very important analysis of publications.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the activity itself is approved by the World Heritage Committee where also all the debate should take place, the current report is intended more as an information.

The **Chairperson** declared the decision adopted.

Resolution 17 GA 8

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/17.GA/8,*
2. *Takes note of the information provided in the above-mentioned document;*
3. *Welcomes the preparation and dissemination of the publications planned within the Series of World Heritage Resource Manual;*
4. *Encourages States Parties to contribute extra-budgetary funding to support the publication of titles within the Series.*

Résolution 17 GA 8

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Ayant examiné le document WHC-09/17.GA/8,*

2. Prend note des informations communiquées dans ce document ;
3. Se félicite de l'élaboration et de la diffusion des publications prévues dans le cadre de la série de Manuels de référence sur le patrimoine mondial ;
4. Encourage les États parties à verser des contributions extrabudgétaires, afin d'aider à la publication des titres de cette série.

I

TEM 3B

ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/3B
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.1
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.3B.2

The **Chairperson** read the results of the first ballot of the general election. In total 141 ballots were casted out of which 1 was invalid and 140 were valid. The majority required was 71.

The results of the first ballot of the general election were:

Afghanistan	48
South Africa	78
Saudi Arabia	49
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	43
Bosnia and Herzegovina	32
Bulgaria	40
Cambodia	83
Colombia	50
Croatia	59
Estonia	66
Ethiopia	56
France	78
Hungary	40
Indonesia	54
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	52
Iraq	57
Ireland	59

Mali	47
Mexico	65
Democratic Republic of the Congo	16
Tanzania (United Republic of)	38
Senegal	40
Sudan	28
Switzerland	104
Thailand	82
Togo	21
Yemen	20

With more than 71 votes each the **Chairperson** declared South Africa, Cambodia, France, Switzerland and Thailand as elected. A second round without any threshold was announced for the remaining 5 seats.

The States Parties were granted 20 minutes for consultations.

The **Chairperson** announced that Sudan, Yemen and the Democratic Republic of Congo had withdrawn. He named the remaining candidates: Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Estonia, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Mali, Mexico, Tanzania (United Republic of), Senegal and Togo.

The **Chairperson** read the results of the second ballot of the general election. In total 144 ballots were casted out of which none was invalid and 144 were valid. There was no threshold.

The results of the second ballot of the general election were:

Afghanistan	22
Saudi Arabia	27
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	28
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12
Bulgaria	18
Colombia	37
Croatia	14
Estonia	55
Ethiopia	69
Hungary	21
Indonesia	36
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	44
Iraq	52

Ireland	38
Mali	46
Mexico	56
Tanzania (United Republic of)	23
Senegal	32
Yemen	8

The **Chairperson** declared Estonia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mali and Mexico as elected and congratulated all newly elected members of the World Heritage Committee. He thanked the Secretariat, the designated tellers, the interpreters as well as all further supporting staff and adjourned the meeting.

Resolution 17 GA 3B

The General Assembly,

1. *Elects the **United Arab Emirates** (State Party with no property on the World Heritage List) as a member of the World Heritage Committee;*
2. *Elects the **Russian Federation** (Electoral Group which might have no State Party in the composition of the next Committee) as a member of the World Heritage Committee;*
3. *Elects the following eleven States Parties as members of the World Heritage Committee: **Cambodia, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Iraq, Mali, Mexico, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland and Thailand.***

Résolution 17 GA 3B

L'Assemblée générale,

1. *Élit les **Émirats arabes unis** (Etat partie sans bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial) comme membre du Comité du patrimoine mondial ;*
2. *Élit la **Fédération de Russie** (Etat partie appartenant à un groupe électoral susceptible de n'avoir aucun État partie dans la composition du Comité suivant) comme membre du*

Comité du patrimoine mondial ;

3. Elit les dix Etats parties suivants comme membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial : **Afrique du sud, Cambodge, Estonie, Ethiopie, France, Iraq, Mali, Mexique, Suisse et Thaïlande.**

17 session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*

Tuesday, 27 October 2009
10:00-13:00

ITEM 9

FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

Documents *WHC-09/17.GA/9*
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9
 WHC-09/17.GA 9 Rev

The **Chairperson** recalled that already on the previous Friday the General Assembly touched on the item on the Future of the *Convention* and that on Saturday morning an open-ended group looked at issues covered by the Future of the *Convention* in order to have a clearer idea on how to proceed. Following that group discussion he suggested proceeding in following steps: discussing the report on what has been achieved so far, then – a draft vision and draft action plan concluded with an adoption of a Draft Resolution. He invited the Delegation of Australia to introduce the discussion and present the report on what has been achieved so far.

The Delegation of **Australia** recalled the decision of the World Heritage Committee in Seville which set out the parameters of the present document on the Future of the *Convention*. It emphasized that the discussions on this topic would be a step by step process which started 18 months ago in July 2008 and which will continue until 2012, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*. This date could also be the possible inscription of 1000th site on the World Heritage List. Thus this General Assembly is another step in this process.

The Delegation of **Australia** recalled that in October 2008, the World Heritage Committee invited all States Parties to provide proposals due in 2009. A call for proposals in written form from all States Parties was an innovative step. 44 proposals were made by States Parties and two by Advisory Bodies. These proposals could be summarized around 3 themes as follows:

- Perception of the *Convention* by the larger public, i.e. messages, images and values put forward, in brief, the World Heritage brand.

- Conservation and sustainable development – a look at communities and also the relationship with other conventions and common issues like climate change
- Inward view of the World Heritage system itself for more transparency and efficiency.

In July 2008, the World Heritage Committee decided (Decision 32 COM 10) that a workshop should be held to consider and fine tune all related issues, to identify global strategies and key processes for reflection on the Future of the *Convention*. This workshop was held in February 2009 and consisted of some 168 participants among which some 129 experts, representatives of Advisory Bodies and 29 representatives from NGOs. In the Plenary debate there were roughly 400 representatives of States Parties, Member States, NGOs and other governmental representatives. This was the highest attendance ever before at a World Heritage statutory meeting.

The outcome of this workshop was presented in a report to the World Heritage Committee. Six key challenges were identified in this report:

- The credibility of the World Heritage List;
- Imbalances within the World Heritage List;
- The public perception of World Heritage brand;
- Focus on inscription to the detriment of conservation, imbalances;
- Governance and financing;
- Difficulties to match sustainable development.

The World Heritage Committee's Decision (**33 COM 14A.1**) established a consultative body to review the Future of the *Convention* and formulate recommendations through a Working Group. Participation was opened to all States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and not just to World Heritage Committee Members. This body met 5 times during the session and participants came from approximately 40 States Parties from all regions. A key point to note was that the debates were open to all and this procedure remained unchanged which indicated the maturity of the process to respect all ideas and opinions. The consultative body looked at the next step to identify priorities i.e. increase community awareness and engagement, reduce the number of properties meeting conservation and management problems, finalize clear Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SoOUV) for all properties, manage better the World Heritage Committee's increasing workload and increase financial support.

The Delegation of **Australia** concluded by mentioning that a draft Action Plan was to be prepared to establish an overall strategic vision. The World Heritage Committee worked over the last year to put forward new solutions for updating the *Convention*. The mode of discussion allowed participation by all through an open-ended process.

The Delegation of **Australia** informed that today, the task of the General Assembly would consist in continuing the debate and making it further, allowing the participation of all States Parties and preparing the 40th Anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The **Chairperson** mentioned the work already accomplished during the previous session on Saturday on the reflection on the Future of the *Convention* and commended the delegates on the high level of participation in the February 2009 workshop. He believed that the draft Action Plan should be prepared keeping in mind other issues common to the whole UN system. For example the draft Action Plan should be articulated with UNESCO medium-term strategy and objectives. He was of the view that category 2 centres could also play a role in capacity-building as part of this process. The General Assembly could amplify on the draft agenda to take all comments into consideration. In his opinion, this reflection was an open-ended process of what the Committee had to do between now and 2012. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to States Parties.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the Secretariat and the organizers behind the preparation of the February 2009 workshop, led by Australia, Brazil, the Netherlands, Israel and Switzerland. Kenya had participated in the Future of the *Convention* workshop and had some concerns to express. It remarked that the *Global Strategy* (page 4, para.11.b, WHC-09/33.COM/14A) referred to under-represented themes and regions. The Delegation of **Kenya** was of the view that Africa remained still under-represented. Therefore, it believed that one should not concentrate on themes alone, as it is not addressing the issue in a straightforward manner but only by “moving the goal post”, but also focus on regions. It suggested that an evaluation of the *Global Strategy* is needed. Additionally it was interested in the *Convention* and its relation to themes such as sustainable development, climate change and poverty. The question it raised was: what does this *Convention* bring in general and to Africa in particular? World Heritage sites should start moving ahead from just the practical approach. It summarised that sometimes it is felt that the spirit of humankind was not there and thus wished to review the *Convention* in relation to sustainable development. With regard to the

number of World Heritage sites, almost 1,000, the Delegation of **Kenya** noted that there were States Parties with numerous sites on the World Heritage List and others which had no sites at all. A solution should be sought to address this situation where some States Parties are dragging along while others are at the top. However it was emphasized that there is no competition and that the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is not the issue. The open and frank manner of discussing this situation was welcomed since it was deemed time to allow under-represented States Parties to move forward with nomination of properties.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** fully supported the Delegation of Kenya and praised the extensive work, presentation and broad involvement of States Parties. The attempt to come up with priorities was thought a good idea. A focus on capacity-building in Africa and elsewhere was mentioned since training is needed for sustainable development, but also sustainable conservation. Also it was felt that without community involvement and participation nothing could be achieved. The Delegation of **Ethiopia** urged to focus on a strategy on how to approach these specific matters mentioned. Lastly, one should consider the workload generated by the implementation of the *Convention* in order to reach its objectives in the coming years. The emergency of certain situations ought to be addressed as well.

The Delegation of **Hungary** felt that elaborating a vision was of great importance. It supported the importance of ICCROM and that there should be more cooperation between countries and stakeholders. Financial support was needed for campaigns to address issues mentioned. The Delegation of **Hungary** stressed the need for competition but rather for fine tuning of strategies. Sustainability of conservation was deemed the main issue. It concluded by suggesting adopting a 6th C, that of Cooperation. Furthermore it stressed that a statistical balance between cultural and natural sites is not the main issue. The most important issue is rather to balance sustainable development and conservation. These two things should go together and not compete.

La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie le groupe de travail. Comme souligné par ses prédécesseurs, pour le paragraphe 11. b concernant la *Stratégie globale*, elle est d'avis que l'importance doit être de mettre l'accent sur les régions plus que sur les sous-thèmes. Dans ce processus, l'Afrique devrait recevoir une attention particulière. En ce qui concerne la conservation et le développement durable, la conservation du patrimoine

a des aspects culturels mais également des aspects liés au changement climatique, d'où sa dualité. Conservation et développement durable vont de pair: le développement durable repose sur la conservation mais le développement durable assure aussi la pérennité du patrimoine.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) wished to focus on community participation and tourism. Management plans for World Heritage sites should include a special chapter devoted to community participation and youth. A tourism management plan should be designed as tourism may be a problem to develop communities at sites. With regard to the List of World Heritage sites in Danger, the Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) was of the view that initially this List was intended as a way to assist sites which met problems. Today, once a site is placed on this List, there are other issues which come into play. For this reason, this Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) suggested to define benchmarks to be put in place and studied with regard to decision-making on World Heritage sites in Danger listing.

La Délégation de la **Guinée** appuie les interventions des Délégations du Kenya et du Maroc concernant l'approche régionale. Concernant la *Convention* et le développement durable, l'instabilité des pays affecte le travail effectué dans ce cadre, donc la stratégie pour développer un environnement favorable à la conservation des sites doit être réalisée en fonction de la stabilité des Etats parties.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe aux différents pays pour adresser ses félicitations pour l'excellent travail réalisé par le groupe de travail. Elle souligne deux points : la sensibilisation des communautés est la pierre angulaire de toute conservation durable. En effet, la communauté ne s'approprie pas toujours le patrimoine, il convient donc de réconcilier la communauté et son patrimoine. Ceci constitue un axe majeur dans les politiques de développement durable. Elle conclut en ajoutant que l'inscription des biens prime sur la conservation. Ainsi, sans pour autant ralentir les inscriptions, il convient aussi de renforcer la sensibilisation pour assurer la conservation des biens inscrits.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** exprime ses remerciements pour l'excellent travail réalisé dans ce document. Faisant référence à ses propres expériences, elle souhaite faire deux remarques : tout d'abord, la formation des gestionnaires de sites, tout en étant productive et effective, manque pourtant de suivi ; par ailleurs, la participation des communautés autour des sites patrimoniaux est importante, c'est

pourquoi il faut les sensibiliser à la mise en valeur du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Mexico** acknowledged the Working Group and encouraged all States Parties to continue in a spirit of participation and transparency. It focused on sustainable development, capacity-building and a better balance among WH sites. While supporting the Delegation of Australia in finding creative formulas to deal with problems at hand, the Delegation of **Mexico** referred to the networks established by the World Heritage Centre and the creation of category 2 centres. These mechanisms could be used for South/South and North/South cooperation as well as cooperation between States Parties. It concluded by saying that it is of the opinion that preservation and sustainable development go hand in hand while the development of local communities and their involvement in conservation are important.

The Delegation of **Canada** acknowledged the Working Group and expressed the view that it is necessary to identify clear priorities since there is a risk that if too many issues are being raised, one could end up with no action taken. The Delegation of **Canada** wished to see the Draft Action Plan in order to check how the World Heritage Committee's work would be tied to the 5 Cs.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the team which prepared the report of the Working Group. It considered important to keep the credibility of the *Convention* as the key issue. In conclusion, it added that the number of World Heritage properties could affect credibility of the *Convention* itself and pushed forward linking sustainable development and World Heritage sites through cooperation.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Working Group as well as Spain for having held the World Heritage Committee session in Seville. It provided the impetus for reflection on the key issues of the present debate. The Delegation of **India** wished to have a regional approach to the credibility of the *Convention* which is the most important point. It agreed with the Delegation of Morocco to focus on regions. Besides, it stressed the fact that being on the World Heritage in Danger List was perceived as negative. It insisted that the Committee should find a mechanism to take sites off this List. A balance of sites represented on the World Heritage List should be sought, in particular in the Pacific Region where more World Heritage properties should be inscribed, in order to encourage the States Parties from this Region. The Delegation of **India** added that it considers the issue of climate change in the

Caribbean and the Pacific Regions of great importance. In order to alleviate the World Heritage Committee workload it suggested holding two annual meetings. One would be held in Paris on financial and management issues. The other would be held elsewhere and deal with more substantive issues.

The Delegation of **Oman** acknowledged the Working Group and considered the Future of the *Convention* of utmost importance to safeguard World Heritage properties. In many regions, it was deplored that the recognition of the *Convention* as a tool is too weak. Supporting the Delegation of Kenya on the question of imbalance of World Heritage sites, it wondered how to achieve a good balance. It mentioned that one of Oman World Heritage properties was taken off the World Heritage List in 2007 and concluded by supporting the Delegation of Morocco about highlighting the significance of World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of **Sudan** mentioned that there were steps taken in Arab and African States Parties concerning World Heritage sites in Danger. It acknowledged the Director of the World Heritage Centre for solutions found to put an end to destruction on some of these sites. It urged for public awareness so as to protect World Heritage sites. It stressed the fact that emphasis is put mainly on the inscription process whereas post-inscription action should be supported. Sudan had a number of prehistoric sites and proper training and capacity-building would prove very useful. The assistance from the African World Heritage Fund in this domain is much appreciated. The creation of an Arab World Heritage Fund for community participation and assistance for World Heritage sites was suggested.

The Delegation of **Israel** acknowledged the Working Group and welcomed the new Members of the World Heritage Committee. Concerning the *Global Strategy*, it deplored that the bottom up relation exists only on paper while an integrated process would be needed. It also stressed the importance of regional cooperation in terms of ideas and expertise. Cooperation should not be organized solely according to UNESCO regional groupings. It was of the view that it is necessary to harness changes, linkages and twinning in education in order to guide their ongoing process for the Future of the *Convention*. It concluded by suggesting adopting a language which could be translated locally.

The **Chairperson** suggested continuing the discussion divided into two phases. Phase I would discuss the report of the Working Group on the Future of the *Convention* presented by the Delegation of Australia, with

inputs from the floor and wrapping up of this discussion by Australia. Phase II would concern the draft vision which will be later presented by the Delegation of Brazil, with inputs from the floor and wrapping up of discussion by the Delegation of Brazil. In the afternoon, the discussion on the Action Plan would follow the same working method.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** appreciated the work undertaken by the Working Group and welcomed the new members of the World Heritage Committee. Regarding representativeness, it wished to focus on regions rather than on themes. It pushed for more cooperation between States Parties. Appropriation could be encouraged through pilot projects involving two or more States Parties. Also, Africa 2009 and the African World Heritage Fund allowed for nominations of more World Heritage properties, for management capacity-building and raising awareness of the public. Regarding the Future of the *Convention*, the Delegation of **Nigeria** was of the opinion that the capacity of States Parties to implement action was to be considered. Regarding sustainability, in particular in Africa the issues of poverty alleviation and education were critical for heritage conservation. Thus it concluded by questioning about the value of funding if it does not improve the lives of communities concerned.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se joint aux remerciements adressés au Groupe de travail. Un aspect supplémentaire est l'idée de l'ouverture. Le patrimoine mondial est un instrument important, en particulier sur les grands thèmes actuels : développement durable, rôle des communautés, tourisme local, et changement climatique. Tous ces aspects ne doivent pas seulement être limités à la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* mais aussi être liés aux autres instruments et aux actions menées dans d'autres domaines. En ce qui concerne le plan d'action et en appui à l'intervention de la Délégation du Canada, il conviendrait de fixer un ordre de priorités et de faire une estimation des moyens financiers nécessaires.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** acknowledged the Working Group for its work and the presentation. It agreed that the reflection on the Future of the *Convention* was an all inclusive process which should take note of other conventions and processes implemented by UN agencies as for example climate change. Conservation should be linked to priorities of the 5 Cs. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the Delegation of Kenya on the idea to allow under-represented States Parties to catch up on inscription of sites on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Cuba** congratulated the newly elected Members of the World Heritage Committee. It supported the Delegation of Mexico about strengthening networks and regional groups. It stressed its concern about the ever-growing number of properties on the World Heritage List and the imbalance of certain regions in the List. Management plans for sites which suffered damage should be made. Capacity-building is needed for World Heritage sites which should be linked to communities to give them a sense of appropriation. The Delegation of Cuba was very interested in climate change issues in relation to World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of **Germany** acknowledged the Working Group and was of the view that the question of the number of World Heritage properties is less important than a reflection on the preservation of sites of the world for future generations. Conservation is deemed critical and the World Heritage Committee has to be vigilant on intentional destruction of World Heritage sites (i.e. Dresden). It supported the Delegations of Mexico and Tanzania (United Republic of) on creative ideas to help World Heritage sites develop plans to raise their visibility. The Delegation of **Germany** informed that the German Commission for UNESCO worked with some African States Parties to develop management plans for sites together with other countries. Additional funding from sites which had higher economic benefits was shared with those which received less income. It concluded by stressing the importance of training and capacity-building about the *World Heritage Convention* for young people i.e. Brandenburg Technical University Cottbus MA degree.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** acknowledged the Working Group for its excellent job and presentation. The new statistics and working methods of the World Heritage Committee were considered of great importance and one should focus on conservation and credibility. As the World Heritage Committee is overloaded with too many issues, (periodic reporting, SOC reports, etc.) the Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the idea of holding two annual meetings as suggested by the Delegation of India. Also, policies and strategic issues should be left to the General Assembly to reflect. Tentative Lists should address the 5 Cs in a systematic way. It concluded by saying that it considered important to maintain a high standard of sites to boost credibility and pride and create a solid basis for working on the image of heritage at the eve of the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Barbados** welcomed the new members of the World Heritage Committee and acknowledged Australia for the energetic and open-ended discussions of the Working Group. It would prefer an

approach whereby the *World Heritage Convention* would associate elements of other UNESCO conventions as suggested by the Delegation of the Netherlands and other conventions like Convention on Biological Diversity. It supported the Delegation of Canada on priorities in order to know what is feasible in terms of cost and what is not. It concluded by stressing that financing should be made available for all decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and that the capacity of the World Heritage Centre should match the workload.

The Delegation of **Belgium** acknowledged Australia and Spain and the Working Group for their discussions. It considered capacity-building as a key factor and cooperation between States Parties as one element for the preservation of sites. It appreciated the German experience as of great interest and supported the Delegation of Mexico on category 2 centres. Finally it suggested that use be made of the expertise of a number of UNESCO Chairs in the field of heritage.

The Delegation of **Sweden** acknowledged the Working Group and Australia for its presentation. It recommended local and global sustainable management of all World Heritage properties and wished more linkages between heritage and sustainable development. It is of the view that World Heritage is an integral part of sustainable development and a vital component of social development at the local level. Article 5 of the *Convention* mentions that heritage should bring life in the community. It stressed the need for careful planning by States Parties and wished that information be shared and a methodology found to enhance the *Global Strategy*. The Delegation of **Sweden** would also like an evaluation of working methods for efficiency and good implementation. A “gap-analysis” report should be undertaken to address the issues, notably imbalances within the World Heritage List. The Delegation of **Sweden** concluded by saying that the *Global Strategy* had foreseen a function for communities and referring to cooperation between Nordic countries with regard to category 2 centres and to Tentative Listing.

La Délégation de la **France** se félicite d'avoir participé aux réflexions concernant l'avenir de la *Convention*. En ce qui concerne le développement durable, sa préoccupation est partagée de le concevoir dans sa globalité, même s'il s'agit de priorités planétaires, car il existe des spécificités. Comme le dit la Délégation de la Hongrie, la conservation est importante pour le développement durable mais la coopération est un des aspects du développement durable. Aussi conviendrait-il peut-être d'ajouter le C de coopération aux 5C existants.

Pour ce qui concerne la crédibilité, des priorités restent à explorer dans le domaine de la coopération décentralisée et des échanges de site à site du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** félicite le Groupe de travail. Selon son expérience avec ses propres sites, elle est d'avis que les interventions doivent mettre en lien la conservation avec les aspects socioculturels et économiques du développement durable. Elle souligne les efforts des Etats parties pour rééquilibrer la représentativité entre les pays et les régions.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its gratitude for the presentation by the Delegation of Australia. It considered the credibility and balance of sites as important as well as the representation by types or categories and geographical regions. It stressed that some types of heritage were not even represented on the World Heritage List and proposed to introduce a new category for a new vision. Capacity-building was considered crucial and after 40 years since the adoption of the *Convention*, new needs should be addressed. A mechanism of several workshops to strengthen the debate on policy issues was suggested on the occasion of the 40th Anniversary in order to build a vision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the idea of a process for reflection on the Future of the *Convention*. It recalled that a paper was presented to the February 2009 Workshop and saw a need to focus on conservation, as after all, this was a *Convention for the protection of natural and cultural heritage*. It expressed the need for a global strategy and supported both sustainable development and capacity-building. However it insisted that one should come to grips with the issue of protection of heritage. The point is how well listed sites are protected and not how many they are on the List. An analytical approach of threats should be elaborated. Credibility is also about how much time is dedicated for every state of conservation report at the World Heritage Committee sessions. Finally the Delegation of the USA agreed that the workload of the World Heritage Committee is far too important for its capacity. However it concluded by considering that it would be too costly to send two delegations every year to the World Heritage Committee.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** félicite le Groupe de travail. Comme les Délégations des Etats-Unis d'Amérique et du Nigéria, elle se demande ce qui se passe après l'inscription des sites. La priorité doit être donnée aux sites inscrits plus qu'aux nouvelles inscriptions car il existe des pays en situation post-conflit qui ont des sites en péril. Pour

sauvegarder ces sites, il conviendrait donc que le Centre du patrimoine mondial réalise des microprojets en faveur des populations menacées.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the Delegation of Canada to identify priorities and achieve them. It believed that the credibility of the *Convention* was the main priority. In its opinion, the preservation of sites is linked to the credibility of the List. Conservation is more than just the inscription of sites. Some regions need more assistance. It suggested that States Parties strike a balance and felt that conservation could help development and vice versa development could also help conservation. The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** concluded by stressing the fact that it would not support that the *Convention* becomes an economic engine. In its opinion, the *Convention* is a world convention for the protection of natural and cultural heritage and *not* a world tourism convention, not an "eco-engine".

The Delegation of **Iraq** acknowledged Spain, Australia and the Working Group and supported the safeguarding of heritage and sustainable development. It wished to focus on training and capacity-building as well as on the awareness-raising and involvement of communities living near World Heritage sites. They should participate actively in the conservation process. It reminded that Mesopotamia was the cradle of civilization and concluded by appreciating the confidence expressed through the election of Iraq as Member of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** congratulated the new Members of the World Heritage Committee as well as Spain and Australia. The United Kingdom took part in the Working Group in Seville and agreed that conservation is important, as conservation is about the management of change. Therefore both a balance and clear priorities are needed. Principles have to be implemented along with practical action. Transnational nominations present ways for cooperation and an international approach between North/South and South/South States Parties. Therefore twinning between World Heritage properties is supported. It advocated a strong management of World Heritage properties, in order for practical issues to be solved and tools developed.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a félicité le Groupe de travail. Elle préfère l'approche thématique par catégorie de biens pour inscription sur la Liste, en mettant l'accent sur les thèmes sous-représentés, plus que sur une approche régionale. Elle souligne la nécessité d'obtenir un soutien financier et de l'expertise. Il faut privilégier la coopération entre Etats parties et encourager la coopération bilatérale pour la gestion des sites

du patrimoine mondial, en plus de l'expertise apportée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Colombia** acknowledged Spain and Australia. It was of the view that States Parties should help the *Convention* to adapt to challenges. A focus should be put on category 2 centres for cooperation and on shared experiences. Preservation is not a question of numbers of sites but of the transmission of World Heritage properties to future generations.

The Delegation of **China** acknowledged Australia and informed that it took part in the Working Group. Three ideas were put forward – 1) the number of sites on the World Heritage List increases the attractiveness of the *Convention*; 2) there is need for regular monitoring and periodic reporting as well as for training and capacity-building to be bolstered; 3) a method is to be found to continue reflection on the Future of the *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Australia to summarize the debate on this topic.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that there had been 37 interventions. It was the first time at a General Assembly that States Parties had such a discussion. Thanks to the hard work in Seville, all points raised in today's debate were very clear and precise. The debate could be summarized around 4 broad themes:

- Conservation was endorsed by almost all States Parties which took the floor as the central element in implementation of the *Convention*;
- Sustainable development was considered critical as well as capacity-building and training without which there could not be any conservation;
- The involvement of communities in their sites was also underlined.;
- All issues wrap up in enhancing the credibility of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted the convergence of issues, and the need for more reflection. The Delegations of Mexico and Saint Lucia had mentioned tourism impacts. Other issues were brought up such as climate change, biodiversity and category 2 centres. The Delegation of India had put forward a proposal for better working methods – having 2 annual meetings, one on financial and management aspects and the other on substantive topics. This idea was mentioned also by other participants including the Delegations of the United States of America

and the Republic of Korea. The Delegation of Japan thought it was critical to address both issues i.e. types of representativeness and geographical representativeness. Several participants including the Delegations of Oman and China supported strengthened regional cooperation to achieve goals.

In conclusion, the Delegation of **Australia** was of the opinion that there was a great degree of common understanding and wisdom in the debate. It was now for the General Assembly to take a decision on how to pursue this work which had been participative.

The **Chairperson** concluded that last Saturday the tone of the debate was not as clear as today's discussions and he thanked all delegates for their important work. He believed that the themes that emanated from today's debate would form a basis for the process in the route to the future. He commended the meeting on this historic and participative work.

ITEM 9

FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Draft vision (Annex 1 of Decision 33 COM 14A.2)

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/9
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9
WHC-09/17.GA 9 Rev

The **Chairperson** welcomed the Minister of Culture of Brazil, H. E. Mr. Ferreira, new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

The Minister of Culture of Brazil thanked the World Heritage Committee for electing his country to chair the next World Heritage Committee session in Brasilia in 2010, on the 50th anniversary of this city.

The Minister of Culture of Brazil stressed the fact that Brazil is proud to hold this meeting in Brasilia, a World Heritage property since 1987. He gave a brief history of the importance of Brasilia whose modern architectural and urban structure influenced the world since 1960, date of its construction.

He informed that the February 2009 Workshop gathered 129 experts from 72 countries and 35 from developing countries, all seeking new horizons for the Future of the *Convention*. He recalled that the *Convention* was born in 1970s to reflect on aspirations about the beauty of nature and structures of the world. Benefits were drawn from both natural and cultural heritage. Now the situation has changed and there is a need to reflect and discuss with courage and daring all the challenges and the conceptual framework of the *Convention* – what is the common vision we all aim at and how do we see it implemented to remain united under it?

Heritage is a factor of opportunities and new values grounded in singularity of various heritage processes would allow us to enhance development through cultural and natural heritage. As 2012 is approaching there is a need for action that will prove the new vision.

Thus he further informed that the President of Brazil had signed up an action plan and a new vision for historic cities with Ministries of Education and Culture, the public and private sectors, including banks. 500 million USD would be made available for 73 cities to highlight their heritage and contribute in their development.

Category 2 centres would assist in this new vision. The establishment of a category 2 centre in Rio de Janeiro would be an occasion to test this vision. The World Heritage Committee sessions will take place in Brasilia in 2010 and Manama in 2011. It will gather information to help improve this vision. The 40th anniversary of the *Convention* and the reflection behind it will help adapt with this new vision.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated the Minister of Culture of Brazil and thanked him for the donation of 500 million USD for historic cities.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Minister of Culture of Brazil and thanked him for hosting the next World Heritage Committee session.

The Delegation of **Cuba** appreciated the excellent presentation of the Minister of Culture of Brazil which outlines the work to be accomplished by the next World Heritage Committee session. It praised Brazil for its major contribution in favour of historic cities.

La Délégation du **Bénin** a remercié le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil d'avoir présenté une nouvelle vision du patrimoine. Elle a souligné le fait

que le concept de patrimoine et de développement durable est vague et peut être employé différemment. Il conviendrait par conséquent de se concentrer sur les relations entre patrimoine et développement et d'affiner ces concepts. Elle a salué la haute conscience patrimoniale des autorités brésiliennes et leurs investissements dans le domaine du patrimoine. Elle s'est réjouie de venir constater in situ cette conscience et ces investissements.

The Delegation of **Croatia** acknowledged the Minister of Culture of Brazil for hosting the forthcoming World Heritage Committee session in Brasilia.

The Delegation of **Israel** appreciated the offer made by Brazil to host the next session of the World Heritage Committee in Brasilia. It was of the view that the *World Heritage Convention* could add to the appreciation of modern architecture as represented in Tel Aviv and Brasilia. It praised the great architects of Brazil and hoped that Niemeyer who is now 102 years old would support the World Heritage Committee's work.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the Minister of Culture of Brazil upon his election as Chairperson of the forthcoming World Heritage Committee and also for his presentation. It noted with satisfaction the contribution of 500 million USD for 73 cities. It hoped to be in Brasilia in 2010 and invited the World Heritage Committee to Manama, Bahrain in 2011.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged the new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. Kenya has a good cooperation with Brazil which is the lead on issues concerning biodiversity and cultural diversity as well as South/South cooperation. It mentioned that the African World Heritage Fund financed the organization of a meeting for Portuguese-speaking African countries with the support of Brazil.

La Délégation de **l'Égypte** a remercié le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil et félicité ce pays pour l'organisation de la session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en juillet 2010.

The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated H.E. Minister Ferreira on his election. It noted with pleasure that Brazil would host the next meeting in Brasilia. It further noted that Brazil had always had a calling to protect heritage in all its expressions. It hoped that Niemeyer would be present at the next World Heritage Committee session.

La Délégation de la **Guinée** a remercié le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil. L'expérience du Brésil mérite d'être dupliquée pour servir d'exemple au sud du Sahara, sous forme de visites, de coopération sud-sud ou de documents audiovisuels.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Minister of Culture of Brazil and was pleased to continue co-operating with this country and with other financial partners in support of historic cities.

The Delegation of **Mexico** congratulated the Minister of Culture of Brazil and thanked the World Heritage Committee for its work. It felt that an excellent session of the World Heritage Committee next year would strengthen the work of the *Convention* in particular for methods of cooperation, like the proposal made by Brazil.

La Délégation d'**Haïti** a félicité le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil pour son intervention. Elle a estimé qu'il existe une vision ainsi que des actions prometteuses pour le bonheur du peuple brésilien.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a félicité le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil pour la présidence du Comité du patrimoine mondial et pour l'aspect visionnaire de son intervention.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Minister of Culture of Brazil and suggested to support cities in post-conflict countries like Somalia and Sudan.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** a félicité le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil pour son excellent exposé. Elle serait intéressée par la comparaison de ce projet brésilien de 500 millions USD en faveur de 73 villes avec un projet tunisien noué avec la Banque Mondiale sur la gestion et la mise en valeur du patrimoine culturel de 40 millions USD pour 7 projets pilotes, dont quatre sites du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** a félicité le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil pour son intervention et pour l'intérêt du Brésil en faveur de l'avenir de la *Convention*, pour son projet visionnaire et pour la conservation de biens patrimoniaux du Brésil. Elle s'est félicitée de ce partage d'expériences avec les pays partageant la même histoire et la même langue. Elle a manifesté son intérêt et suggéré à la Délégation du Brésil que des projets soient mis en œuvre avec le Fonds africain du patrimoine mondial. Il existe des pays qui ont des richesses naturelles mais des difficultés, auxquels le Brésil peut apporter un plus.

The Delegation of **Venezuela** thanked Brazil for hosting the next World Heritage Committee session in Brasilia where States Parties will be able to continue their important discussions. It was of the view that Brazil was an outstanding example of preservation of heritage and it wished the session every success.

La **Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture** a félicité le Ministre de la Culture du Brésil au nom du Directeur général et du Secrétariat. Ce projet de vision sur 10 à 20 ans s'inscrit dans la perspective de l'anniversaire des 40 ans de la *Convention*. Elle a souligné l'idée d'une vision holistique du patrimoine avec une exploration élargie et continue du patrimoine et de la culture. La Sous-directrice générale pour la Culture a souligné en conclusion l'importance des réseaux et en particulier des centres de catégorie 2 qui permettront de transcender les catégories de patrimoine (matériel, immatériel et subaquatique).

The Minister of Culture of Brazil thanked the floor for its warm words about his country and for the historic cities project. The idea was to focus on the economic development of historic cities. He felt that there was a need to invest in order to maintain World Heritage sites. Brazil had and still has a demographic pressure; the rural exodus over the past four decades resulted in an increase from 25% to 80% of the population living now in cities. Therefore it was deemed important for Brazil to care for its historic cities. The overall idea is to make funding available for site conservation for the benefit of cities. Cities would share their experience with other States Parties and also wished to learn from other cities.

With reference to World Heritage sites in Brazil, seven World Heritage properties are natural heritage sites and ten are cultural heritage properties. All are managed for the sustainable development of local communities. The **Minister of Culture of Brazil** said that he would explain the model of Brazil to protect heritage sites during an information session to be held in the afternoon during which he would present Brazil's approach to enhance sustainable development for heritage conservation.

**17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
to the *World Heritage Convention***

Tuesday, 27 October 2009
15:00-17:05

ITEM 9

**FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*
*Draft Action Plan (Annex 2 of Decision 33 COM 14A.2)***

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/9
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9
WHC-09/17.GA 9 Rev

The **Chairperson** announced that after the session there would be an orientation session at 17:30 for the new members of the World Heritage Committee. To continue the debate on Item 9 he invited Mr. Christopher Young to introduce the Draft Action Plan.

Mr. Christopher Young noted that the Future of the *Convention* has been a matter of concern since the very beginning. Processes and solutions keep changing, the conditions in which we operate change, and therefore solutions change; however it is important to bring forward with us what works.

The Action Plan dates back from the February 2009 Workshop and follows the Working Group in Seville in 2009. However, it is not yet a full Action Plan. It includes some short term and some long terms actions which will serve to increase the credibility of the *Convention*, increase conservation and the cooperation between States Parties. In Seville it was decided that the Action Plan needed to be developed further, and then presented to the World Heritage Committee in Brasilia.

The Action Plan is broken into sections – there are well over 50 actions which are divided into (i) understanding of the *Convention* and engagement; (ii) protection and conservation; (iii) connections; (iv) strategic management. It also offers immediate actions such as Statements of Outstanding Universal Value needed for all sites and providing guidance. Others are more long term and envisage, for example, systems of awards for good performance. It is an Action Plan for the entire World Heritage community: the World Heritage Centre monitors progress and encourages implementation; the Advisory Bodies deal with the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and guidance

and the States Parties will have a key role both on their own, and as members of the General Assembly. For example: States Parties must start the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value process which is to be followed by the Advisory Bodies.

Also there needs to be a prioritization of action and the issue of resources must be addressed as well. Finally, it is proposed that progress reports are provided at the General Assembly meetings.

Four things must be thought of today: (1) general comments on the Action Plan; (2) the need to prioritize actions; (3) specific actions marked for the General Assembly, notably the development of a strategy and action plan for the public image and awareness of heritage values, and also the investigation of means for increased participation; and (4) the implementation of an action plan needs to be coordinated and prioritized.

Finally, there is a need to look outwards at how the *Convention* deals and interconnects with tourism and climate change for example, as well as with other institutions such as category 2 centres.

The **Chairperson** noted that inter-linkage is the hallmark of what we are trying to do with the *Convention*. Currently there is a disjuncture between the intention or spirit of the *Convention* and its implementation. The meaning of the *Convention* does not exist in communities who do not associate with heritage. Thus conservation is suffering from this lack of association.

The Delegation of **Ireland** inquired about the way States Parties will be involved in the implementation of the Action Plan. It also underlined its interest in:

- Pilot projects: implementation and sustainable development;
- The public image of the *Convention*: the Tentative List of Ireland is being revised and one realized that there is a lack of knowledge on the *Convention*;
- Improving the quality of decision-making at the World Heritage Committee: The idea of two meetings per year is a considerable drain on resources, especially for a small country. Moreover, linking Committee decisions to budget is important –if we are taking decisions we must know that we have the budget for implementation;
- The World Heritage Committee's decisions should be linked with capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its interest in addressing the effective management of the *Convention*. It noted that it is important to link the *Convention* to other conventions such as the 2003 and 2001 conventions for example. It further noted that it is interested in the quality of the decision-making process and in continuing the *Global Strategy* which lacks vision. Finally it wondered what is meant by having a credible, balanced and representative List. Definitions and indicators are needed here.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** a mentionné que ce Plan d'action ressemble à une « feuille de route » pour des actions à mettre en œuvre aux niveaux national et régional. Deux priorités devraient être développées et retenues à court terme : il s'agit de la sensibilisation des communautés d'une part, et de la conservation et des pratiques de conservation, comprenant le développement des capacités d'autre part. Elle a conclu en rappelant également que l'objectif essentiel de la *Convention* est la protection.

The Delegation of **Oman** stressed that it is important to refer to the resolutions adopted by the General Conference, in particular the Resolution about the creation of category 2 centres, including Bahrain category 2 centre. It mentioned that still three Arab States Parties have no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and no Tentative Lists. It concluded by noting that category 2 centres will become the main places where the *Global Strategy* will be implemented. Category 2 centres are the departure points of this strategy and should reflect regional priorities as these may differ from one region to the other.

La Délégation de **l'Egypte** a appuyé les Délégations de la Tunisie, d'Oman et de Bahreïn. Elle a exprimé sa préoccupation concernant l'accessibilité des textes de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*, non seulement pour des gestionnaires de sites, mais également pour le public. Elle a souligné que certains termes tels que l'authenticité et l'intégrité sont difficiles à comprendre. Le rôle des centres de catégorie 2 est donc très important car ils doivent permettre de faire le lien avec les communautés locales.

The Delegation of **Hungary** noted that conservation is the most important issue, and Danger Listing should be highlighted. It is important to have a special place in the Action Plan for that. This should be connected with the strengthening of resources and other means to reinforce the *Convention*. Good practice and advice but also cooperation with sites which face problems should be sought.

The Delegation of **Canada** welcomed the opportunity to reframe the Action Plan around the 5Cs, thereby creating a logical link between the 5Cs and the *Convention* Action Plan. It suggested that the States Parties be consulted on how they want to prioritize the Action Plan, before the forthcoming World Heritage Committee session. It noted that the implementation of the Action Plan is crucial. Linking the Action Plan with the budget and workload is equally important.

The Delegation of **Greece** noted that effective management is a vital issue in which ICCROM should be more involved, especially with regards to new nominations. It would like to see a presentation by ICCROM or, if this is not possible, a draft document regarding new nominations. Moreover, an analysis by ICCROM on nominations, especially in conflict zones, would be very useful. Finally, it suggested establishing an international World Heritage Day during which training exercises and best practices could be presented.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed the wish to identify the new challenges facing the *Convention*, such as needs and gaps and the public image of the *Convention*, capacity-building, and transparency.

The Delegation of **Argentina** recalled that the General Assembly is a strategic and general policy body. Its structure should be adapted, in order to allow it to accompany the undergoing process.

The Delegation of **Israel** was of the opinion that more time should be dedicated to who and how. It recommended strengthening the existing networks – even with other conventions – and not being separatists. While there are global priorities, it is important to invite States Parties to bring in their different priorities at local level. Also it is important that the General Assembly reflects on what it expects from this Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Mexico** underlined the need to reinforce the role of the General Assembly by allowing it to work on strategic issues. It suggested to fine tune the Draft Plan of Action and mentioned that the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada is the most pertinent one. Furthermore it recommended integrating an additional column in the chart to link the proposals with the 5 Cs. It added the need to reinforce the image of the *Convention* and ensure that related publications reach all those interested.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stressed the idea that despite the fact that the *Convention* is successful there is room for improvement, such as removing some workload of the World Heritage Committee as it is more

and more difficult to fulfil its functions. Careful reading of the document proposed shows that activities are to be done by the World Heritage Committee with the help of the World Heritage Centre and the advice of the Advisory Bodies. However, there are some functions that the States Parties or the General Assembly should take upon their shoulders in the forthcoming two years so as to come up with recommendations at the next General Assembly.

La Délégation de la **France** a commenté certains éléments du Projet de Plan d'action et fait les propositions suivantes : Il conviendrait d'intégrer au processus d'évaluation, de l'efficacité de la gestion des outils d'auto-évaluation, d'utiliser l'expérience de la Convention France-UNESCO dans le domaine du transfert de compétences, afin de définir de nouvelles formes de jumelage et de réseaux. Des plans de communication devraient être établis. Des formes d'action normative devraient être élaborées car la normatisation n'est pas toujours compatible avec la diversité des patrimoines. Des outils d'auto-évaluation devraient être mis au point pour aider les Etats parties dans le processus d'inscription.

D'autre part, le rythme des inscriptions de thèmes et de catégories de patrimoine déjà bien représentés sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial devrait être automatiquement freiné grâce à l'analyse comparative. Enfin, il faudrait supprimer la distinction proposée entre les thèmes sous-représentés et les régions.

Elle s'est posé la question de savoir si la communication est utilisée comme une publicité et a également mentionné qu'il serait nécessaire de prévoir une phase d'échange d'informations au moment de l'évaluation du dossier de proposition d'inscription. En conclusion, elle a suggéré de mettre en place, au moment du suivi réactif de l'état de conservation des biens, une médiation entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial, l'Etat partie et le ou les gestionnaire(s) du site concerné.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a considéré le projet de Plan d'action comme une bonne base et suggéré de revoir la terminologie proposée. Il conviendrait aussi d'améliorer la rédaction du document, en utilisant la terminologie de l'UNESCO. Elle a souligné la nécessité de définir les priorités, ainsi que de permettre à l'Assemblée générale de jouer pleinement son rôle. L'accent devrait être mis sur la représentativité régionale plutôt que sur la typologie des biens. Enfin, il faudra veiller à ce que le fonctionnement futur de la *Convention* coïncide avec l'objet du plan à moyen terme de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stressed the importance which should be given to (i) the protection and conservation (ii) the strategic management (iii) the workload. There is a need for concentrated action. Emphasis should be given to periodic reporting in the monitoring process. Periodic reporting should be linked with the state of conservation reports. It was of the view that States Parties take responsibility through the periodic reporting exercise.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** a remercié pour son élection pour la première fois au sein du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle a souligné que la priorité devrait être accordée à la conservation plus qu'aux inscriptions et que la vision devrait être plus transversale.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the Delegation of Canada on the need to reframe the Action Plan around the 5 Cs. There is also a need to tighten the budget with future implementation. It is important to assign who will be responsible for what. Finally, it agreed with the Delegation of Sweden on the need to strengthen mechanisms that are already in place and look at how these can be improved in order to fill the gaps instead of adding new mechanisms.

La Délégation de la **Guinée** a proposé de renforcer les centres de catégorie 2 afin d'établir des plans d'action régionaux, d'obtenir une meilleure participation des communautés locales et d'intégrer dans les politiques nationales, notamment dans les pays au Sud du Sahara, les questions de conservation et de préservation.

The Delegation of **Norway** underlined the fact that the Action Plan is a 'work in progress'. It proposed that this should be a standing item on the agenda of every World Heritage Committee session and every General Assembly. It noted that there is a need to prioritize. Also, it is important to develop a comprehensive plan for capacity building in States Parties so that they can then do conservation themselves. There should be a shift from reporting to conservation. Africa 2009 should be used as an excellent example. Moreover, the Delegation of **Norway** expressed its concern about the workload of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre, and other organs involved. It noted that more and more time is spent on bureaucracy and less and less on conservation. Time and more time are not the keys to solving this issue, but rather how time is managed. The World Heritage Committee should do less and the States Parties should do more.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the excellent work done by UNESCO on category 2 centres and noted the cooperation between the Nordic World Heritage Fund and the African World Heritage Fund on nomination files. It noted that this is an area which needs to be strengthened, as is that of South-South cooperation and partnerships. It stressed that category 2 centres could be used to address local particularities as well as conservation in conflict and post/conflict situations and exposed to poverty and climate change issues. Finally, it noted that it would like to see the removal of Danger Listed sites - hanging over the head of Africa for example – covered as a priority in the Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** was of the view that for what concerns protection and conservation, the focus should be on risk management and natural disasters. It asked whether UNESCO could provide detailed guidance and support on disaster risk management for heritage sites (whether inscribed on the World Heritage List or not) which have been affected by natural disasters. Finally it noted that in terms of disasters taking place, guidance is a medium rather than a long-term issue.

The Delegation of **Spain** suggested continuing the ongoing process and use the framework defined during the World Heritage Committee session in Seville, notably the creation of working groups with no restriction in the number of participants and the possibility to have an active participation of Observers. It further stressed the importance of the Action Plan which should allow multiplying initiatives taken by site managers in the fields of conservation, sustainable tourism and twinning. It stressed the importance of local initiatives which are as relevant as global ones. While supporting the proposal made by the Delegation of Sweden, it recalled the need to define priorities and to preserve balance and equity between category 2 centres. It concluded by insisting on the need to intensify decentralized cooperation and manage the World Heritage Committee's time more efficiently.

The Delegation of **Peru** concurred with the proposal made by the Delegation of Sweden and insisted on the important role played by local decision-makers and community, underlining the positive impact of measures taken to alleviate poverty in the framework of the *Convention*. It concluded by requesting the definition of a communication strategy.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** underscored the comment made by the Delegation of Kenya and wished priority to be given to the importance of sustainable development and community involvement as both are linked with protection and conservation.

La Délégation de l'**Égypte** a appuyé la proposition de la Délégation du Kenya concernant la stratégie de développement des centres de catégorie 2, spécialement en Afrique. Elle a souligné que ces centres permettront de renforcer l'axe de coopération Sud-Sud, notamment dans des pays ayant été confrontés aux conflits armés ou aux catastrophes naturelles. En citant le projet de gestion du site de Karnak, elle a proposé de définir des cas d'étude pour étudier divers exemples de gestion.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (United Republic of) wished to add that Africa 2009 was very useful for capacity-building and stressed the importance of the transfer of knowledge through publications such as manuals and guidelines to be published in various languages.

La Délégation de **Sainte Lucie**, en appuyant la proposition du Canada, a proposé de réorganiser le Plan d'action autour des 5C et demandé de trouver de meilleures propositions pour ce Plan. Elle a souligné qu'il n'est pas possible de limiter la coordination aux seuls centres de catégorie 2. Elle a insisté sur le fait qu'il serait nécessaire d'avoir une vision des implications budgétaires de l'ensemble de ce processus. Elle a ajouté que si l'on veut obtenir des résultats, il serait nécessaire de mieux définir qui fait quoi dans ce processus. Elle s'est dit d'avis qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de tout réinventer, la simple mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité du patrimoine mondial aurait permis de résoudre déjà beaucoup de choses. Elle a jugé la décision de 1999 portant sur la représentativité de la plus haute importance.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that in the proposed document on decision-making, clarification was required on what re-examining the state of conservation entails. Moreover, it noted that if there are changes in the reporting mechanism, a certain time of adaptation should be taken into consideration.

The Delegation of **Venezuela** insisted in having pilot projects. It stressed the fact that the Plan of Action seems both open and abstract. It requested information on the *Global Strategy* and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** was of the view that the Action Plan is a series of general proposals and that for this reason there is a need to be more concrete. Also, it was in favour of shared projects and experiences.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted with satisfaction the existence of an Action Plan. It deemed monitoring as very important with regard to conservation and sustainability. It also noted that the exchange of information on best practices is very important and that specific reporting on regions and sectors where best practices can be exchanged is important. Finally, it noted that UNESCO Chairs should be included in the process as they are natural partners.

The Delegation of **Kenya** added that looking at "icons" should be avoided and one should look at heritage in a more holistic way as this is a better framework for African heritage. It was in favour of a regional approach rather than a typological approach. It also emphasized the importance of Africa 2009 for immovable heritage, biodiversity and climate change concerns. It supported further initiatives similar to Africa 2009, especially for natural heritage.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** a salué le rôle des communautés locales pour pérenniser la conservation. Elle a souhaité éviter la fracture entre, d'une part les experts, et d'autre part les communautés locales. Elle a insisté pour harmoniser les Listes indicatives et souhaité que le 40e anniversaire de la *Convention* soit l'occasion de dresser un bilan des sites inscrits et de l'aide apportée aux Etats parties dont les sites connaissent des difficultés.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegates for their participation and interest in the discussion and invited Mr Christopher Young to summarise the debate.

Mr. Christopher Young congratulated the General Assembly for the incredibly rich debate which was difficult to synthesize. He made the following summary of the interventions into these concise points of emphasis: There is a need to prioritize actions, tie implementation to budget, review and strengthen mechanisms – by looking back at past suggestions over time and developing them further for implementation. There is also a need for awareness-raising, action at regional levels (category 2 centres, South - South cooperation, South - North cooperation) and for work with external partners to assist in efforts.

He also reminded that States Parties should deliver their comments by the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee.

Responses were offered to specific interventions such as:

- Periodic reporting and reactive monitoring should be more closely linked to State of Conservation process.
- The “new global strategy” has not yet been defined, and it is in the process of development
- The emphasis on symbols and icons should be replaced by regions and themes.
- Statements of Outstanding Universal Value should be attached to nomination dossiers.
- The Committee has not yet organized sub-committees for handling various aspects of its work. This should involve a broader discussion about workload.
- How to define regions or themes requires further discussion.

The **Chairperson** offered thanks to all Delegations and emphasized the important link that must be drawn to communities and the human dimension of the *World Heritage Convention*. The distribution of amendments made to the Draft Resolution will be made as soon as possible.

Additionally the **Chairperson** invited the States Parties to review the Draft Resolution and check whether all items have been included and whether it captures the essence of their interventions. He requested further amendments to be well-drafted. He adjourned the session at 17:05.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced a consolidated text that would include the suggested amendments. He announced an orientation session to follow the meeting.

**17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
to the *World Heritage Convention***

Wednesday, 28 October 2009
10:00-13:00

ITEM 9

FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*
Adoption of the Draft Resolution

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/9
WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9
WHC-09/17.GA 9 Rev

The **Chairperson** opened the meeting and recalled that, when yesterday's meeting was adjourned the Draft Resolution on the Future of the *Convention* was being examined.

He explained that the purpose of the Draft was to capture the original views expressed in the documents and yesterday's interventions from the floor. He said that the work accomplished was commensurable and had to continue until 2012. He underlined that the open ended Working Group was transparent and that the inclusive process it adopted was much appreciated. He informed the floor that the two planned World Heritage Committee sessions in Brasilia and Manama would elaborate further on the subject.

Therefore the **Chairperson** invited the floor not to open the debate on substance and consider that the work was in progress. He also invited the General Assembly to consult the Draft Document 17GA 9Rev which was being distributed and underlined that it corresponds with what was examined during the previous day. He concluded by reading the signatories of the Draft Document – whose names appeared in the Draft Resolution - and called on the States Parties who wished so to express their adherence to the Draft Document 17GA 9Rev to take the floor.

The following Delegations expressed their approval on the Document 17GA 9Rev and asked for their names to be added to the list of co-drafters of the Document: **Venezuela, Tunisia, Zimbabwe, Sudan, Serbia, New Zealand, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, Bulgaria, Jordan, Iraq, Benin, Malaysia, Madagascar, Finland,**

Cameroon, Indonesia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, bringing the number of signatories of this Document to a total of 42.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the general principle of the draft text but expressed its disagreement in calling all countries to express their approval on it. It also said that the text did not mention prioritization, that it lacked reference to the 5Cs, and asked for this reference to be incorporated in the text.

The **Chairperson** said that the Draft Resolution was first to be acknowledged and that amendments would be done at a later stage. He asked the Delegation of New Zealand to provide a written proposal for its incorporation into the Resolution.

The **Chairperson** called to look into the Draft Resolution for adoption; he added that the proposed amendments should not attack its spirit.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to add reference in paragraph 1 also to the WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9

The Chairperson announced *paragraph 1 as adopted*.

The **Chairperson** said that Canada had proposed an amendment to paragraph 2 and asked to display it on the screen. He read it out and explained that it proposed replacing “evolve” by “be implemented” and adding “and opportunities” after “challenges”.

La Délégation de la **France** affirme qu'elle n'a pas d'objection.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of France to confirm that the revised translation was convenient to it.

La Délégation de la **France** a confirmé qu'elle n'avait pas d'objection.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a été d'avis que les mots "auxquelles elle est confrontée" doivent être supprimés après les mots "saisir les opportunités".

La Délégation de la **France** a proposé "pour relever les nouveaux défis auxquels elle est confrontée et saisir les opportunités".

The Delegation of **India** asked to move on and leave the concordance checking to a later stage.

The **Chairperson** asked Algeria and France if they were satisfied with the translation. The Chairperson announced *paragraph 2 adopted as amended* by Canada.

The **Chairperson** read out paragraphs 3 and 4 with the Canadian amendment proposing to merge them.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a demandé à la Délégation du Canada en quoi les deux paragraphes séparés pourraient gêner.

The Delegation of **Canada** explained that this was meant to streamline the decision.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a insisté et demandé pourquoi il serait nécessaire d'introduire un amendement, car, selon elle, cela ne gêne en rien le texte.

The **Chairperson** said the objective of this amendment was to streamline and compact two paragraphs that expressed the same idea.

La Délégation du **Mali** a demandé de rationaliser le texte le plus possible.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo to approve the amendment.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a admis que l'on pourrait fusionner le texte pour gagner du temps.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo for its understanding. The Chairperson announced *the adoption of paragraph 3* as amended by Canada.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a été d'avis que des changements restaient nécessaires.

The **Chairperson** re-directed the question over the new paragraph 4 (former paragraph 5) to the floor and stressed the fact that there was already one amendment in writing.

The Delegation of **India** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to give the Chairperson a helping hand and objected the bad translation done by the Secretariat. It said that it preferred the word “desirable” instead of “necessary” and found the word “notes” very dry; it preferred “welcomes” instead. It added that there was a need to move quickly.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a dit comprendre la Délégation de l'Inde. Elle a proposé de remplacer "nécessaire" par "souhaitable", qui s'avèrerait moins engageant.

The Delegation of **India**, asked that in the new paragraph 5 “remains necessary” be replaced by “would be necessary”, then asked that it be replaced by “should be utilized” as it thought that the English formulation was not satisfactory. It protested that the English was poor and asked the Secretariat’s assistance.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed that “would be necessary” should replace “should be utilized”.

The Delegation of **India** approved.

The **Chairperson** announced *paragraph 4 adopted*.

The **Chairperson** announced a proposed amendment by Canada to paragraph 5 (former paragraph 6) by adding “or a subsequent version of it”.

La Délégation du **Mali** a souhaité modifier la proposition en écrivant "pourrait servir de base de discussion pour approfondir la discussion lors de sa prochaine session".

The Delegation of **India** apologized to Canada on behalf of the drafting group and contested the way the debate was conducted. It added that this amendment was problematic and deplored that there was no negotiation prior to the adoption process.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it had no intention to spend more time on the Draft Resolution; it added that a draft vision was submitted to the General Assembly with the purpose of reviewing it at the next session; nevertheless, it expressed its readiness to withdraw its amendment in case its proposal created a problem.

The **Chairperson** asked for comments on the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it had submitted a written amendment for starting the paragraph with “Recognizing that this is a work in progress, notes that...”

The **Chairperson** announced that the Delegation of Canada had withdrawn its proposal, and asked the floor whether it had any other proposals.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** protested that it could not be expected to have the same draft after the debate of the previous day where 80 speakers took the floor, and after almost 2 years of work. It added that the Draft Resolution was not clear about who was doing what. It concluded that since the vision had to be reviewed, the Draft would certainly be a new one.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Delegation of Israel proposed an amendment which was not compatible with the UN terminology, and asked to add the following: “should be amended by the Secretariat of the World Heritage Centre to take into account the rich debate at the 17th session of the General Assembly so that it could be used as a basis for discussion at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee and the 18th session of the General Assembly”. It concluded by asking the Delegation of Israel to withdraw its amendment.

The **Chairperson** said the amendment made by the Delegation of India reflected concerns expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia over who should be doing what and added that it was satisfactory. He asked the Delegation of Israel if it could withdraw its proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Israel** approved this proposal as “work in progress” was reflected in the Indian amendment.

La Délégation de l'**Iran** (République islamique d') a souhaité qu'au lieu de "base de discussion" il soit écrit "comme point de départ de la discussion".

The **Chairperson** answered that the proposal made by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran would pose a problem because the “work had already started” and asked this Delegation whether it could respectfully reconsider its proposal.

La Délégation de l'**Iran** (République islamique d') a souligné que cela ne créerait pas de problème et elle s'est dit prête à retirer sa proposition.

The **Chairperson** expressed his appreciation.

The Delegation of **Hungary** requested that reference be made in the brackets on "Annex 1, Decision 33 COM 14 A2" which constitutes the basis of the Resolution under discussion.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Hungary for its pertinent comment.

The Delegation of **Brazil** cautioned with regard to the comment made by the Delegation of Saint Lucia not to confuse the draft vision and the work plan and pointed out that there is unclear wording regarding this matter as it would not be possible to redraft the draft vision if it was adopted. It also commended the Delegation of Hungary for its precision in indicating its reference.

The Delegation of **India** agreed on the point made by the Delegation of Brazil to differentiate between the documents and proposed to improve the wording of paragraph 5.

The **Chairperson** proposed to add to the draft vision the element of the Action Plan to clarify the connection between the two documents.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that there have been already extensive discussions on the draft vision and requested that the draft vision be reviewed according to the discussion which took place. The World Heritage Committee would review it and present it to the 18th session of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any objections to replace the World Heritage Centre by the World Heritage Committee to revise the draft vision.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** insisted that it is the role of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** expressed his view that the original text was not bad after all. He admitted that it was difficult to understand unless one becomes a magician and supposed there was a procedural issue.

La Délégation de la **France** est revenue sur la proposition de la Délégation du Canada, même si cet amendement a été retiré. Selon elle, il est clair en effet que l'Assemblée générale souhaite que le document portant sur la vision stratégique soit enrichi en prenant compte du débat de la veille. Elle a exprimé son accord avec le point de vue de la Délégation de l'Inde.

The **Chairperson** read the revised version of the text in its English version. He asked the floor whether there were any comments.

The Delegation of **India** objected about attaching the draft vision to the work plan.

The Delegation of **Hungary** requested to be informed on the way the Secretariat would proceed with the final text.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** raised a point of order, requesting the immediate adoption of this paragraph. It summarized that the text reflected the comments made and requested to close the debate.

The **Chairperson** announced *paragraph 5 adopted*.

The **Chairperson** introduced the amendment made by the Delegations of Canada and Estonia to new paragraph 6 which underlined the issue of credibility.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that credibility refers to the World Heritage List and not to the *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** informed that an amendment could be made accordingly.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to its comment submitted in writing in connection with paragraph 6. It supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada and Estonia and withdrew its comment in the interest of efficiency.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** announced an amendment under 6c) therefore to be examined later.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** announced an amendment under 6d).

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a soumis un point d'ordre selon lequel on ne pourrait pas revenir à l'alinéa 6a) alors que l'Assemblée générale se trouve déjà entrain d'examiner l'alinéa 6b). Elle a demandé que les amendements soient soumis avec ordre et méthode.

The **Chairperson** underlined that implications follow from interventions that might concern other paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo. It underlined the need to clarify who will be doing what in the implementation.

The Delegation of **India** introduced a point of order as it was not given the floor despite being the first on the list of speakers. It threatened to leave the room if not allowed to speak.

The **Chairperson** pointed out the list of States Parties to speak.

The Delegation of **India** wished to be deleted from the list of speakers.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the order of the list cannot always reflect order of hand signs, but rather follows the points of the Draft Resolution.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** explained that paragraph 7 and 8 are immediately related to paragraph 6 as they explain who will be doing what in this regard and therefore suggested reading them together.

The **Chairperson** suggested adopting the suggestion made by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** insisted that the Action Plan was not mentioned in paragraph 6.

La Délégation de la **France** a demandé de supprimer la mention "essentielle". Elle a aussi souhaité que soient mentionnés les huit thèmes identifiés par M. Christopher Young dans ce paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to Decision 33 COM 14 A.2 which requests the Action Plan to be sent for discussion at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee. All requests formulated during the debate should be taken into consideration.

The Delegation of **Brazil** addressed the different roles of the Committee, the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre. This decision refers to the States Parties and not to the World Heritage Committee or the World Heritage Centre. The Plan of Action should take the 5Cs into consideration. The *Operational Guidelines* are defined by the World Heritage Committee and constitute the conceptual framework for the General Assembly. It advocated a reference to the work plan in general. In conclusion it admitted however that it should not be under paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that the action plan could be specified in later paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Brazil and postponed its reply until the following paragraphs.

The Delegation of **India** shared the points raised by Brazil and asked the Delegation of Israel to withdraw its amendment. It pointed out the discrepancy between the English and the French texts in paragraph 6. It agreed that one should not limit the reflection to the sole 5 Cs. Amendments should be reflected in French as well.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to withdraw its reference to the 5 Cs. One should not reinvent the wheel. Furthermore it agreed with the Delegation of France about "questions importantes".

La Délégation de la **France** a souhaité ajouter les thèmes débattus la veille en les énumérant dans le paragraphe 6.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the position of the Delegation of France regarding the key points, but highlighted that they should not be seen as complete as there is a need for broader reflection of the debate.

La Délégation de la **France** a accepté avec des réserves de laisser le paragraphe 6 sur un plan plus général.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** advocated the inclusion of the key points identified the previous day, in accordance with the conclusions of the debate.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** volunteered to extract the eight key points from the discussion and include them in the Draft Resolution. It added that 2 or 3 additional key points could be added like awareness-raising. It noted that the will expressed yesterday to work together on a regional level could not be found in the text. It stressed the fact that the Plan of Action needs to be linked with the budget. One should examine and revise the existing mechanisms.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that it would be premature to list all points, the word 'important' would be sufficient.

The Delegation of **Israel** insisted on including the 5 Cs in the action plan.

The **Chairperson** declared the "*chapeau*" of paragraph 6 adopted and opened the discussion on paragraph 6a).

The Delegation of **India** withdrew co-sponsorship in the amendment submitted by the Delegation of Israel and raised its concern about the meaning of the amendment it read. It stressed the need to firstly reflect upon the *Convention* in terms of conservation and sustainable development not in comparison with other conventions. It wondered if at all this could be only addressed in a separate paragraph.

The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Advisor whether withdrawals from sponsorships were possible.

The Delegation of **Israel** accepted the suggestion made by the Delegation of India to add a paragraph to include the additional points raised on the importance of the relationship between the *Convention* and other international normative instruments.

The Delegation of **Germany** submitted a point of order. It pointed out that it was the role of UNESCO to find a consensus. It emphasized that States Parties have the right to make amendments.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the Rio and Johannesburg Declarations and expressed its satisfaction with the original version of the text. It pointed out that elaborations could be found in the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to return to the original draft of paragraph 6a).

The Delegation of **Brazil** added a grammatical correction.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6a) adopted*.

The **Chairperson** introduced the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel to paragraph 6b).

The Delegation of **Bahrain** suggested to change the procedure for the sake of efficiency and to move paragraph 6b) to the end of paragraph 6. Thus the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel would become paragraph 6g).

The **Chairperson** accepted the suggestion proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested an amendment to paragraph 6b) with a reference to public image and awareness-raising.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the point raised by the Delegation of Bahrain to put this amendment at the end.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested focusing on the five initial points under paragraph 6 and then move on to the additional amendments.

La Délégation de la **France** a soutenu l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Canada et déploré le fait qu'il ait été retiré prématurément.

The Delegation of **Canada** clarified that it did not withdraw its amendment on "credibility" and expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of **India** suggested splitting paragraph 6b) and moving its second part to the end of paragraph 6. It further stressed that the public image is somewhat different from the awareness-raising.

The Delegation of **Hungary** supported the amendment submitted by the Delegation of Canada and stressed that the paragraph should not be split.

The Delegation of **Germany** raised a point of order. It objected that the suggestion made by the Delegation of Bahrain to change the sequence

of paragraphs was not proper for a fruitful discussion. It doubted about the possibility of placing all changes at the end to be a positive one.

The **Chairperson** informed that those comments referred to the procedures and therefore declared them points of order.

The Delegation of **Georgia** supported the proposals made by the Delegations of the United States of America and Canada, but questioned the wording. It felt uncomfortable about the words "Public image". Hence it suggested improving the wording by adding reference to communication.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** pointed out the redundancy in the points raised. It underlined the fact that the second part of this paragraph was to be found also in paragraph 6d).

The **Chairperson** decided to remain with the previous version of the text as the *Global Strategy* is another aspect of the question.

The Delegation of **Namibia** asked whether its proposed changes on awareness-raising and communication would be taken into account especially regarding the community involvement.

La Délégation de la **France** a soutenu la crédibilité du système du patrimoine mondial dans son ensemble et non pas seulement en ce qui concerne la crédibilité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle a suggéré des termes tels que "image publique, crédibilité et sensibilisation".

The **Chairperson** informed that this had been pointed out by the Delegation of Germany before.

The Delegation of **India** asked for the points raised by Namibia to be shown on the screens and pointed out that the wording needed to be improved. It also emphasised that the whole *Convention* is not being questioned here but only certain issues.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested not opening that discussion again and moving on with the agenda. It supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil on the 5 Cs. It suggested deleting the whole paragraph 6b) in order to avoid raising the question again later.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** showed understanding for both the approaches of the Delegations of India and Israel but advocated the

solution promoted by the Delegation of Hungary which is a compromise. It also added that the debate was now about World Heritage in general and about its credibility and public image.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** made a suggestion to improve the clarity of paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of India for a better structured paragraph 6. It recognized that it is a complex issue. It clarified that the notion of credibility already includes the public image, awareness-raising and involvement of local communities.

The **Chairperson** commended the logic of the proposal made by the Delegation of Japan and showed concern about the length of the discussion with eight more States Parties to take the floor.

La Délégation de la **France** a dit ne pas avoir d'opposition à proprement parler.

The Delegation of **Spain** raised a point of order and requested asking the General Assembly for its support of the proposal made by Japan.

The Delegation of **Germany** raised a point of order and proposed to ask the General Assembly for objections to the proposal made by the Delegation of Japan.

The **Chairperson** asked the floor about any objection.

La Délégation de la **France** a affirmé que la crédibilité est en étroite liaison avec l'image publique. Aussi elle a proposé d'indiquer "la crédibilité de l'image publique de la *Convention* et la sensibilisation à celle-ci".

The Delegation of **Germany** emphasised that the term 'credibility' refers to the World Heritage List and not to the *World Heritage Convention*.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** est d'avis qu'il ne s'agit pas de la crédibilité de la *Convention*. Selon elle, à partir du moment où la *Convention* est adoptée, elle devient crédible. Ici, d'après elle, la Délégation de la France évoque la crédibilité de l'image.

The Delegation of **Hungary** admitted that the General Assembly was far from the original intentions. It suggested not going into the different elements of credibility, but dealing with credibility of the whole World Heritage system only.

In this connection the **Chairperson** informed the General Assembly about the difference between a summary record and a decision, the latter being binding.

The Delegation of **India** urged to focus on the topic and integrate the suggestions made previously by the Delegations of France and Spain. It asked the General Assembly whether the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Japan was supported or not.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** raised a point of order asking to check whether there was a broad majority for the current version of the text to proceed.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out the faulty wording in the French version indicating "soutenu" for "sustained".

La Délégation de la **France** a critiqué la qualité de la version française. En français "sustainable" ne se traduit pas par "soutenu" mais plutôt par "durable".

The Delegation of **Germany** deplored the fact that its proposal was not reflected in the text.

The Delegation of **Japan** raised a point of order stressing the arbitrary character of the text on the screen as the reference to communities had been deleted. It requested not to add any further elements to the paragraph and agreed that the text referred to the credibility of the public image.

The **Chairperson** made a reference to the original text version and elaborated how the text evolved. He suggested a simplified text based on what had been discussed.

La Délégation de la **France** a expliqué que la Délégation du Japon ne s'était pas opposée au texte affiché à l'écran. Elle a souligné d'autre part à destination du Président que favoriser un amendement au détriment des autres reviendrait à ignorer les contributions de plusieurs Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the text version shown on the screen and the original version likewise. It highlighted that it was in the interest of all States Parties to come up with the best possible text that is a consistent one. Therefore it would be advisable that all States Parties wishing to introduce any amendments do so during the lunch break.

The **Chairperson** asked for objections to the current version of the text.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** raised a point of order: Did one speak of the text on the screen?

The Delegation of **Ireland** did not object, but expressed its confusion. Since the version of the text shown on the screen did not make sense it preferred not to adopt it.

The **Chairperson** agreed that there was a language issue, however he deemed the message contained in the text reasonable. He asked the sponsors of the amendment to cooperate with the Secretariat during lunch break to finalize the text.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that four words had been wrongly deleted and thus the text would make sense if these four words were brought in again.

Sharing Ireland's confusion about the current version of the text the Delegation of **Japan** suggested taking a break. It added that it could not understand the meaning of "the credibility of the public image".

The **Chairperson** adjourned the session and suggested to finalize the text during the lunch break. He further announced that the Minister of Culture of Brazil would make a presentation on Brasilia at 3 p.m.

**17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
to the *World Heritage Convention***

Wednesday, 28 October 2009
15:00-18:00

ITEM 9

FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*
Adoption of the Draft Resolution (discussion continued)

Documents: WHC-09/17.GA/9
 WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9
 WHC-09/17.GA 9 Rev

The **Chairperson** deplored the fact that the quorum was not obtained and therefore the Resolution could not be adopted. He invited the Minister of Culture of Brazil to deliver his presentation.

The **Minister of Culture of Brazil** presented the organization and plans for the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Brasilia.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Minister of Culture of Brazil and asked the floor whether States Parties wished to ask questions.

La Délégation de la **France** a salué le dynamisme du Brésil. Elle a demandé si la réunion d'experts sur les Paysages urbains historiques qui se tiendra à Rio de Janeiro en décembre 2009 sera nationale ou internationale.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Expert Meeting was expected to suggest a draft text for recommendation and adoption of operational guidelines on Historic Urban Landscapes.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** asked about the relationship between the Expert Meeting in Rio de Janeiro and the future Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes. Will the World Heritage Committee work in parallel to the elaboration of this Recommendation? Or will the Committee wait for the results of this Expert Meeting to start working on Historic Urban Landscapes?

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that there are two distinctive processes. The Recommendation of Historic Urban Landscapes was decided by the 33rd Session of the General Conference and covers all historic urban landscapes and not only those inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a demandé si la représentation des experts aux réunions de Rio de Janeiro en décembre 2009 et de Paraty au Brésil en mars 2010 sera équilibrée.

The **Minister of Culture of Brazil** confirmed that the participation of developing countries will be assisted to guarantee balanced participation.

The Delegation of **Spain** wished to know if the Expert Meeting organized in Rio de Janeiro would take place in the Category 2 Centre.

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of this Resolution 17 GA 9 and expressed his wish to finish the adoption process today. As the General Assembly is not a drafting group he requested it to be tolerant.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6b) adopted* and moved to paragraph 6c).

La Délégation de la **Suisse** a indiqué que son intervention n'avait pas pour but de bloquer le processus mais au contraire de faire participer tous les Etats parties au processus. A propos du « développement des capacités », il faudrait selon elle ajouter après « des Etats parties » « et d'autres acteurs importants ».

The Delegation of **India** wished to add "notably in developing countries".

La Délégation du **Maroc** a indiqué qu'en français il conviendrait de parler de « renforcement des capacités » en langage UNESCO plutôt que de « développement des capacités ».

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6c) adopted*. He moved to paragraph 6 d).

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** wished to reflect about this paragraph in the context of the One UN reform.

The Delegation of **India** was of the opinion that this does not reflect the debate from the previous day.

The **Chairperson** offered the Delegation of Viet Nam to submit its amendment later.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6d) adopted* and moved to paragraph 6e).

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6e) adopted*.

The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 6f) and noted that during the debate on the previous day, States Parties had requested to link the 1972 *Convention* with other conventions. This proposal was made by the Delegations of Estonia and Israel.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the Delegation of Israel and referred to UNESCO Chairs.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stressed the fact that this means the Man and Biosphere programme, but this is not included in this text.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 6f) adopted*.

The **Chairperson** announced that paragraph 6g) had been deleted.

The Delegation of **India** asked why it had been deleted. It requested the words "and the representativeness of the World Heritage List" to be mentioned somewhere in the Resolution.

La Délégation de la **France** s'est dite en faveur de la représentativité. Toutefois, elle a pensé que la mention de la crédibilité n'était pas nécessaire car elle va de soi.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wished to indicate the full title of the *Global Strategy* in paragraph 6d).

The **Chairperson** declared the whole *paragraph 6 adopted*.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegates to move to the new paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Canada** recalled that it had made an amendment to this paragraph.

The Delegation of **Jordan** underlined the importance of capacity-building.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **Bahrain** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The **Chairperson** was of the view that capacity-building is linked to many topics.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 7 adopted*.

The **Chairperson** introduced paragraph 8 for adoption.

The Delegation of **India** deplored the formalism, condemning the demand to communicate “in writing”.

The Delegation of **Canada** wished to indicate "prefers in writing".

The Delegation of **India** explained that it was not only about Members of the World Heritage Committee but about every State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** was of the opinion that the proposal made by the Delegation of India was not adequately placed in this text. It preferred to put it at the end.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Jordan** wished to obtain some guidelines before making a decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the amendment made by the Delegation of Canada.

La Délégation de la **France** a confirmé son accord avec les trois paragraphes proposés par la Délégation du Canada

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed but expressed the need for higher transparency and thus the need to remain “in writing” in order for comments can be put on the website. Furthermore it wished to accept in

the debate at the 34th session all States Parties and not just those who are Members of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia to continue this debate during the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** also supported keeping the reference for discussion “in writing in order to have better record and facilitate information exchange.

The Delegation of **Yemen** supported the Delegation of Australia about the website of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** criticized the word “preferably” asking how it would be possible and how would one expect this to be implemented?

The Delegation of **India** explained that some delegations are not able to submit views in writing and therefore there should be also a possibility for them to participate in a debate.

The Delegation of **Argentina** raised a point of order that none of the Delegations had accepted such a wording and that it needs to be clarified.

The Delegation of **India** was also of the view that observers ought to be given the floor. Therefore it recommended keeping paragraph 9 as it was.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a expliqué qu'il faudrait retirer " de préférence " et garder « par écrit ».

The Delegation of **India** refused to delete this until the General Assembly adopts this text.

The Delegation of **Hungary** said that this had been adopted.

The Delegation of **Spain** concurred with the Delegation of Hungary. This text was accepted in good faith and there were no objections. It is thus adopted. It requested the Delegation of India to show some understanding.

The Delegation of **India** complained that in the noise it thought that "preferably in writing" had been deleted. It wished to be respected.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the General Assembly could be paralyzed due to an already adopted paragraph and expressed the fact that this was unacceptable.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** asked what would happen if the mention 'in writing' was not indicated. It was of the view that it is compulsory to put everything in writing.

The Delegation of **India** stressed the fact that some Delegations are well organized and others are not.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a soutenu la préoccupation de la Délégation de l'Inde, car elle dit avoir connu un cas similaire. Aussi il conviendrait de notifier très clairement « par écrit »

The Delegation of **Argentina** explained it was the whole sentence which was not accepted.

The Delegation of **Hungary** raised a point of order asking to delete the text as requested by the Delegation of India. It informed that it had to leave.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that the text would be adjusted and that according to the procedure the consultation mainly is done by circular letters.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraphs 8 and 9 adopted*.

The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **Israel** inquired about different types of Expert Meetings and indicated that Expert Meetings could be international, regional, national and local.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that according to UNESCO classification of meetings, Expert Meetings belong to category VI meetings and their organisation depends on States Parties.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a expliqué que les « réunions d'experts » telles que mentionnées peuvent paraître comme étant régionales. Toutefois,

pour les pays en développement, il conviendrait d'indiquer que les pays qui le souhaitent pourraient obtenir le soutien de l'UNESCO.

The **Chairperson** agreed but indicated that there would be budgetary and geographical balance issues.

The Delegation of **Brazil** confirmed the explanation provided by the Director of the World Heritage Centre regarding the UNESCO format of Expert Meetings. It agreed with the Secretariat about the organization of these meetings and supported the last paragraph of this draft. The World Heritage Centre could negotiate with the States Parties the geographical distribution of experts attending these meetings.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that the Expert Meetings should be category VI meetings.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** argued that the type of a meeting should not be specified.

The Delegation of **Japan** also supported the proposal to leave the possibilities opened to organize different kinds of meetings. Additionally these meetings should not be restricted to certain regions but be opened to all.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that the category of a meeting can be decided by the host country.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 10 adopted*.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** inquired who would be financing these Expert Meetings.

The Delegation of **Australia** confirmed that they would be financed by the organisers.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** added that in order to ensure full regional representation these Expert Meetings would be category 2 meetings.

The Delegation of **India** explained that category 2 and category 6 meetings have different financial implications. It added that the organization of such meetings do not only include expenses for the delegates but also all other relevant logistic and secretariat expenses which are to be taken into consideration.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** a expliqué que la catégorie de la réunion n'a pas été établie pour l'instant, car ce choix dépendait des discussions à venir entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Etats parties. C'est à ces derniers de décider. Il a alors fait référence au chapitre G, article 5, des Textes fondamentaux, qui décrit les huit catégories de réunions, trois étant à caractère représentatif, et cinq à caractère non représentatif. La réunion envisagée relèverait donc de la catégorie II ou VI.

The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Delegations of Australia and Bahrain and asked the World Heritage Centre to initiate consultations on Expert Meetings to be discussed during the next session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation of **Israel** added that it had already sent a written amendment of the paragraph asking the World Heritage Centre and the States Parties to facilitate and initiate consultations on meetings and agenda. It read the paragraph to be added and asked the World Heritage Centre to coordinate these activities

The **Chairperson** said that it is an administrative issue and asked the World Heritage Centre to explain.

La Déléation de la **France** a réfuté le terme d' "opacité " employé alors que cela relève de la souveraineté même des Etats parties qui sont libres de soumettre toutes les propositions qu'ils souhaitent

The Delegation of **Argentina** explained that category II meetings have specific rules and are decided through the Executive Board and the Director-General. The procedure already exists and there is no need to invent it. The General Assembly would not need to take a specific decision regarding this. It was of the opinion that one could have consultations without having to organize a category II meeting. This would leave some flexibility until the final decision-making process.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** was of the view that the whole process should not be complicated. It wished the choice of experts to be transparent and the geographical representation to be guaranteed. Every region should be represented. This General Assembly has no mandate to take decisions which have budgetary or financial aspects. However it wished to know if the costs for such a meeting would be borne by the Regular budget or from the World Heritage Fund. All of this issue should be subject to a negotiation.

La Délégation de la **France** a exprimé son accord avec le point de vue de la Délégation de Sainte Lucie qui lui paraît particulièrement pertinent. Une partie des coûts sera assumée par l'Etat partie invitant la réunion. Elle a estimé que la phase préalable envisagée par la Délégation d'Israël est tout à fait pertinente. Elle se dit reconnaissante envers les Délégations de l'Australie et de Bahreïn, mais considère toutefois que ces Etats parties ne pourront pas prendre en charge tous les coûts. Elle aimerait donc avoir au moins un ordre de grandeur de ces coûts, en raison des ressources limitées du Fonds du patrimoine mondial et du programme ordinaire.

The **Chairperson** recommended not going into micro-management. The General Assembly's role is to discuss the greater picture. He said that negotiations were going on. A process had already been established. He warned that if the General Assembly keeps on discussing it will discourage rather than encourage States Parties to host Expert Meetings of this kind. He asked the General Assembly to look at the text as amended by the Delegation of Israel.

The **Chairperson** informed that the session should be adjourned within ten minutes as interpretation services would stop. He asked the floor whether paragraph 11 could be left in its original text subject to finding an appropriate adjective.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 11 adopted*. He moved to paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **Brazil** announced that the World Heritage Committee session in Brasilia would be a category VI meeting and that it would assist developing countries which would wish to participate.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 12 adopted*. He moved to paragraph 13

The Chairperson declared *paragraph 13 adopted*. He moved to paragraph 14.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that paragraph 14 is about the involvement of the Advisory Bodies and that it included an amendment prepared for the final paragraph which is related to this paragraph as well.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 14 adopted*. He moved to paragraph 15.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it had submitted a digital correction for paragraph 15 which recommends working together with UNESCO Chairs.

La Délégation de la **France** a exprimé son accord avec la proposition d'amendement de la Délégation d'Israël. Elle a estimé que parler dans ce paragraphe de réunion "prévue" pour les centres de catégorie 2 est un peu incohérent. Ces centres venant à peine d'être créés, une telle réunion relève pour l'instant du virtuel.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that this meeting would take place in a year time. In the meantime some category 2 centres would have been established and States Parties will be welcome to this meeting. It is important for the prospective of the category 2 centres to meet the colleagues.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** indicated that the General Assembly has no mandate to take decisions with financial implications. And if such a meeting for category 2 centres was organised it had to be financed by extra-budgetary funds.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that all activities of category 2 centres will be paid by extra-budgetary funds.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** requested writing in English in full: "World Heritage" instead of using the abbreviation "WH" in order to harmonize the various paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Spain** agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel and, taking into account the observations of the Delegation of Saint-Lucia, asked not to delete « develop an effective network ». Additionally it underlined the need to develop category 2 centres as effective instruments.

The Delegation of **India** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to inform the General Assembly about the venue of this meeting.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the venue was still not known. The meeting would be held at the end of 2010 therefore it

would be decided soon. The venue will depend on the negotiations with the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked changing in the English version “through” by “with”.

La Délégation du **Maroc** a déclaré vouloir attendre la version française du texte, sans laquelle elle estime ne pas pouvoir discuter.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** asked for the French version.

The **Chairperson** asked to move on.

La Délégation de la République islamique d'**Iran** a estimé que le mot local n'était pas approprié et demandé à ce qu'il soit enlevé.

The **Chairperson** said that the Secretariat was facing a problem and that the General Assembly should wait. He announced that the General Assembly could not move on until the French version would be ready.

La Délégation d'**Egypte** s'est demandé s'il était possible d'accepter le mot "planned". Peut-on dire qu'une réunion est prévue alors que les dates n'en sont pas encore déterminées ?

The **Chairperson** said that the plan does not depend on a date but that the General Assembly could take “plan” away.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** expressed its confusion concerning the amendment suggested by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Delegation of **India** considered that the Director of the World Heritage Centre had the responsibility to ensure that the last paragraph could be adopted. It also suggested changing “local” by “national”.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for 10 minutes more.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** supported the amendment made by the Delegation of India and asked to move on with this paragraph.

The **Chairperson** asked the floor if there were any more suggestions.

The Delegation of **Belgium** did not agree with the changes proposed by the Delegation of India. In Belgium for example, research is not national

but provincial. It also asked which problem would generate the word "local".

The Delegation of **India** suggested writing "at the regional and national levels".

The Delegation of **Iran** (Islamic Republic of) agreed with this suggestion.

The Delegation of **Belgium** agreed as well.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 15 adopted*

The **Chairperson** introduced paragraph 16 which had been amended by the Delegation of Italy.

La Délégation de **France** a expliqué que sa proposition allait dans le même sens que l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Italie. L'auditeur externe est par définition indépendant, et il est par conséquent parfaitement capable de mener une telle évaluation. La Délégation de **France** ajoute un second amendement à la fin du paragraphe, par l'ajout des mots "la *Stratégie globale* et de l'initiative PACTe".

The Delegation of **Australia** asked to make an amendment at the end of the paragraph.

The Delegation of **India** asked for the meaning of PACT to be explained.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** inquired more information about what the PACT was.

The Delegation of **Iran** (Islamic Republic of) suggested deleting reference to PACT in this paragraph.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that PACT is an acronym for "Partnerships for Conservation".

The **Chairperson** asked to write the acronym and then the name in brackets.

The Delegation of **Italy** explains its amendment. As the evaluation is not clear in its view, it asked for more clarifications

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the French Cour des Comptes had been mandated by the General Conference as the external auditor of UNESCO from 2005 to 2011. It is therefore the French Cour des Comptes which will do the evaluations as UNESCO External Auditor.

La Délégation de **France** a précisé qu'en français, ce n'est pas "l'auditeur externe" mais le Commissaire aux Comptes, et que ce type d'évaluation fait partie de ses attributions.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked to change the end of the paragraph.

La Délégation de l'**Iran** (République islamique d') appuie la proposition de la Délégation de l'Italie. Elle estime qu'on ne peut pas limiter cette évaluation à l'auditeur externe. L'UNESCO doit pouvoir utiliser un autre expert indépendant si elle le souhaite. En outre, l'ajout de la mention de l'initiative PACTe risque de compliquer l'affaire. La Délégation de l'**Iran** (République islamique d') demande donc à la Délégation de la France de retirer ses deux amendements afin que le texte puisse être approuvé sans perdre de temps.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** wished to know whether it had understood correctly what was requested from the Centre to be presented at the 18th session of the General Assembly: a summary about the Future of the *Convention* including an evaluation of the *Global Strategy*. It wondered if this evaluation could be implemented by the World Heritage Centre or an independent evaluator.

The Delegation of **Iran** (Islamic Republic of) requested that its name be mentioned about the two deletions requested in this text.

The Delegation of **India** insisted in requesting an independent evaluation of the World Heritage Centre. Thus it asked to remove mention of France in the text.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of France.

La Délégation de **France** a expliqué qu'elle s'inquiétait des coûts. Elle voudrait une évaluation indépendante, ce qui est le cas de la Cour des Comptes de la France. Par ailleurs, la proposition de demander l'évaluation par le Commissaire aux Comptes de la France répond à un souci d'économie.

The Delegation of **Saint-Lucia** requested to keep the mentioning of PACT. It reminded what happened with the evaluation of the management of the World Heritage Centre. It does not wish to spend funds to hire someone who is not a World Heritage specialist. It asked about the amount needed to hire an independent consulting company.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that the interpreters would stay only until 6 p.m. After 6 p.m. the cost will rise significantly. He asked the General Assembly to decide to continue the debate or stop.

The **Chairperson** considered that if the General Assembly was precisely talking about cutting costs it should not debate beyond 6 p.m.

La Délégation du **Maroc** aurait aimé que le Conseiller juridique soit présent afin de trancher la question. Elle a estimé que le Commissaire aux Comptes avait la compétence nécessaire pour mener ce genre d'évaluation. Il l'a d'ailleurs prouvé par le passé et peut donc parfaitement trouver le personnel adéquat pour évaluer le Centre du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its concern about the costs of an external audit. It acknowledged the Delegation of France for its proposal to do the work but expressed some doubts about this possibility because of the specificity of World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Jordan** considered that it is very important to have an independent evaluation by an external auditor.

The **Chairperson** expressed his concern that the General Assembly would go into micro-management issues and that “independent” should be sufficient.

The Delegation of **Spain** stressed the fact that there was a general consensus on the need to implement an independent evaluation and asked to postpone the decision about the choice of the evaluator to another session.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the proposal of an external auditor

The Delegation of **India** said that the solution would be to keep references to the external auditor and mention the “implementation of the *Global Strategy*”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendments made by the Delegation of India and requested the adoption of the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Grenada** requested to check the concordance between the English and French texts.

The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Advisor to make an input on it.

The Delegation of **India** was of the view that the advice of the Legal Advisor was not needed anymore.

The **Chairperson** announced that the French version was in concordance with the English one.

The **Chairperson** declared *paragraph 16 adopted*. And therefore he informed that the whole Item 9 was adopted.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the General Assembly for its good work and adjourned the 17th session of the General Assembly.

Resolution 17 GA 9

The General Assembly,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-09/17.GA/9 and WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9*
2. *Noting that the World Heritage Convention is approaching universal ratification and that its 40th anniversary is to be celebrated in 2012 and, therefore, that it is appropriate to reflect on the successes of the Convention and also how it can best be implemented to meet the emerging challenges and opportunities it faces while also increasing its relevance and engagement with communities around the world,*
3. *Considering the results of the Workshop to reflect on the Future of the World Heritage Convention, which took place from 25 to 27 February 2009 at UNESCO Headquarters, and taking into account the subsequent discussions of the consultative group established by the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd Session, held in Seville in June*

2009;

4. *Welcomes the progress report on the implementation of the Global Strategy for a Credible, Representative and Balanced World Heritage List from 1994 to 2009 (Document WHC-09/17.GA/9 Part III) while observing that improved indicators and analysis would be necessary for future reports of progress achieved in the framework of the Global Strategy;*
5. *Notes that the draft vision presented to the General Assembly (Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9) should take into account suggestions made during the debate on this issue at the 17th session of the General Assembly so that it could be used as a basis for further discussion at its 34th and 35th sessions by the World Heritage Committee and by the General Assembly of States Parties at its 18th session in 2011;*
6. *Calls upon States Parties to cooperate in continuing the process of reflection on the future of the World Heritage Convention, addressing inter alia the following important topics:*
 - a) *the relationship between the World Heritage Convention, conservation and sustainable development;*
 - b) *the credibility of the public image of the Convention, awareness raising and community involvement in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;*
 - c) *capacity building for States Parties, particularly for developing countries and other stakeholders, to implement the World Heritage Convention;*
 - d) *strategic management and the Global Strategy for a Credible, Representative and Balanced World Heritage List;*
 - e) *the efficiency and transparency of decision-making of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention;*
 - f) *working relationships with other relevant conventions and UNESCO programmes;*
7. *Welcomes the development of a draft Action Plan, recognizing that further work is required to both prioritize actions, as well as develop an effective implementation*

plan;

8. *Requests that the views of all States Parties related to the identification of priorities in the Action Plan be solicited by the World Heritage Centre prior to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2010;*
9. *Further requests that discussion take place during the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2010 involving all interested States Parties to the Convention to prioritize the actions in the Action Plan based on input from States Parties, to reorganize it on the basis of the strategic objectives (5 Cs) and to report back to the General Assembly of States Parties at its 18th session;*
10. *Invites States Parties to take the initiative in convening expert meetings on the above issues with a view to identifying key policy questions for discussion during the 34th and 35th sessions of the World Heritage Committee and submit them for consideration and adoption by the General Assembly at its 18th session in 2011;*
11. *Welcomes the offer of Australia and Bahrain to host an expert meeting in Bahrain on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention to identify opportunities for increasing the efficiency and transparency of these procedures, and requests the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with these two States Parties, to launch and facilitate consultations on the meeting's scope and agenda for discussion by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;*
12. *Also welcomes the offer of Brazil to host in 2010 an expert meeting on the relationship between the World Heritage Convention, conservation and sustainable development;*
13. *Further welcomes the offer by Australia and Japan to host such a meeting pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Decision **33 COM 14A.2** in Document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9 including the issues of Tentative Lists and International Assistance for improving the process of nominations;*

14. Calls upon the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other partners to increase significantly their support to States Parties, particularly less developed countries, in the identification of cultural, natural and mixed properties for Tentative Lists as well as in the harmonization of their Tentative Lists taking into account existing relevant studies;
15. Requests the World Heritage Centre to convene in 2010, through extra-budgetary funding, a meeting of the existing UNESCO category 2 centres active on World Heritage issues together with representatives of relevant UNITWIN networks, UNESCO Chairs, other regional and national research centres at the regional and national levels and graduate programmes in order to facilitate their activities and to strengthen their regional relevance;
16. Also requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to help facilitate the above activities and to provide the General Assembly at its 18th session in 2011 with a summary of the work undertaken in relation to the reflection on the future of the Convention, including an independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnership for Conservation Initiative (PACT), based on indicators and approaches to be developed during the 34th and 35th sessions of the World Heritage Committee.

Résolution 17 GA 9

L'Assemblée générale,

1. Ayant examiné les documents WHC-09/17.GA/9 et WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9,
2. Notant que la Convention du patrimoine mondial approche de la ratification universelle et que son 40e anniversaire sera célébré en 2012, et qu'il convient par conséquent de réfléchir aux réussites de la Convention ainsi qu'à la meilleure façon de la mettre en œuvre pour relever les nouveaux défis auxquels elle est confrontée et saisir les opportunités, tout en développant sa pertinence et son

engagement avec les communautés à travers le monde,

- 3. Prenant en considération les résultats de l'Atelier de réflexion sur l'avenir de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, qui a eu lieu du 25 au 27 février 2009 au Siège de l'UNESCO et tenant compte des discussions ultérieures du groupe consultatif établi par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 33e session, tenue à Séville en juin 2009,*
- 4. Accueille favorablement le rapport d'avancement sur la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial crédible, représentative et équilibrée de 1994 à 2009 (document WHC-09/17.GA/9, section III), tout en observant que des indicateurs et une analyse de meilleure qualité seraient nécessaires pour les futurs rapports d'avancement présentés dans le cadre de la Stratégie globale ;*
- 5. Note que le projet de vision d'avenir présenté à l'Assemblée générale (document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9) devrait tenir compte des suggestions faites lors du débat sur ce point à la 17e session de l'Assemblée générale, pour qu'il soit utilisé comme une base de discussion par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à ses 34e et 35e sessions et par l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à sa 18e session en 2011;*
- 6. Engage les États parties à coopérer à la poursuite du processus de réflexion sur l'avenir de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, en examinant, entre autres, les questions importantes qui suivent :*
 - g) le rapport entre la Convention du patrimoine mondial, la conservation et le développement durable ;*
 - h) la crédibilité de l'image publique de la Convention, la sensibilisation et l'implication des communautés à la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial ;*
 - i) le renforcement des capacités des États parties, notamment pour les pays en développement et d'autres acteurs, à mettre en œuvre la Convention du patrimoine mondial ;*
 - j) la gestion stratégique et la Stratégie globale pour une*

Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, crédible et équilibrée ;

- k) l'efficacité et la transparence de la prise de décision des organes statutaires de la Convention du patrimoine mondial ;*
 - l) des relations de travail avec les autres conventions et programmes pertinents de l'UNESCO ;*
- 7. Accueille favorablement le développement du projet de Plan d'action, reconnaissant qu'un travail supplémentaire est nécessaire afin d'établir des priorités entre les actions et de développer une mise en œuvre efficace de ce Plan ;*
 - 8. Demande que le Centre du patrimoine mondial sollicite le point de vue de tous les Etats parties au sujet de l'identification des priorités du Plan d'action avant la 34e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2010 ;*
 - 9. Demande en outre que des débats se tiennent au cours de la 34e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2010, impliquant tous les Etats parties à la Convention intéressés, afin d'établir des priorités parmi les actions du Plan d'action, en se basant sur les contributions des Etats parties, de réorganiser le Plan d'action sur la base des objectifs stratégiques (5C) et de faire rapport à l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à sa 18e session en 2011 ;*
 - 10. Invite les États parties à prendre l'initiative d'organiser des réunions d'experts sur les points qui précèdent afin d'identifier les questions clés en matière de politique générale à discuter lors des 34e et 35e sessions du Comité du patrimoine mondial et à les soumettre pour considération et adoption par l'Assemblée générale à sa 18e session en 2011 ;*
 - 11. Considère favorablement l'offre de l'Australie et de Bahreïn d'accueillir une réunion d'experts à Bahreïn sur les procédures décisionnelles des organes statutaires de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, afin d'envisager les possibilités d'augmenter l'efficacité et la transparence de ces procédures, et demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial, en coopération avec ces deux États parties, de lancer et de faciliter des consultations sur la portée et l'ordre du jour de la réunion pour discussion par le Comité*

du patrimoine mondial à sa 34e session en 2010 ;

- 12. Considère également favorablement l'offre du Brésil d'accueillir en 2010 une réunion d'experts sur le rapport entre la Convention du patrimoine mondial, la conservation et le développement durable ;*
- 13. Considère en outre favorablement l'offre faite par l'Australie et le Japon d'accueillir une réunion faisant suite au paragraphe 14 de la Décision **33 COM 14A.2** incluse dans le document WHC-09/17.GA/INF.9, comprenant la question des Listes indicatives et de l'Assistance internationale pour améliorer le processus de préparation des dossiers d'inscription ;*
- 14. Engage le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Organisations consultatives et les autres partenaires à accroître de manière significative leur soutien aux États parties, en particulier dans les pays moins développés, concernant l'identification des biens culturels, naturels et mixtes pour les Listes indicatives ainsi que l'harmonisation de leurs Listes indicatives, compte tenu des études déjà réalisées à ce sujet ;*
- 15. Demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'organiser en 2010, grâce à un financement extrabudgétaire, une réunion des Centres de catégorie 2 de l'UNESCO existants, qui jouent un rôle actif en matière de patrimoine mondial, en coopération avec les représentants des réseaux UNITWIN pertinents, les Chaires UNESCO, d'autres centres de recherches à l'échelle régionale et nationale et des programmes universitaires, afin de faciliter leurs activités et de renforcer leur pertinence régionale ;*
- 16. Demande également au Centre du patrimoine mondial et aux Organisations consultatives de contribuer à faciliter lesdites activités et de présenter, à l'Assemblée générale des États parties lors de sa 18e session en 2011, un bilan des travaux entrepris par rapport à la réflexion sur l'avenir de la Convention, y compris une évaluation indépendante par le Commissaire aux comptes de l'UNESCO sur la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie globale depuis ses débuts en 1994 jusqu'en 2011, et de l'Initiative de partenariats pour la conservation (PACTE), sur la base des indicateurs et des*

approches qui seront développés lors des 34e et 35e sessions du Comité du patrimoine mondial.