



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

19 GA

WHC-13/19.GA/INF.12

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
19-21 November 2013

SUMMARY RECORDS

RESUME DES TRAVAUX

FIRST DAY – Tuesday, 19 November 2013

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Professor Karunaratne Hangawatte (Sri Lanka)

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

1A. Opening of the General Assembly by the Director-General

No document

The General Assembly was opened by the **Director-General**, who welcomed all States Parties to the 19th session of the General Assembly.

The Director-General greeted Her Highness Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and thanked the outgoing Chairperson, His Excellency Dr SOK An, Vice Prime Minister of Cambodia.

She indicated that the General Assembly will have to address some fundamental questions as the sustainability and the credibility of the 1972 Convention, which are linked.

The Director-General underlined that the risk is to see the credibility of the Convention thrown into doubt, which will have a direct impact on the capacity to act. She indicated to be pleased to see that a specific item on the agenda of the General Assembly was dedicated to this matter.

She also underlined that other critical issues will have to be addressed, and notably the follow-up to the report of the External Auditor on the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative, the follow-up to the *Future of the World Heritage Convention* and the Action Plan and Vision 2012-2022; but also the critical budgetary situation and the recommendations of the recent evaluation of the working methods of the Culture Conventions.

La Directrice générale rappelle la pertinence de la Convention, autorité morale suprême dans le domaine culturel, et l'importance de sa mise en œuvre face aux menaces qui pèsent sur le patrimoine. Elle rappelle à ce titre, la mobilisation du Comité et celle de la communauté internationale- soutenue par l'UNESCO - notamment pour la protection du patrimoine syrien et malien.

La Directrice générale insiste sur la nécessité de garantir que l'objectif principal de cette Convention soit de protéger et de promouvoir les patrimoines sur le long terme par le renforcement des capacités notamment. Elle réaffirme l'ambition de l'UNESCO dans ce cadre ainsi que son engagement personnel.

[Le discours de la Directrice générale dans son intégralité se trouve à l'Annexe I du présent document]

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

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/INF.1B

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 1B**

The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran presented **H.E. Professor Karunaratne Hangawatte (Sri Lanka)** as Chairperson of the 19th session of the General Assembly.

The Delegations of **Nicaragua**, the **Russian Federation** and **Madagascar**, on behalf of their electoral groups, supported this proposal.

This proposal was approved by acclamation.

Upon proposals by the Delegations of Canada and Zambia, **Switzerland and Zimbabwe** were proposed as Vice-Chairpersons. These proposals were approved by acclamation.

The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates presented the candidature of **Mr. Hassan Al-Lawati (Oman)** as Rapporteur of the 19th General Assembly. This proposal was approved by acclamation.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 1B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 1 of the Agenda.

ITEM 2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE 19TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND TIMETABLE FOR THE ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

2A. Adoption of the Agenda of the 19th session of the General Assembly

Documents: WHC-13/19.GA/2A
WHC-13/19.GA/INF.2A

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 2A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** briefly introduced documents 2A and INF.2A, and indicated that the Agenda was established by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session, and was composed of 11 items.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 2A** was adopted.

2B. Adoption of the Timetable of the 19th General Assembly and of the Timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/2B

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 2B**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the provisional timetable as contained in Document 2B.

The **Chairperson** reminded the States parties and Observers of the time limit for interventions, i.e 3 minutes for States Parties, 2 minutes for Observers.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 2B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 2 of the Agenda

**ITEM 5 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (UNESCO, 2011)**

No document

Draft Resolution: 19 GA 5

Ms. Hyosang JO (Republic of Korea), Rapporteur of the 18th session of the General Assembly of States Parties, presented her Report. She reminded the Delegates that the 18th session was held between 7 and 9 November 2011, and that the 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention then stood ahead. She also reminded the Delegates that 12 Resolutions were adopted, including Resolutions related to the financial, administrative and conceptual aspects of implementing the World Heritage Convention.

She recalled that Algeria, Colombia, Germany, India, Japan, Malaysia, Senegal, Serbia and Qatar were elected to the World Heritage Committee.

The Rapporteur indicated that the main issues and highlights of the session were mainly centered on the Strategic Action Plan for the Future of the Convention, together with the evaluations of the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative by the external auditor, who presented the evaluations of both programs and recommendations for better implementation in the future.

The General Assembly welcomed and applauded the work on the Future of the Convention and its action plan setting out 6 goals with priorities.

Regarding the Global Strategy the External auditor highlighted numerous problems, stating that the Strategy lacks a clear definition of the objectives and appropriate indicators to evaluate its results.

The External Auditor's recommendation for the PACT Initiative was also duly noted.

Furthermore, the rapporteur indicated that a report on the activities of Category 2 Centres related to the World Heritage Convention was presented.

Finally, issues on financial and managerial aspects were adopted taking note of the status of States parties' contributions and the means for increasing additional voluntary contributions.

Ms Jo reaffirmed its honour for having been elected Rapporteur of the General Assembly and indicated having put her utmost consciousness and dedication for the task.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 5** was adopted.

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

[The entire presentation of Mrs Jo is included in Annex II of the present document]

**ITEM 6 REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE**

Document: See document **37C/REP/13**

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 6**

The **Chairperson** welcomed H.E. Dr Sok An and thanked the Kingdom of Cambodia for its hospitality in hosting the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee. He invited the Delegates to refer to Document 37C/REP/13, which was also presented to the General Conference. He underlined that the Report does not require any decision on the part of the General Assembly.

The Chairperson of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, H.E. Dr Sok An, expressed its pleasure to participate in the Assembly, and offered his warmest congratulations to Mrs Irina Bokova for her re-election as Director-General. He emphasized that the General Assembly is an occasion for all Delegates to meet every 2 years and review the implementation of the *Convention*, but also to participate in the reflection on its importance, its credibility, its implementation, and on the forthcoming challenges it shall face. He noted that the General Assembly also has the responsibility to elect the members of the World Heritage Committee, and that elected members bear a great responsibility.

Dr Sok An underlined that after the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention* the coming year should be a starting point for the renewal of the Convention. He expressed no doubts that, thanks to the States Parties' and the Secretariat's efforts, the Convention shall remain an important tool of UNESCO's work. He then mentioned Document 37C/REP/13 which has been consolidated according to the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Convention, and presented the main sections of the report.

Dr Sok An reminded the Delegates that Brunei, Palestine and Singapore have joined the *Convention*, and that a new bureau, including the new Chairperson, H.E. Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani, and a new Rapporteur, Mr Francisco J. Gutierrez, have been elected.

He presented an overview of the new properties inscribed, and underlined that Fiji, Lesotho and Qatar had their first properties inscribed on the List.

He underlined that in the light of its work to improve transparency, the World Heritage Centre launched, with the support of the Flemish Government, an online database on the monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, which is publically available online. He mentioned that 20 requests for International Assistance were approved, and also reminded the States Parties that Periodic reporting is a very important exercise for the follow-up and monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties.

Mr Sok An reminded the States Parties of the celebrations that surrounded the 40th Anniversary of the Convention, and that a number of events were organised worldwide on the theme of World Heritage and Sustainable Development. He also mentioned the Global

Training Strategy, the Youth Forum, as well as other educational activities related to World Heritage and emphasized that a number of publications have been produced by the Centre on World Heritage issues.

He reminded the Delegates that a revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and the Rules of procedures of the World Heritage Committee was adopted during the last session of the Committee.

En conclusion, M. Sok An propose des réflexions pour l'avenir. Il exprime tout d'abord des inquiétudes au sujet des ressources financières consacrées à la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Il souligne le travail considérable fait par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et par les organisations consultatives : ICCROM, UICN et ICOMOS, et appelle à leur donner les moyens d'assumer leur tâche.

Enfin, il appelle les délégués à éviter l'écueil de la politisation des débats. Il recommande aux délégués de veiller à la sérénité des travaux du Comité du patrimoine mondial, durant les prochaines sessions.

[L'intervention in extenso de Son Exc. Dr SOK AN se trouve en Annexe III du présent document]

The **Chairperson** thanked H.E. Dr Sok An and proposed to take note of the Report contained in Document 37C/REP/13.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the World Heritage Convention is a very important instrument. It recalled the debate of the previous day during the General Conference, when the Director-General spoke about looting and destruction in Libya and Syria and of the need to preserve World Heritage Sites. It regretted that the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the Executive Board were only against Israel, not other countries that are endangering properties. It further regretted that missions are sent only to Jerusalem, but not to Libya and Syria. It finally regretted the politicizing of the debate, which endangers the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Syria** congratulated the newly elected Chairperson of the General Assembly and thanked the outgoing Chairperson. It reminded the other States Parties that a number of properties have been added to the List in Danger, including Syrian properties, and that the inscription of the Old City of Jerusalem on the List of World Heritage in Danger was because of the occupation of the Palestinian Territories, which is threatening the Arab nature of the heritage, which is also threatened due to the extended nature of the occupation. The Delegation also highlighted that what is currently happening in Syria is due to armed groups fighting against the authorities in Syria, i.e. an internal matter, and asked the other Governments not to interfere with their internal politics and those of the Occupied Territories.

The Delegation of **Libya** congratulated the newly elected Chairperson of the General Assembly, and wished to make a distinction between the accidental threats to World Heritage and the threatening of World Heritage on purpose, under a specific organised plan. With reference to the statement made by the Ambassador of Israel, the Delegation mentioned that what was happening in Palestine now was the result of something planned by

a Government that claims to be democratic. The Delegation also underlined that Libya is coming out of a difficult period, yet makes efforts to protect its heritage, despite many difficulties, and looks forward to a constructive cooperation with UNESCO and other helpful bodies.

The **Chairperson** underlined that the report of H.E. Dr Sok An was not open for debate, and reiterated that the General Assembly should take note of the report.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 6** was adopted.

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

ITEM 3 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/3
WHC-13/19.GA/INF.3A
WHC-13/19.GA/INF.3B

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 3**

The **Chairperson** reminded the Delegates that elections would be held in Room X.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Delegates that no country in arrears with its Contributions can be candidate. He indicated that the final list of candidates standing for election, Document INF.3A.REV, was issued 48 hours before the opening of the General Assembly. He mentioned that all candidate countries have cleared their dues. He then presented the Rules for the elections as well as the elections timetable.

The **Chairperson** moved to the designation of two Tellers for the elections.

Two candidates were proposed, Mr Gábor Soós (Hungary) and Mrs Alicia Gonzalez Gutiérrez (Cuba).

The two designated Tellers were approved by the General Assembly, and the Chairperson invited the Delegates to proceed with the Elections to the World Heritage Committee in Room X.

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the ballot for the reserved seat for State Party without property

Total votes: **175**
Valid votes: **171**
Invalid votes/Abstentions: **4**
Majority required: **86**

Results of Voting:

Candidates	Number of votes in favour
Angola	79
Jamaica	92

The **Chairperson** declared **Jamaica** elected Member of the World Heritage Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

FIRST DAY – Tuesday, 19 November 2013

SECOND MEETING

14.30 p.m – 15.00 pm

Chairperson : H. E. Professor Karunaratne Hangawatte (Sri Lanka)

ITEM 3 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the first ballot's general election:

Total votes: **173**
Valid votes: **169**
Invalid votes: **4**
Majority required: **85**

Results of Voting

Candidates	Number of votes in favour
Angola	37
Burkina Faso	61
Croatia	107
Finland	115
Honduras	79
Kazakhstan	104
Kenya	60
Korea, Republic of	104
Lebanon	86
Mauritania	73
Palestine	70
Peru	87
Philippines	116
Poland	93
Portugal	111
Romania	67
Saudi Arabia	67
Tanzania, United Republic of	83
Turkey	121
Viet Nam	93
Zambia	51

The **Chairperson** declared **Croatia, Finland, Kazakhstan, Korea (Republic of) Lebanon, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Turkey and Viet Nam** elected Members of the World Heritage Committee.

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

The **Delegation of Croatia** expressed its sincere thanks to all States Parties that have supported its candidature.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked all supporters of its candidature and assured its commitment for a dedicated collaboration with all States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

Les Délégations du **Gabon, Sénégal et du Burkina Faso** soulignent leur acceptation du résultat du scrutin. Elles expriment leurs profondes regrets, leur déception et préoccupation qu'aucun des pays africains n'ait été élu au Comité du patrimoine mondial. Les Délégations expriment leur espoir d'une future représentation géographique équitable au prochain Comité.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** remercie tous les états membres qui ont apporté le soutien à la candidature vietnamienne.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its thanks to all supporters of the Lebanese candidature.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked all States Parties for their support and confidence.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked all Delegations that have expressed confidence in Poland.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** thanked all States Parties that have supported the candidature of the Philippines and reassured that the Philippines would not inscribe any sites on the World Heritage List during its mandate.

The Delegation of **Mauritania** congratulated all newly elected members of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe, Senegal and Tanzania** congratulated the newly elected Committee members and expressed their deep regrets and disappointment about the absence of new African countries at the Committee. They recalled the provisions of the *World Heritage Convention* regarding balanced geographical representation and further recalled the recommendations made by the External Auditor in 2010. The delegations stressed the utmost importance and urgency to develop an appropriate mechanism for a balanced geographical representation of States Parties in the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked all supporters of the candidature of Kazakhstan.

The Delegation of **Tonga** stated that its region, the Pacific, will not be represented at the next World Heritage Committee. However, it expressed its confidence that the elected States Parties will consider the challenges that the Pacific countries were facing.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the States Parties that expressed their trust on Portugal. It further expressed its deep regrets that no African country has been elected and pointed to the need to reflect this situation in order to preserve universal representation in the Committee.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its thanks to all supporters of its candidature. It underlined that Peru shares the regret and the frustration expressed by the countries of Africa. It indicated its hope and conviction that the current General Assembly will be the last session in which countries are not elected on the basis of a balanced and equitable geographic distribution. In respect thereof, the delegation underlined the utmost need to bring the electoral system in line with the provisions of the convention.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its gratitude for the support that led to the election of the Republic of Korea as a member of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated the newly elected Committee members. It assured that the Committee would take on board the interests of all States Parties. However it underlined the importance of a review of the issue of geographical representation.

La Délégation du **Maroc** exprime ses félicitations aux Etats parties élus. Elle constate que la question de la représentativité est posée avec acuité et regrette vivement que l'Afrique ne soit pas représentée au Comité. Elle estime que le principe de l'universalité de la Convention doit être respecté à l'avenir.

The Delegation of **Palestine** congratulated the newly elected Committee members and expressed its sincere thanks to all States Parties that supported the candidature of Palestine.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the newly elected Committee members and underlined its disappointment with the outcome of the election. It recalled that Africa is a global priority to UNESCO. It stated that it would put its trust on the serving and newly elected Committee members to review the issue of underrepresented regions.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** remercie les Etats parties qui ont soutenu la candidature de l'Angola et se joint à la demande des pays africains pour une régulation de la représentation géographique.

The **Delegations of Nigeria, Zambia, Niger, Grenada and Kenya** stated that they are sharing the utmost concern and disappointment already expressed by many States Parties regarding a balanced geographical representation at the Committee. They requested the General Assembly to reexamine the election procedures.

The **Chairperson** congratulated all newly elected Member States. He closed the Item 3 of the Agenda and adjourned the session until 20 November, 2.30 pm.

The meeting rose at 3.00 pm.

SECOND DAY – Wednesday, 20 November 2013

THIRD MEETING

2.30 pm. –6.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Professor Karunaratne Hangawatte (Sri Lanka)

ITEM 4 REVISION OF THE *RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY*

Document: *WHC-13/19.GA/4*

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 4**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 4 explaining that it was added to the provisional Agenda of the General Assembly during the 37th session of the Committee in Phnom Penh, at the request of several members of the Committee. He invited the Director of the World Heritage Center to present document WHC/-13/19.GA/4

The Director of the Centre indicated that in 2007, the General Assembly decided to examine all possible alternatives to the current election system and to establish an open-ended Working Group in order to make recommendations on this issue. Following two years of extensive consultations among States Parties under the leadership of H.E Ambassador Kondo (Japan) Chairperson of the Working Group, a number of recommendations to amend the Rules of Procedure were submitted to the consideration of the General Assembly and adopted in 2009. The major recommendations were: *reiterating the invitation to States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, to voluntarily reduce their term of office from six to four years; a rule of a four-year gap between mandates in the World Heritage Committee; establishment of reserved seat(s) for States Parties from one or more Electoral Group(s) that risk(s) not being represented in the composition of the next Committee and a streamlined electoral mechanism with absolute majority in the first round of each ballot and relative majority in the second round.* A recommendation was also to maintain a reserved seat for a State Party with no property on the List. The Director of the Centre indicated that these recommendations were implemented, but that, in the meantime, the evaluation of the global strategy by the external auditor observed that the last recommendation was not in the interest of the implementation of the Global strategy because it implicates that if a State Party become a member of the Committee the chances of getting a site inscribed on the World Heritage List increases. The Director indicated that based on this, a proposal to remove the rule reserving a seat to a State Party without a property is presented to the consideration of the General Assembly. The Director also underlined the improvement due to the simplification of the election rule. He finally indicated that the difficulties encountered by the Kondo Working Group regarding the designation of seats on the Committee as per electoral groups have been reflected in the Working document that is submitted to the General Assembly for consideration. The Director of the Centre recalled that amendments to the Draft Resolution proposed have been received.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre and opened the item for discussion.

The Delegation of **Brazil** introduced the draft amendment by stressing that the pursuit for equitable representation was not a new issue, and that there were various ways to reach this goal. Since 2001, the Committee has pursued this matter, and referred to the informal consultation held by Brazil during the 37th World Heritage Committee whose conclusion was to bring into line the *Rules of Procedure* of the World Heritage Committee with those of other UNESCO Cultural Conventions, namely the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which provide for election on the basis of the composition six Electoral Groups of UNESCO. He recalled that all UNESCO intergovernmental bodies follow this rule and that there was no reason why the World Heritage Committee should act differently.

The Delegation of the **United States** showed its appreciation to the Brazilian proposal and mentions that wide and a diverse representation in the Committee is critical. He stated that it was attractive and would potentially advance the equitable representation of its democratically ally Israel, whose fair and equitable treatment of Israel throughout UN systems is a key foreign policy US goal. However, the Delegation indicated that the proposal could undermine the universality of the Convention. Currently the Committee is based on a special system that sustains a competition of competence between the best experts throughout the world, not a system on prearranged outcome based on group politics. He believes this system should be exported to other UNESCO Cultural Conventions and not the opposite. As the World Heritage Convention is a crown jewel, the Delegation believed that time is needed to consider how to improve the election system without jumping into any conclusion.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked Brazil for the interesting proposal. It expressed understanding for the disappointment of some countries about the outcome of the elections and wished that more African countries would have been elected. However, it suggested that decision should not be taken too rapidly. He recalled that election system has been changed several times and acknowledge the values of the result of the Kondo working group. It concluded by stressing on the importance free elections based on expertise but believed that more time is needed before changing the system again.

La Délégation de **l'Italie** exprime ses regrets quant au fait qu'une région aussi importante que l'Afrique soit représentée par un pays seulement au sein du Comité. Néanmoins, la Délégation approuve l'argumentation de la Délégation des Etats Unis et souligne l'importance de l'expertise professionnelle du Comité et la valeur des campagnes électorales libres et ouvertes. La Délégation reconnaît que le système actuel est caractérisé par quelques faiblesses mais considère qu'une amélioration doit être développée avec prudence et sérénité.

The Delegation of **Cuba** welcomed the proposal of Brazil and other countries. It stressed that the issue of the composition of the Committee has been discussed for a long time. It regretted the result of the elections which excluded an entire continent from an

intergovernmental Body that should be universal, and supported the principle of fair geographic distribution. It insisted on the necessity of taking action immediately.

The Delegation of **Nicaragua** welcomes the initiative by Brazil and other countries. As stated also before the General Conference, Nicaragua is in favor of this proposal. It stated that representation in such an important Convention must be universal and that the issue had been discussed for long time. It believed that the experts of developing countries are as experts as those of the rest of the world and questioned claims of a ranking level of experts, as lack of respect for the intelligence coming out of developing countries. It stressed that time had come to improve the elections system to the Committee by basing it on the principle of fair geographical distribution.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime ses doutes relatifs à l'argument de la compétition entre experts et pointe la disparité des ressources des différents Etats parties. En revanche, elle estime que le danger d'une banalisation du Comité réside plutôt dans le déséquilibre géographique que par un nouveau règlement électoral. En outre, la Délégation évoque le rapport des experts concernant la crédibilité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et la relation entre le mandat au Comité et l'inscription des sites. Par conséquent, elle assure son soutien à la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Denmark** welcomed efforts to improve geographical representation. The observation of the system of election, over a considerable period of time, had lead to the conclusion that the present system needs improvement and should be based on expertise and fair chances to be elected to the Committee. The Delegation supported the Brazilian amendment. It also requested to have the paragraphs on mandate period, names of experts and halt on nominations reintroduced in the draft amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** regretted the results of the election and noted the process of reflection that took place under the Kondo Working Group recalling its key recommendation that regional groups be represented. However it expressed doubts over the fact that the Brazilian will help reaching those goals. It understood the concerns that regional groups could put forward clean slates, thus diminishing the technical aspect of Committee composition and agreed with the Delegation of Senegal on putting forward CVs so that the technical competence of the Committee could be well understood. It proposed a period of further reflection by continuing the Working Group and invite former Ambassador Kondo to lead it. Noting that 106 States parties have never served on the Committee, out of which $\frac{1}{4}$ are African States, it further proposed to increase the diversity of the membership of the Committee by allocating a single reserved seat to a Member State who never served on the Committee and this will serve the goal of Brazil better than allocating numerical quotas.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed discontent with the outcome of the elections. It acknowledged that geographical distribution was not a new issue but felt that more time was needed for reflection. It agreed with the Delegation of Cuba that campaigns for the Committee had become very costly and this was the reason why his Delegation has not run for the Committee recently. It agreed with Delegation of Australia regarding the reserved seat on the Committee and proposed to increase the interval between terms to 10 years to avoid that some Members dominate the Committee. It proposed to have more reflection through a Working Group and an extraordinary session of the General Assembly to

resolve the issue once for all. It proposed to use the Brazilian proposal as a base to be improved for ensuring total expertise in the Committee and to reinstall the proposal of a halt on nominations from States parties while members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** stressed that the Brazilian proposal was not directly linked with the results of the elections. It supported it with minor amendments. It regretted that expertise of African members has not been utilized, as African countries were not represented. It recalled that the Brazilian proposal was in line with the observations of the 2010 External Audit and stressed the importance of rectifying anomalies by implementing recommendations such as those of the Kondo Working Group. It concluded by recalling that African countries do not have the resources to conduct costly campaigns and hoped that the Convention would not become a battle between the haves and the have-not.

The Delegation of **Belgium** indicated that it shared the opinion of the room and the statements by Senegal and the UK. It mentioned that no equitable representation on the Committee has been achieved during the past elections, even though everyone seems to think this is essential. However, it recalled that the debates of the Kondo group showed this was not an easy topic and that it therefore considered that time is important to reflect on this subject. . Furthermore, to solve the issue of groups ending up with one seat in the Committee, it recommended look already at the safety net that was proposed by the Kondo Working Group and increase the minimum seat per group from 1 to 2 which could be a temporary solution while discussing more in depth how the current Rules can be improved. It noted that there are some issues that cannot be solved today and that these should be discussed in a Working group that can propose a solution to the next session of the General Assembly.

The Delegate of **Ecuador** indicated to be a co-sponsor of the draft amendment presented by Brazil. It believed that the result of the elections were not fair, undemocratic and based not on the quality of the experts but on negotiations between various countries. It stressed that the issue had been discussed since many years and insisted on the necessity of reforms to ensure fair representation of all the States parties in the Committee.

The Delegation of **Spain** called for a further in-depth study to improve the composition of the Committee. It stated that the principle objective should be to guarantee the excellency of the experts on the Committee.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted the wide consensus of the need to achieve fair geographical distribution on the Committee and it recognized that pre-defined distribution according to electoral group was an option. However it stressed the importance for States Parties to designate experts in cultural and natural heritage as stipulated in the Convention. It regretted the politicization of the Committee. It welcomed the decision of Philippines to halt on nominations during their mandate and encouraged other delegations to do likewise in order to avoid possible conflict of interests. It also hoped that State Parties would refrain from seeking consecutive mandates in the Committee.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle l'article 8.2 et le fait que la Convention n'évoque pas le critère de la géographie concernant la représentativité mais ceux de la culture et des

régions. Elle considère donc que la distribution du nombre des sièges à partir du seul critère de groupe électoral n'est pas suffisante ; en revanche d'autres critères comme le nombre de sites inscrits devraient être pris en compte. De plus, la Délégation remarque que dans le passé, la sur-représentativité de certaines régions n'était pas toujours corrélative avec la dominance économique ou politique de ces régions.

La Délégation de la **France** reconnaît que le résultat des élections n'est pas satisfaisant et a des conséquences négatives pour tous. Elle soutient la proposition de la constitution d'un groupe de travail qui aurait pour mission de formuler des recommandations quant à la composition du Comité pour la prochaine Assemblée générale. La Délégation souligne que ces recommandations devraient assurer l'efficacité et la légitimité du Comité. Elle précise que la Délégation de la France est prête à participer à ce groupe de travail.

La Délégation du **Niger** exprime son soutien aux propositions de la Délégation du Sénégal et de la Délégation du Brésil.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** soutient la proposition de la Délégation du Sénégal. Elle rappelle les contributions prestigieuses des Etats parties africains comme membres du Comité dans le passé.

The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the Brazilian proposal but had reservation of the formula proposed. It supported the creation of a Working Group as well as the German proposal of two allocated seats for electoral groups with others open for competition. It felt that this solution would combine the representative element with the competitive element.

The Delegation of **Honduras** supported the Brazilian proposal. It stressed that the result of the elections, by excluding a priority region, indicated clearly the need to change the mechanism of elections. However, the Delegation was not in favor of the proposal of a Working Group.

The Delegation of **Chili** welcomed the Brazilian proposal. It claimed that there was no evidence that geographical distribution would be detrimental to the quality of the Committee. It stated that the information available to the General Assembly could lead to a fully informed decision to solve the issue.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** supported merit-based representation but underlined that expertise was universal and not a prerogative of any region of the world. It stated that fair and balance geographical distribution, as envisaged in the Brazilian proposal, was the only possibility to ensure fair representation of all countries in the Committee. It encouraged the Assembly to adopt the Draft Resolution presented by Brazil and requested an implementation strategy to give preference to unrepresented categories in the next elections, namely Africa.

The Delegation of **Egypt** regretted that Africa was not represented on a Committee that should include all cultures. It reminded that the principle of fair geographical representation is important but noted that this cannot be achieved by reserving seats for each group. It supported the application of quotas as well as qualification and expertise but felt that both indicators needed to be considered.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, as a co-sponsor, indicated to fully support the Brazilian proposal and what have been said by other African States. It stressed that this was not a new issue and that it was about fairness. It indicated that it did not support the proposal of a Working Group and that a decision should be taken today and that a vote might settle the issue. The Delegation mentioned that for what concerned expertise, it concurred to what had been said by Zimbabwe and Senegal who opposed claims that suggested there is only expertise in certain regions of the world. It indicated not to believe that the nature of the Committee would not be affected or damaged in terms of expertise and be thus a political body, as there were proposals in the Draft Resolution to take care of that. It insisted on the fact that a decision should be taken today.

The Delegation of **Namibia** fully supported the spirit of the Brazilian proposal but stressed that membership in the Committee should not be perceived as a right. It stressed that the notion of competitiveness and rotation was the responsibility of the electoral groups. It feels that this was the only way to achieve a credible World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the Brazilian amendment and the importance to ensure geographical representation in the Committee. It opposed the argument of trivialization as other bodies use geographical representation and this system had not been shown to be detrimental.

La Délégation du **Canada** rappelle la priorité de l'Afrique dans la stratégie globale de l'UNESCO et l'urgence de trouver une solution au problème de la représentativité géographique. Elle rejoint la proposition de la Délégation du Royaume Uni.

The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** indicated to be a co-sponsor of the Brazilian amendment stressed that politicization was a separate issue and should not be mingled with that of lack of geographical representation. It did not agree to the proposal of a Working Group and stated that a decision needed to be taken on the basis for the Draft Resolution proposed.

The Delegation of **Argentina** regretted the results of the elections that excluded an entire regional group. It supported the Brazilian proposal of an equitable geographical representation as a matter of justice and believed that the creation of a Working Group would postpone the discussion without ensuring a successful outcome.

The Delegate of **Kenya** welcomed the Brazilian proposal. It agreed with other delegations on the importance of the quality of expertise and indicated that the ideal of the Convention of equitable geographical representation were correctly illustrated in the proposal of Brazil.

The Delegation of **El Salvador** as a co-sponsor of the amended Draft Resolution believed that it represented an effort toward the democratization of the Committee. It urged the General Assembly to take innovative decisions to ensure diversity and not to maintain the status quo. It recalled that all countries have good experts and felt insulted by the comments of some States Parties. It encouraged the Assembly to move into the future with fair representation.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** estime qu'une représentation équitable au sein du Comité est indispensable. Elle constate qu'il y a des intérêts divergents mais un consensus sur la nécessité d'un changement durable. Par conséquent, elle appuie la proposition du Brésil et souhaite vivement que le changement soit opérationnel dès les prochaines élections.

La Délégation de la **Grèce** indique son soutien à la proposition du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Peru**, as co-sponsor of the amended Draft Resolution, hoped that decision could be taken. It disagreed with the arguments presented against the Draft Resolution. It reminded that the technical experts role of the Committee should be carried out together with the principle of fair geographical distribution, as stated in article 8 of the Convention. It concluded by stating that the politicization could be prevented by applying the provision of the Convention on equitable representation.

The Delegation of **China** highlighted that World Heritage is a flagship program of UNESCO, and that all Member States must take full part in it to be successful. It considered that geographical representation must be guaranteed, but given the complexity of the issue, China supported the establishing of a Working Group and convening an Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly on this subject. It indicated that the Government of China was ready to finance the organization of such an extraordinary session in China.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** endorsed the issue of regional representation in particular for small islands and developing states like the Caribbean. It suggested that a regional approach should be taken and the countries in the same regions should work together and strategize in order to get better support for candidacy and regional representation.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** exprime ses regrets concernant le résultat des élections. Elle approuve la proposition de la Délégation du Sénégal et apporte son soutien à la proposition du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the Brazilian proposal. It stated that it did not understand why the Convention should be the exception. It noted that the World Heritage Committee is an intergovernmental and not an expert body but also stressed the importance of expertise. It supported the Delegation of Denmark regarding the need of CVs of experts and of holding elections even in the case of clean slate in order to maintain legal coherence with the *Rules of Procedures*.

The Delegation of **Norway** welcomed the Brazilian proposal and reminded it was in line with former proposals made by his country in previous sessions of General Assembly. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of Denmark in relation to the CV of experts. It proposed to amend rule 13.2 of the *Rules of Procedures* to extend the gap on candidatures to the Committee from 4 to 6 years to ensure better rotation.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** supported the Brazilian proposal and noted that the Committee should have both expertise and universality, as the lack of representation of an entire region was making the legitimacy of the Committee's decision at stake. It stressed that the matter was not only fair geographical distribution but also the credibility of the

Convention. It recalled that in 2011 elections results risked to leave out the Latin American region together with the results of the election it was evidence for the need of change to address the issue of equality.

The Delegation of **Colombia** as a co-sponsor of the amended Draft Resolution and a member of the Committee, stated the importance of expertise as the basis to evaluate candidatures to the Committee. It recalled that Latin America experienced a situation similar to Africa in 2011 and stated its support to the inclusion in the Agenda of an item to improve representation on the Committee before the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee. It supported the proposal of taking a decision at the current session of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Finland** regretted the result of the elections being a country that has supported a stronger voice of Africa in the international community. It appreciated the proposal of Brazil that is opening up alternatives. It agreed on the universality of expertise worldwide and to a halt on nomination proposals for Committee members. The delegation stated that it will apply that provision during its term of mandate. It noted the necessity of better defining the gap between mandates in the Committee and find ways to support countries that lack the resources to apply to the Committee. It agreed with the Delegations of Denmark and Norway with regard to expertise and not enlisting one's own sites while members on the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** favored equitable representation of all regions. It stated that while voting was a possibility, another was trying to find consensus. It mentioned that if the priority was to ensure better representation in time for the next General Assembly, it suggested the creation of a Working Group whose results could be enforced by the next meeting and asked the opinion of the Legal Advisor on that proposal.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** déplore les résultats du vote et insiste sur la nécessité d'en comprendre les raisons. Elle approuve la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil en indiquant souhaiter y apporter des amendements.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** soutient la proposition du Brésil.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed regrets for the outcomes of the elections. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of Australia to reserve a seat for countries that never served in the Committee. It also supported the proposal of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly and was in favor of extending the rotation period for membership in the Committee. It hoped that a consensus could be found to allow the Assembly to move forward on this issue.

The Delegation of **Bangladesh** stressed that the principle of equitable geographical representation was widely applied in the UN system and that the Committee should not be the exception. It believed that the establishment of geographical quota system was the only solution to ensure better universal participation. It fully supported the amended Draft Resolution.

The Delegation of **Tonga** supported equitable representation of regions and cultures of the world. It noted that the results of the elections drifted away from this goal. However, it expressed doubts as to whether the Draft Resolution proposed by Brazil would ensure better representation of small countries in the Committee and suggested to reserve one seat of Electoral Group 4 to the Pacific countries. It stated that while they might lack the expertise and financial means, they are strongly supporting the mandate of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported equitable representation on the Committee but agreed that time was needed for reflection and supported the proposal of a Working Group as a way to find a consensus before the next General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Nepal** shared the concerns and interests of previous speakers about achieving a more equitable representation in the Committee and supported the Brazilian proposal.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime sa déception quant aux résultats des élections. Elle met en garde contre le danger de dénaturer les rapports de responsabilité entre le Comité et l'Assemblée générale. En conséquence, elle propose de donner mandat à un groupe de travail et d'organiser une Assemblée générale extraordinaire une journée avant la prochaine Assemblée générale pour voter sur une proposition.

The Delegation of **Barbados** regretted the results of the election and recalled that a similar situation happened for the Latin America region in 2011. In recalling Barbados' experience in the Committee, the delegation stated that geographical representation in the Committee did not mean automatic support for nominations from the same region, but bringing a regional perspective. It considered equitable geographical representation as a way to rectify the imbalance of geographical distribution of sites on the World Heritage List. It supported the proposal by Brazil, but given the complexity of the issues, it also was in favor of the creation of a Working Group that would discuss issues with far-reaching implications for the future of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Iceland** supported in principle the Brazilian proposal. It suggested approving the changes on an experimental basis and reviewing them after 4 years, during the 21st session of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** stressed the urgency of geographical representation given the result of elections. It congratulated the Delegation of Brazil for the proposal, but supported the creation of a Working Group to find a mechanism for ensuring equitable representation.

The Delegation of **Costa Rica** supported the Brazilian proposal. Given the importance of the issue discussed, it indicated that delay was not advisable as it involved the credibility and effectiveness of the Committee. It stressed that the concept of universal heritage also implies inclusiveness and representativeness. It suggested taking a vote on the Brazilian proposal.

The Delegation of **Pakistan** underlined the seriousness of the issue of leaving out a regional group from the Committee. It disagreed with the argument that geographical distribution

would dilute the expertise in the Committee. It supported the Brazilian proposal but given the concern expressed by a large number of members of the General Assembly, it suggested the creation of a Working Group to help reaching consensus before coming to a final decision.

The Delegation of **Austria** stated its support for geographical balance but in the framework of a consensus. It suggested using the momentum created by the results of the elections to encourage the creation of a Working Group with the mandate of finding a compromise solution acceptable to all.

The Delegation of **Hungary** fully shared the concern of the General Assembly regarding the results of the elections but stated it was the responsibility of the members of the General Assembly to ensure representation while casting its votes. It reminded that the results of the Kondo Working Group were reached by consensus and wished that every opportunity to reach consensus in relation to the election process should be attempted. It supported more reflection on the issue and thanked Brazil for putting forward a proposal and the issue to discussion.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** noted that the result of the elections showed the necessity to review the procedures. It stated that African countries inability to be elected was not linked to a lack of expertise and agreed with the Delegation of Jamaica regarding the link between representativity in the Committee and effective implementation of the Convention. It supported the Brazilian proposal.

The Delegation of **Grenada** stressed the importance of establishing a fair mechanism for equitable representation by a consensual decision. It supported the proposal of Belgium and others to increase the reserved seats for regional groups from one to three. It supported the proposal of a halt of nominations for States parties serving in the Committee with the exception of those not having sites on the World Heritage List or for transnational inscriptions. It supported the Delegation of Tonga on ensuring equitable representation within regions and the Delegation of Namibia on the importance of the availability of experts CVs. It suggested leaving three seats open to competition to further correct some unbalance.

The **Chairperson** recognized that there was wide disagreement and recalled, as mentioned by the delegation of Hungary, that pervious decisions were taken by consensus. He reminded the proposal of China to fund a Working Group and the importance of reaching consensus. In this case he would inquire the Legal Advisor on the feasibility of an extraordinary session with extra-budgetary funds to arrive at such consensus.

The Delegation of **Argentina** indicated it believed there was a consensus, a general feeling is the room to go along with the Brazilian proposal with some amendments in order to reach a compromise solution.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Advisor to take the floor on this subject.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that neither the Rules of Procedures nor the Convention envisioned the possibility of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly. However, the Rules of the Committee allow for convening an extraordinary session of the Committee if requested by 2/3 of its members. In the absence of a specific rule of the General Assembly,

the rule of the 2/3 majority would be required to have an extraordinary session of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **India** raised a point of order and asked for a 20 minutes break for consultation as it felt there was a consensus in the room. It suggested that instead of reiterating positions a break could allow time to come back with a consensual decision.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** and **Palestine** supported the Indian proposal.

The **Chairperson** suspended the session for 20 minutes.

[.....]

The **Chairperson** asked if the informal Consulting Group has a statement and who was its spokesperson.

The Delegation of **India** informed the Assembly that the informal consulting group broadly agreed on some principles. Firstly, that geographical representation needed to be recognized in the working of the Committee and the Convention, although the details were not discussed. Secondly, that decisions should be made operational in time of the next elections, thus at least a year in advance to elections to the World Heritage Committee. Thirdly, that the Working Group would be the modality that should bring to the decisions although details on working methods and financing were not discussed. Lastly, there was reluctance to go for a formal vote and rather to find consensus although that had not been reached.

The **Chairperson** suggested establishing a Working Group that could meet 2-3 times with extra budgetary funding and finish its work a year before the next General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Ecuador, Cuba** and **Argentina** raised points of order stating that there was no consensus on the Working Group, thus the option needed to be discussed before being accepted.

The **Chairperson** stated that since there was no consensus the option was to go for a vote which would require a 2/3 majority. He recalled the two options: going for consensus or proceeding with a vote.

The Delegation of **Denmark** recalled that the consultations clearly showed that there was need of change but also of reflection. The Delegation proposed as a solution to try the new system on an experimental basis and asked if there was consensus on that proposal.

The Delegation of **Palestine** stated that there was a clear agreement from the Consultation Group on the principle of equitable distribution, but no agreement on the details. It suggested to have a decision taken during the current session that consisted of five points: 1) recall and reaffirm the principle of equitable distribution; 2) define a Working Group of limited duration; 3) define a date for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly at least a year before the ordinary session with only the item discussed on its agenda; 4) guaranteed the financial

resources to conduct the meeting 5) have the next General Assembly apply the principle of geographical distribution to the elections of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Palestine and stated that this proposal aligned with his suggestion.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with Argentina, Cuba and Mexico that there was no consensus for a Working Group. It noted that the Palestinian proposal would avoid vote which could be an advisable solution. It suggested strengthening it by inserting the need to apply geographical representation and leave to the Working Group to decide the modalities and features of the new system. It stated that if this is accepted they could go for consensus.

La Délégation du **Liban** salue la proposition de la Délégation du Palestine et propose de reprendre dans la description de la mission du groupe du travail le libellé exact de la convention de la « représentation équitable des régions et des cultures ». En outre, elle propose de répéter dans la même Résolution la recommandation aux membres du Comité de renoncer aux inscriptions des sites pendant leur mandat.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined that to have a change of the *Rules of Procedures* applicable when the General Assembly will be meeting next time, the General Assembly has to adopt something. It underlined that if the Working Group was the preferred option, an Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly should be convened to examine the outcomes of such a working group and therefore a vote was necessary to see if there was a 2/3 majority in favor of an Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly. Therefore, the Delegation suggested having a vote first and, if the Extraordinary session was approved, to discuss about the Working Group, or to vote directly on the Brazilian proposal.

The Delegation of **Pakistan** agreed on the Palestine's five points proposal. As for the proposal from South Africa it believed there was no need for a vote, as there was consensus. It suggested discussing the terms of reference of the Working Group as those need to be decided by the Assembly.

The Delegation of **Grenada** also indicated that there was no need for a vote and supported the proposal by Palestine on the condition that both the open-ended Working Group and the Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly should meet in Paris, as all Delegations could not afford to travel to meetings worldwide.

The Delegation of **Gabon** supported the Palestinian proposal in five points and its approval by consensus.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the Palestinian proposal but agreed, as suggested by the Delegation of Peru, that the terms of reference of the working group should be clearly defined and agreed with the Delegation of Grenada on the location of meetings in Paris. It asked the Secretariat if funds were available to hold a session in Paris.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the Palestinian proposal and suggests using the words of the Convention to constitute the Working Group.

The Delegation of **Albania** supported the Palestinian proposal with a clear definition of the terms of reference and agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon in following the recommendations of the External Auditor about not inscribing sites during the mandate on the Committee which were adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated to recall that the order of the agenda was reversed to allow the General Assembly to take into account the recommendations of the Kondo Working Group.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** supported the Delegation of Peru and the establishment of a mechanism for changing the *Rules of Procedures* to be adopted at the next session of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** informed the Assembly that the Secretariat had prepared a draft based on the Palestinian proposal and proposed to adopt it paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Serbia** raised a point of order. It noted that consensus had yet to be established, and proposed to set up a Drafting Group which could work on a consensual Draft Resolution and report the following day to the Assembly.

The Delegation of **Croatia, France and Albania** requested to see the text before agreeing to the proposal.

The **Chairperson** proposed to give the floor to the Rapporteur to read the proposed text.

The **Rapporteur** read the proposed text whose main points were: 1) to recall article 8 of the World Heritage Convention related to the equitable representation on different regions and cultures in the Committee; 2) to establish a Working Group of limited duration to reach a consensus amending the Rules of Procedures, based on the proposal of Brazil; 3) to hold an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, in November 2014, financed by extra-budgetary resources to adopt the proposal to be applied at the 20th session of the General Assembly.

La Délégation du **Canada** propose d'ajouter une mention précisant que le travail pourra aussi porter sur d'autres amendements/propositions qui pourraient être soumises par d'autres pays.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose d'ajouter dans le texte que la réunion du groupe de travail aura lieu à Paris. Elle réitère en outre sa proposition de rappeler de demander aux membres du Comité de ne pas inscrire des sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial pendant leur mandat.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that the draft text only took into account certain opinions while the Palestinian proposal was more inclusive. It proposed to amend the first paragraph to state that future elections of the Committee would be conducted by applying the principle of equitable representation.

The Delegation of **Cuba** agreed with the Delegation of Peru and suggested to amend the proposal with specific reference to the application of a system of quota as the result of the Working Group and the Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Norway** raised a point of order insisting on the creation of a drafting working group to discuss the terms of reference.

The Delegation of **Grenada** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Cuba. It suggested to mention in the draft, references to the funding and asked if this was available in the regular budget.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** asked to clarify what resources were available to implement the Resolution, as extra-budgetary funds were uncertain.

The **Chairperson** hoped that some State Parties would offer financial support.

The Delegation of the **United States** indicated its support to move forward to a consensus and supported the initiative by the Delegation of Palestine. However it indicated that it was not correct to determine that the work was on the basis of the Brazilian proposal, as not everybody was in agreement on this proposal. It stated that there was no reason to presuppose that this proposal would be the basis on which the Working Group would come up with a solution to equitable representation on the Committee. It asked to remove this reference in order to be able to join the consensus.

The Delegations of **Ecuador** and **South Africa** stated that the Brazilian proposal needed to be retained. It did not need to be the final one but could be a basis for discussion as many countries had agreed on that point.

La Délégation du **Liban** réitère que le terme « répartition géographique » n'est pas approprié.

The Delegation of **Palestine** indicated that it fully agreed with the Delegation of South Africa, stating that the basis for discussion should be the Brazilian proposal as it was the only proposal that have been presented. It furthermore supported the proposal of an informal drafting group to work on the text of the Draft Resolution.

The Delegations of **Chili** and **Peru** supported the proposal of an informal drafting group as suggested by the Delegations of Serbia and Palestine.

The **Chairperson** asked the General Assembly to designate a Chair for the informal drafting group. Norway was proposed and the General Assembly agreed to its chairmanship of the drafting group.

The Delegation of **Norway** invited everyone to the Working and hoped that it would be able to meet consensus.

The Delegation of **Grenada** and **Palestine** asked to be provided with the proposed text of the Draft Resolution to be provided as a basis for discussion.

The **Secretariat** informed that the text on the screen would be provided in the morning in both English and French and that the informal drafting group could meet in Room XI from 9 am onwards the next day.

The **Chairperson** declared the meeting adjourned until the following day at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.30 pm

THIRD DAY – Thursday, 21 November 2013

FOURTH MEETING

12 am. –1.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. . Exc. M. Jean-Frédéric JAUSLIN (Switzerland)

ITEM 4 REVISION OF THE *RULES OF PROCEDURE* OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continuation)

The **Chairperson** announced that the informal drafting group established under this item had not finished with its work and therefore that the Plenary will have to be reconvened at 12 am.

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

*Document: WHC-13/19.GA/7
WHC-13/19.GA/INF.7*

Draft Resolution: 19 GA 7

The **Chairperson** introduced the item and asked the Secretariat to present the report under Item 7.

The **Senior Accountant** from BFM presented the Agenda Item by commenting the two sets of Financial Statements. The first set is for the Biennium 2010-2011 and the second set is for the Interim period of the first 18 months from 01 January 2012 to 30 June 2013.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out mainly Part II of the Document, which was prepared at the request of the World Heritage Committee, drawing the attention of the General Assembly to the reduction in activities as a result of the shortfall of resources in the World Heritage Fund, presented in two ways, i.e. over the three biennia, as well as in percentage reduction in the implementation of activities. He indicated that a significant number of these activities were implemented thanks to the generous contributions of the donors and thanks to the support of States Parties that hosted these activities.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour les informations et le graphique clairs et demande au Secrétariat plus d'éclaircissements sur les retards enregistrés dans le paiement des engagements (ULO) lors du biennium précédent, notamment par rapport aux données de 2013.

The **Senior Accountant** explained that ULOs represent commitments (or activities) that have been entered into in the period but have not yet been delivered and recognized at the end of the period. He explained that data from the biennium 2010-2011 and the period 01 January 2012 – 30 June 2013 are not comparable as the current biennium's results will only be known at the year end, noting that there may be more commitments to come in the 6 months; contracts may be awarded until the end of the year for activities that have to be delivered in the biennium. This explains why there is a difference between the two reports.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** thanked the Secretariat for the report, as well as the Committee for asking for it, and noted that there is a lack of activities in the Caribbean regarding Reactive Monitoring Missions, Thematic Programmes, such as SIDS, and in 2013, regarding Reactive and Reinforced Monitoring Missions and International Assistance, not only in the Caribbean for the latter, but also in Arab States and the Pacific. It requested clarifications on the lack of activities in their region and requested for the next General Assembly the figures of extrabudgetary resources and in particular their distribution and disbursements, especially considering the high amount contributed to the *Convention*.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that in the Annex expenditures are not shown by region but globally, and that the activities were undertaken following the Committee's decisions. He further reminded that a detailed reporting showing the utilization of funds from all sources (Regular Programme, World Heritage Fund and Extrabudgetary funds) is presented annually to the World Heritage Committee and that these documents are available on the website.

The Delegation of **Estonia** thanked the Secretariat for the document and its helpful insight in understanding the increasing difficult situation of the World Heritage Fund. The Delegation said that it is disheartening to see the chronic lack of funds for supporting Sites in Danger and providing International Assistance for which the Fund was established, and stressed the need to find ways for further encouraging States Parties to make supplementary contributions to the Fund so that the Convention have the means to respond to its objectives.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for further clarifications on the column "Total Expenditure" in the Schedule of Appropriations and Expenditure.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that this question concerned Document WHC-13/19.GA/INF.7 pertaining to the previous biennium. In view of the Delegation previous question, he reminded that the Committee decides to apply the reinforced monitoring only to a specific number of sites (9 or 11 sites, and none of these sites fall in the Latin America and Caribbean region) and decides which reactive monitoring missions need to be undertaken. Expenditure shown concern only those missions that have been carried out.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 7** was adopted.

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

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

Document: *WHC-13/19.GA/8*
 WHC-13/19.GA/INF.8
 WHC-13/19.GA/INF.8A

Draft Resolution: 19 GA 8

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre presented the report under Item 8 and Document WHC-13/19.GA/8, namely its first part on determining the percentage of the States Parties'

contributions to the World Heritage Fund as per Article 16 of the Convention and its second part on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. Concerning the latter, the Director informed the General Assembly that since its 18th session, several analyses and studies were carried out and that the various options for additional resources to the World Heritage Fund (Annex I), that are voluntary for States Parties, were presented to the World Heritage Committee. He specified that, during the two Committee's sessions, the work was led by Mr. Marthinus van Schalkwyk, Representative of South Africa, who may contribute to the present discussion.

The **Director of the Internal Oversight Service (IOS)** of UNESCO presented the methodology used and the latest key findings of the IOS Audit on the Working Methods of Cultural Conventions, notably that there is a growing disparity or disconnect between the work at hand and the resources available, that the current financial model is not sustainable, that the Secretariat cannot continue to deliver on this basis and that there is a logical need to either do less or raise resources. He mentioned that there is a need to capitalize on the strong brand of the Convention. Based on the main conclusions, the Director informed the General Assembly on the need to agree on a sustainable financial model, decide on the creation of a General Trust Fund formed out of States Parties contributions to cover ordinary expenses of the Secretariat, conduct the self-assessment as decided by the General Conference as one of the inputs for the External Auditor's review on the overall governance of the Institution and for the Secretariat to continue streamlining the working methods where possible.

The Representative of **South Africa** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to highlight some of the discussions in the World Heritage Committee Budget Working Group and recalled that the issue of the sustainability of the Fund was discussed during the two sessions, that it relates to the inscription of new sites and that the increasing work within the Convention was recognized by the Group. He explained that it is understood that no State Party can be forced to pay voluntary contributions, but that measures can be taken to encourage States Parties increasing their contributions. He acknowledged that there was good discussion on the proposed options – States Parties should consider them, consider doubling their contributions for example or consider how many sites they have, ... The Group recognized the need to raise awareness among States Parties on the importance to ensure the sustainability of the World Heritage Centre's and other stakeholders' work and the risks if no action is taken. The Representative recalled that States Parties could agree to the message that came out in the Committee's decision that is to have additional contributions to the Fund. He highlighted that the simplest option is whether States Parties can double their contribution or give more. He urged for further efforts from States Parties when concluding that the situation is not sustainable and that actions definitely need to be taken.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Président, demande des précisions quant au montant alloué au Centre du patrimoine mondial dans le cadre du programme ordinaire de l'UNESCO et sa répartition, et note sa préférence pour l'adoption de l'option 2.3, qu'il juge la plus équitable.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded that all budgetary resources are presented at the World Heritage Committee annually. He further stated tentatively that the resources that will be available to the World Heritage Centre would be of approximately

10 M \$ during the biennium 2014-2015: 8 M \$ to support staff costs and 2 M \$ for activities emphasizing that these are approximate figures as the budget level as not yet been fixed.

La Délégation du **Gabon** apprécie les présentations qui ont été faites et demande au Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial et surtout au Représentant de l'Afrique du Sud quelles actions ont été engagées dans le cadre du Conseil d'administration afin de tenir les membres du Conseil informés de la situation d'urgence du Fonds.

The Representative of **South Africa** recalled the decision of the World Heritage Committee making an appeal to States Parties for voluntary contributions and explains why it is important and useful to address this issue and decide on a suggested option for voluntary contributions at the General Assembly due to the universality of the Convention.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed with the Representative of South Africa, adding that there are various ways by which States Parties are informed about the dire situation of the World Heritage Fund and the need to ensure its sustainability by making additional voluntary contributions, such as adding an appeal by the Director-General of UNESCO for supplementary voluntary contributions in the letter of assessed contributions as reflected in the draft Resolution.

Le **Président** propose d'examiner le projet de Résolution paragraphe par paragraphe.

Les paragraphes 1 à 4 sont adoptés.

La Délégation du **Gabon** propose d'invertir l'ordre des paragraphes 5 et 4, en expliquant que le paragraphe 5 qui constate l'état des contributions doit figurer avant l'appel à la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO. Cette proposition est acceptée.

Regarding paragraph 7, the Delegation of **Japan** noted that there has been no consensus on choosing any specific option in the Budget Working Group and in the World Heritage Committee, and that the options proposed to the General Assembly are similar ones. It explained that it is difficult for Japan to accept an option which allocates an amount recommended to be paid by each State Party as it would be considered as compulsory rather than voluntary. The Delegation further reminded that many States Parties still have unpaid compulsory contributions to the Fund and stressed that priority should be first given to settling those arrears. Finally, it suggested that the second part of the paragraph 7 be removed and that further options be proposed at the Committee's 38th session.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** reconnaît que le Comité n'a pas trouvé de consensus pour choisir une des options proposées, mais croit néanmoins que le choix d'une option augmentera symboliquement l'urgence de l'action et de la demande des contributions volontaires des États Parties, et exprime sa préférence pour l'option 1 comme l'Afrique du Sud, c'est-à-dire doubler la contribution ordinaire. La Délégation indique que si l'Assemblée générale ne peut se décider pour une option, il n'est pas nécessaire de demander à nouveau au Centre du patrimoine mondial des options supplémentaires, car elles existent déjà et dans ce cas il suffit de laisser la demande des contributions volontaires.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Chairperson and suggested, since it would be difficult to reach an agreement on the best option, to enumerate all of the proposed options in the resolution so that States Parties can decide which option best suits their situation. The Delegation proposed the wording for the Draft Resolution accordingly.

The Representative of **South Africa** agreed with the point made by Switzerland and Brazil's proposal. Although recognizing Japan's difficulty, it recalled that this is a symbolic measure, which gives guidance to States Parties and takes the General Assembly forward by highlighting to the States Parties that these are options/proposals to consider. The Representative expressed the position that it would not be in favour of referring back for further studies and reiterated how much study has already taken place and how much discussions and time were spent on this issue due to the fact that the options have exhaustively been discussed and examined. It concluded by suggesting to point States Parties in a direction.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the proposition made by Brazil to include all options in the Resolution with the exception of option 2. The Delegation proposed to delete option 2 considering that the minimum level is fixed at 1%.

Le **Président** fait le résumé des propositions : (i) supprimer la deuxième partie du paragraphe 7 et toute référence à une éventuelle option ou (ii) maintenir la deuxième partie du paragraphe 7 en y incluant soit une seule option, soit toutes les options (sans l'option 2) en les laissant ouvertes. Le Président propose deux possibilités : soit de voter sur la proposition du Japon, soit de parvenir à un accord sur la deuxième proposition provenant du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Japan** reminded that no consensus could be reached on the options and that it considers that it is not a good option to mention the list of proposed options. The Delegation prefers to delete the list of options from paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the President's position mentioning that if necessary a vote can be taken on this issue. It believed that a consensus may be reached within the General Assembly and requested the latter to go by what is being presented.

Le **Président** soumet d'abord au vote la proposition du Japon (i.e. supprimer la deuxième partie du point 7, et donc toute mention aux options dans le projet de Résolution), laquelle est rejetée par la majorité des Etats parties présents et votants.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its alignment with the proposition of Germany to exclude option 2 from the list of options to be written down one by one in paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with Brazil's proposal and asked to cite the options with their headlines in paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Singapore** explained that it had voted against the proposition of Japan not because they were against it, but because it relates to voluntary contributions for which previous attempts were not successful. It considered important to give alternative options as fixed guidelines or motivation to States Parties, and was even in favour of a suggested rate/amount to pay voluntary contributions, such as for Museums.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that the General Assembly is to take note of the various options that could apply and not to decide which option is going to definitely apply, and thus found the proposal of Brazil and Germany the most appropriate one.

La Délégation du **Gabon** déclare qu'elle soutient la proposition conjointe du Brésil et de l'Allemagne et demande à ce que les chiffres obtenus par chaque option soient si possible mis en annexe du Projet de Résolution.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** suggested that it would be difficult to indicate an actual amount and thus, that no additional modification be made.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** demande à ce que l'on procède à l'adoption de la Résolution paragraphe par paragraphe pour clore la discussion.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the proposal from Brazil and Germany.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that it also supported the proposal of Brazil and Germany and participated in the discussions in the Budgetary Working Group and appreciated the work of that group in developing these options, which shall be reflected in the Resolution.

The Delegation of **Hungary** asked whether, if all options were mentioned in the Draft Resolution, a State Party would be free to choose making a voluntary contribution without applying one of the options stated.

Le **Président** répond qu'aucune contribution volontaire ne sera refusée, qu'elle suive ou non une des options suggérées, et propose de passer au vote sur la proposition du Brésil et de l'Allemagne.

La Délégation de **Chypre** demande sur quelle proposition les États doivent voter compte-tenu de la différence dans les propositions du Brésil et de l'Allemagne.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked to include also Options 4 and 5 in the Draft Resolution.

Le **Président** rappelle que le Brésil s'est rallié à l'Allemagne et procède au vote. La proposition de l'Allemagne (c'est-à-dire mentionner toutes les options dans la Résolution, excepté l'option 2) est acceptée par la majorité des membres présents et votants. Le paragraphe 7 est adopté tel qu'amendé.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande le bien-fondé du second vote puisque le Brésil s'est rallié à l'Allemagne.

Le **Président** rappelle qu'il était nécessaire de voter, car l'Assemblée générale devait se prononcer sur les options proposées et amendées.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

THIRD DAY – Thursday, 21 November 2013

FIFTH MEETING

3 pm. –7.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Professor Karunaratne Hangawatte (Sri Lanka)

**ITEM 8 DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF
ARTICLE 16 OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION* (Continuation)**

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its doubt as to the relevance of the second part of paragraph 8 concerning the creation of a sub-account to the World Heritage Fund and suggested that the General Assembly requested the World Heritage Committee to examine the auditor's recommendations first.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that there already existed sub-accounts built into the World Heritage Fund (for earmarked and promotional activities) and this would be yet another sub-account concerning staff costs and recovering staff time spent on administering the Fund as recommended by the Internal Oversight Service. The Director indicated that it is fully within the General Assembly's competency to agree on the creation of such sub-account but proposed that the Bureau of Financial Management could clarify it.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** agreed with the Director of the World Heritage Centre and confirmed that the General Assembly had the power of such a decision to create sub-account which fall within the financial regulations of the Fund.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** a pleine conscience de la situation économique difficile de l'UNESCO en général et du Centre du patrimoine mondial en particulier, mais exprime quelques réticences par rapport à la deuxième partie du paragraphe 8, qui prévoit le financement des tâches du Secrétariat par des contributions volontaires, alors que ces tâches sont liées au budget ordinaire de l'Organisation, et indique que cette question, qui suit une recommandation des auditeurs, mérite une réflexion plus approfondie. A cet effet, la Délégation propose d'amender le paragraphe 8 en ajoutant après « l'UNESCO » « et demande à la Directrice générale de mener une réflexion coordonnée pour l'ensemble des Conventions culturelles sur la mise en œuvre de ces recommandations et de présenter les résultats à la 20e session de l'Assemblée générale en 2015 », de biffer le reste du point et des points suivants 9, 10 et 11, et de considérer la prise de cette mesure de nouvelle stratégie de financement dans une vision globale sur toutes les Conventions culturelles et pas en tant que mesure isolée pour le patrimoine mondial.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that all Conventions within the Culture Sector are adopting the same strategy, and that such a sub-account was already created under the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Director confirmed that the same resolution goes to the other Culture Conventions and that this is a common approach as suggested by the Director-General for all the Culture Conventions.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked for the legal basis for the General Assembly taking the decision. By quoting Article 15.4 of the World Heritage Convention, it requested legal advice as it considers that it is the World Heritage Committee which defines the purpose for which the fund is used, not the General Assembly.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** clarified that the General Assembly decides on the creation of the sub-account and its purpose, and that the World Heritage Committee decides on the use of the funds on a yearly basis.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient l'avis exprimé par la Suisse concernant le changement de financement du Secrétariat et s'interroge comme le Royaume-Uni sur le pouvoir de décision du Comité sur l'utilisation de ce sous-compte, créé pour les capacités humaines.

The Delegation of **Singapore** asked where the current voluntary contributions are retained.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** further clarified that there are various types, such as earmarked voluntary contributions for specific purposes as determined by the donor and non-earmarked contributions kept in a pool for which the Committee take the decisions on the use of these funds.

The Delegation of **Saint-Vincent and the Grenadines** asked how the application of the cost recovery policy would be managed.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded that the cost recovery policy is applied to regular programme staff which implements extrabudgetary projects, i.e. the amount of staff time spent managing these projects and activities is charged against the extrabudgetary funds, that the World Heritage Fund is technically an extrabudgetary Fund and that therefore the rationale is that any regular programme staff time spent in administering the World Heritage Fund should be recovered.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked whether the cost recovery mechanism covers only salary costs for the staff or does it cover also pension contributions, heating, lighting and other overheads, etc., and any premium applied on the top of that.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** stated that the cost recovery policy's main objective is to recover all costs relating to the management of extrabudgetary projects by regular programme staff, which could also include operating costs (telephone charges, utilities, etc.). He reminded that since many staff financed under the regular programme budget spend time on extrabudgetary activities, the policy is to ensure that all costs are charged to the right activity.

The Delegation of **Singapore** wished to receive clarification on the cost recovery policy for the two kinds of voluntary contributions: tied (extrabudgetary projects) and untied funds, i.e. whether the additional costs of staff time for extrabudgetary projects are charged under the tied funds or whether the intention is to use the untied funds to supplement the extrabudgetary projects.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** explained that for the tied funds the donor decides what needs to be funded, i.e. the donor can approve the staff time to be recovered in the project proposal. For untied funds, all resources are pooled together and then the activities to fund are determined.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked if the cost recovered funds end up in the regular budget, to which the representative of the Bureau of Financial Management replied positively, adding that the regular budget resources are then reallocated to other mechanisms.

The Delegation of **Singapore** commented that it seemed illogical that tied funds are given for a specific project, which does not include all the necessary additional expenses of the Secretariat to run this project and has then to be funded by another Fund intended for another purpose, and asked whether all tied projects should include in their costing all the expenses, including the additional staff time.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reiterated what the Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management explained, i.e. when an extrabudgetary project is negotiated with a donor a budget line for cost recovery of staff time spent is added into the project. The Director confirmed that staff cost is recovered from that agreed project and that the intention is not to recover staff costs from other funding sources if there is no provision made in the project concerned.

Le **Président** rappelle la proposition de la Suisse de modifier la deuxième partie du paragraphe 8 et de supprimer les paragraphes 9, 10 et 11, et demande s'il y a consensus ou s'il faut passer au vote. Faisant suite à la remarque du Directeur du patrimoine mondial, le Président demande à la Suisse si elle maintient sa proposition à la suite des explications qui ont été données.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se range du côté de la majorité de l'Assemblée générale, mais souhaite entendre les autres États parties sur l'attribution des fonds extrabudgétaires pour des frais ordinaires du Secrétariat.

La Délégation du **Mexique** souhaite proposer un amendement.

The Delegation of **Grenada** asked for clarification on whether the sub-account within the World Heritage Fund will be funded by existing voluntary contributions or new voluntary contributions given specifically to this sub-account.

The **Representative of the Bureau of Financial Management** confirmed that the sub-account will be funded by voluntary contributions given specifically to this sub-account upon a specific request made for this sub-account, and not by the general contributions.

The Delegation of **Ecuador** wished to have more clarification from the Director-General on what is applied on other Conventions.

The Delegation of **Australia** explained that it has had arrangements similar to those proposed by the Director-General for this and other Conventions in place since 2007 to enable the cost recovery for staff, which was supporting the projects that were delivered by Australia's funds and confirmed that the proposed arrangements here are entirely consistent with those they had and that these are very transparent.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported maintaining the original wording of paragraph 8 as it is one option that the States Parties can use if they feel the need to do so.

The **Director of the Bureau of Financial Management** clarified that the cost of regular programme staff working on other funds should be fully charged against those funds, and confirmed that the specific time of the staff is charged and recovered into a cost-recovery sub-account against which the Division is able to use those fund for the activities of that Division in which the Regular Programme Staff work, as these funds are not pooled for the general administration of the Organization, but are kept with the concerned Division.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** retire son amendement suite aux discussions.

Le **Président** demande s'il y a des objections sur l'adoption du paragraphe 8 tel que formulé dans sa version initiale et adopte celui-ci sans modifications.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** asked not to accept this paragraph by recalling Article 15.4 of the Convention according to which the World Heritage Committee decides how money in the World Heritage Fund is spent, whereas paragraph 9 authorizes the Secretariat to use any funds without any intervention by the Committee.

La Délégation de la **France** partage les mêmes interrogations que le Royaume-Uni et pense que le Comité doit décider de l'utilisation de ces Fonds.

Le **Président** constate qu'aucune objection n'est formulée quant à la suppression du paragraphe 9.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed the addition of the word "total" before "amount" in order to avoid confusion.

Le **Président** constate que cette proposition n'est pas contestée et adopte le paragraphe 10 tel qu'amendé.

La Délégation du **Mexique** propose d'ajouter à la fin du paragraphe 11 une mention indiquant « et de présenter des propositions concrètes pour son examen possible ».

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for clarification as the amendment requests the World Heritage Committee to present concrete proposals for adoption.

La Délégation du **Mexique** clarifie qu'il s'agit de proposer des mesures concrètes afin de donner suite aux recommandations de l'audit.

The Delegation of **Saint-Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to include "for the implementation" in the phrase, which is modified to « ... and to present concrete measures for the implementation of the audit's recommendations ».

Le paragraphe 11 est adopté tel qu'amendé.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 8** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST: REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP TO RESOLUTION 18 GA 8

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/9

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 9**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat who gave an overview of Document WHC-13/19.GA/9.

The **Chairperson** indicated that he will briefly give the floor to Mr David HAMADZIRIPI, Ambassador of Zimbabwe, who carried out with great success the charge of Chairperson of the Open-ended Working Group which was established to examine the report of the External Auditor.

The **Chair** of the open-ended working group recalled that the Group was established by the 18th General Assembly with the mandate to examine the report of the external auditor on the global strategy and the PACte initiative. He reminded that he had the honor to chair the Group with the help of Ms Vera Lacoecilhe (Saint Lucia), Vice-President, and assisted by Ms Christine Dubois (Belgium) as Rapporteur. He highlighted that during its discussion, the Working group confirmed that conservation was lying at the heart of the Convention and that the focus of the implementation of the Convention was to be on conservation of sites instead of inscription. In that context, importance of the Tentative List in the nomination process and conservation tools was underlined. Furthermore, the Group stressed that conservation of sites needed to be at the core of the objectives of partnerships with the Private Sector. The Chair of the Group informed that, as indicated in the relevant working document, the Secretariat has implemented some of the recommendations that were addressed to it and that some others are still ongoing. However, he noted that several recommendations were not implemented, notably due to a lack of funding. He stressed that the Centre is encouraged to pursue its efforts towards full implementation of the recommendations.

The Chair of the Working group recalled that some recommendations have also been addressed to the World Heritage Committee and that, unfortunately, some of them were not implemented, notably Recommendation 12 concerning avoidance of potential conflicts of interests of its members, as well as the request for the Committee to refine its decision 35 COM 12B, regarding interdiction to States Parties to present nominations during their mandate on the Committee. As indicated previously, the Chair recalled that the recommendations were adopted by consensus by the 18th General Assembly and that the 19th session of the General Assembly will have to decide on the way forward taking into account the current status of implementation of those recommendations.

The Delegation of **Denmark** thanked the Secretariat for the useful report. It stated that some recommendations have not been implemented, in particular, the ones concerning the governing reform. It stated that all governing bodies should conduct a self-assessment and informed that will suggest an amendment to the proposed draft resolution.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stressed that Recommendation 12 is in contradiction with the decision of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested an explanation by the Secretariat on the fact that Recommendation 12 has not been taken on board and proposed that the External Auditor conducted a review on the implementation of the recommendations.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** remercie la Présidence du groupe de travail et le Secrétariat et constate que le travail pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations n'est pas accompli. Elle suggère une évaluation externe des mesures prises. Elle constate également que les points 9 et 10 devraient être fusionnés en un seul point.

The Delegation of **Barbados** thanked for a very comprehensive report. It joined the positions expressed by Bahrain and Saint Lucia and suggested that the General Assembly should advise the Committee, notably regarding the question of advocacy. .

The Delegations of the **United Kingdom and Finland** endorsed what has been said by Bahrain and Saint Lucia and congratulated for the work done

The Delegation of **Canada** underlined the importance to maintain the integrity of the decision-making process within the Committee.

The Delegation of **Sweden** recalled that the Committee must respect the Resolution of the General Assembly and welcomed Denmark's proposal about the governance procedure.

The Delegation of **Grenada** supported Bahrain concerning the issue of conflicts of interest.

The Delegation of **Nepal** reiterated the commitment of his government to preservation of cultural and nature heritage and explained the efforts of his country in this matters.

The Delegation of **Austria** supported Denmark's proposal.

The Delegation of **India** suggested having the texts of the relevant Decisions/Resolutions on the screen to better understand the debate.

The **Secretariat** explained that Decision 37 COM 12.B was taken by the World Heritage Committee after considering the recommendation of the external Auditor.

The Delegation of **India** questioned what the stipulation, recommendation of the General Assembly is. It recalled that the decision of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee that revised the Rules of Procedure was to allow States Parties to take the floor, by request of the Chairperson, on their nomination. The argument was that the Advisory Bodies had the floor repeatedly on proposed nomination and that States parties should be allowed to take the floor on their nomination. Regarding "advocacy", the Delegation recalled that it is a common practice, even in the UN. Finally, the Delegation requested the Legal Advisor, in these divisions of responsibilities of the Convention, on who sets the rules of procedure, the General Assembly or the World heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the General Assembly is not in the position to say that the decisions of the Committee were in contradiction of the recommendations from the Auditor since they are yet to be proven, the change of the Rules has not been “tested” yet.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that all the Recommendations of the External Auditor were adopted by the 18th General Assembly. It underlined that the Working Group dispatched responsibilities regarding implementation of those Recommendations among States Parties, the Centre and the Committee. However, why Recommendation 12 was not implemented, i.e integrated in the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, should be clarified. It underlined that the General Assembly does not set the Rules of procedure of the Committee, but that the Assembly takes policy decisions and, when making recommendations, it expected that it be implemented.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the position of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **India** asked to see the Rules and procedures modified on the screens.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed changing the wording of the Resolution to “note with regret” that the World Heritage Committee, at its 37th session, decided not to implement recommendation 12 and 20 of the Working Group, related to conflict of interests.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** insisted on see the amendment concerning 12 and reiterate its wish to be informed why this was not done, as requested by the General Assembly.

The Director of the **World Heritage Centre** reiterated that it was indicated page 11 in the column against Recommendation 12, that the document was provided to the 37th session of the Committee but that the proposed revisions were not adopted. He recalled that Committee members spoke about this and that the Secretariat was not in a position to provide more explanation beyond this.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** indicated to agree with the proposal by Australia.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested having the proposed text read out, as from certain corners of the Room it was impossible to see the screens.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4 of the Draft Resolution as amended by Australia.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** indicated that it was in agreement with paragraph 4. It further indicates its wish to add another paragraph to the resolution as follows “request the World Heritage Committee to reexamine recommendations 12 and 20, with a view to their implementation.”

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** expressed its support to the Amendment to the Draft Resolution proposed by Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed its support to the amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by Australia as well as to the new paragraph 5 proposed by Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the new paragraph 5 proposed by Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **India** requested to add a new paragraph 6 as follows “welcomes the decision taken by the World Committee to provide an opportunity to States parties to speak on their nomination”.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** apporte son soutien à la proposition de Sainte Lucie. Toutefois, elle précise ne pas soutenir le nouveau paragraphe proposé par la Délégation de l'Inde qui est en contradiction avec les paragraphes 4 et 5.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** indicated its support to the amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by Australia as well as the new paragraph 5 proposed by Saint Lucia. However, it indicated not to support the new paragraph proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** indicated that it could not see any recommendation in the document submitted to the General Assembly corresponding to the paragraph proposed by India and that therefore, it was not supporting it.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique que concernant les conflits d'intérêts, elle s'est engagé, lors de sa candidature, à ne pas présenter de propositions d'inscription au cours de son mandat comme membre du Comité, toutefois elle considère que ceci est contraire aux règles de déontologie et d'éthique du Comité. Elle précise que le Comité a décidé de donner l'opportunité aux Etats de présenter leur proposition d'inscription et de s'abstenir de participer à la décision. La délégation précise qu'elle soutient la proposition de Sainte Lucie concernant les recommandations 12 et 20, mais que ce soit pour éclaircissement, ces points ayant déjà été examinés par le Comité, sans obtenir d'accord.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** indicated that the Committee at its last session took a clear decision after a full and comprehensive debate and that therefore, the Russian Federation supported the proposal put forward by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the proposal by Saint Lucia to delete the paragraph proposed by the Delegation of India as it is not related to any Recommendations by the External auditor that has been endorsed by the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Grenada** supported the amendment by Australia in paragraph 4 and the proposal of a new paragraph 5 by Saint Lucia. It shared the view of Estonia that paragraph 6 proposed by India had nothing to do with Item 9 under discussion and that it should be deleted.

The Delegation of **Bangladesh** stated that the General Assembly has no authority to change the Rules of Procedures of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation proposed to add a new paragraph commending Philippines for having announce its intention not to submit any new nomination during its mandate to the World Heritage Committee.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, en tant que membre sortant du Comité, considère qu'il est juste que l'Assemblée regrette qu'une recommandation faite au Comité n'est pas été mise en œuvre. Elle indique dans ce cadre soutenir les propositions de l'Australie et de Sainte Lucie.

The Delegation of **Barbados** indicated its support to the amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by Australia as well as the new paragraph 5 proposed by Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that it would withdraw its amendment. It however noted that the General Assembly and the Committee did not take the same decision and that the Committee has taken a step which has advance transparency, accountability and responsiveness. It also mentioned that the Committee should review the proposals at its next session and take a decision.

The **Chairperson** indicated that he will close the list of speakers in order to move on regarding this item because of time constraints. He gave the floor to the Rapporteur to read out paragraph 4 as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated its wish to delete the words “with regret” in order to avoid a conflict between the two organs of the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that it regretfully could not agree with the proposal of Germany, the purpose of the text proposed by Australia being to regret that the Committee made decisions not to implement recommendations that have been made by the working group.

The Delegation of **Grenada** supported the Delegation of Australia and proposed to merge the proposal of Australia with the one of Saint-Lucia.

The Delegation of **Albania** supported what was indicated by the Delegations of Australia and Grenada, mentioning its regret that the Committee did not implement these recommendations that were adopted by the General Assembly two years ago.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la proposition de l'Allemagne de ne pas utiliser le mot « regret » et propose de noter que le Comité n'a pas mis en œuvre les Recommandations 12 et 20. Elle précise qu'il faut demander également que le Comité réexamine ses points lors de sa prochaine session.

La Délégation de **Sainte Lucie** précise qu'il n'y a pas de conflit entre l'Assemblée et le Comité mais souligne qu'il y a eu un sentiment de regret et qu'il faut l'accepter. Elle souligne que l'Assemblée regrette et espère que bien sûr le Comité va revoir ses recommandations dans sa prochaine session, mais il ne faut pas empêcher l'Assemblée de regretter.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the statement of Saint Lucia and regret that the Committee took the decision that it did.

The Delegation of **Australia** mentioned that, on further reflection and with the addition of the proposition of Saint Lucia to this cause and the action contained in it, it was willing to conceive that not everyone has regret.

La Délégation de la **France** indique soutenir les propositions allemande et algérienne concernant la suppression du terme « regretter ».

The **Chairperson** mentioned that, in case the consensus could not be reached, the General Assembly could vote on this proposal.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** indique soutenir la proposition de Sainte Lucie. Elle rappelle une déclaration des observateurs qui allait dans ce sens lors de la dernière session du Comité.

The Delegation of **Grenada** regretted that the members who were requesting the deletion of the mention “regret” were members of the Committee. It indicated that this was regrettable.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5.

Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted.

La Délégation de la **Cote d’Ivoire** souligne que les Philippines ne sont pas le seul pays à s’être engagé à ne pas présenter de propositions d’inscription durant leur mandat. Elle propose donc de ne pas conserver cette mention spécifique.

The **Chairperson** proposed in this regard to mention “those countries that have volunteered not to present nominations during their mandate.”

Upon request of several States Parties that could not see well the text on the screens, the new paragraph 6 was read out by the **Rapporteur**.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** mentioned that it would be preferable to see the General Assembly “encouraging” members of the Committee not to present nominations during their mandate.

The Delegation of **Bangladesh** précised that its intention was, indeed, to encourage members of the Committee not to present nominations during their mandate, however it would like to maintain its proposal.

The Delegations of **Norway and Albania** supported the proposal of Zimbabwe.

The Delegation of **Grenada** mentioned that it would be good to refer, in this particular case, to Recommendation 12, which is related.

The **Rapporteur** read out Paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** propose un amendement au paragraphe 9 visant à le rendre plus fort en mentionnant « encourage également à poursuivre » les efforts entrepris pour établir un lien entre le suivi du Plan de mise en œuvre des recommandations du Commissaire aux comptes sur la Stratégie globale et l’Initiative PACTe et la mise en œuvre du Plan d’action stratégique pour la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 10, 11 and 12.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose, pour être consistant, que l’Assemblée générale, qui se réunira dans 2 ans demande au Centre un rapport d’avancement sur cette question pour examen à la prochaine session.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** appuie la proposition Suisse quant à une évaluation de la mise en œuvre des recommandations, mais qui devrait être effectuée par le Commissaire aux Comptes, auditeur externe, ayant effectuée la première évaluation.

La Délégation de la **Côte d’Ivoire** souligne les incidences financières d’une nouvelle évaluation externe.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** mentionne que si les ressources financières ne sont pas trouvées, alors le Centre devrait présenter un tel rapport.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** clarified that usually the external auditor is responsible for ensuring a follow-up on implementation of Recommendations he has made. Therefore, this could be done in this framework, which corresponds to usual business, rather than mobilizing extrabudgetary funding for this purpose.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed what was said by Saint Lucia. He however mentioned that the External auditor does not report back to the General Assembly, but to the Executive Board.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that the External Auditor has not yet determined its work plans for the next two years and will be consulting the Executive Board upon it. It mentioned that the Resolution by the General Assembly could be sent to the Executive Board' Secretariat to keep this in the dialogue with the external auditor about its forthcoming work plans.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 11.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 9** was adopted as amended.

**ITEM 11 SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S MEETING
ON "THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: THINKING AHEAD"
(UNESCO HQS, 2-3 OCTOBER 2012)**

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/11
 WHC-13/19.GA/INF.11

Draft Resolution : **19 GA 11**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 11 of the Agenda and welcomed the Director-General of UNESCO.

The **Director-General of UNESCO** presented the summary of the meeting entitled "The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead" held on 2 and 3 October 2012; indicating that it was an opportunity for the Advisory Bodies, the State Parties, and the World Heritage Centre to collectively review some of the challenges facing the 1972 *Convention*, and discussed methods that would increase dialogue and transparency in the framework of the 40th anniversary of the Convention. The Director-General reiterated that the question of the credibility of the World Heritage List and of the Convention as such should be a major goal. She indicated that improving the credibility of the Convention and of the List should be a common effort and that the credibility of the List and of the World Heritage process depended also on the ability of each body to respect the highest standard of integrity. She stated that this should be considered as a fundamental common understanding.

La Directrice Générale souligne le besoin de recentrer l'attention sur la conservation, aspect majeur de la Convention, qui passe par la priorité qui doit être donnée aux sites déjà inscrits par rapport aux nouvelles propositions d'inscriptions. Elle informe des nombreuses actions entreprises depuis la réunion de l'année dernière notamment en ce qui concerne, entre autre, l'amélioration et la transparence des méthodes de travail concernant l'état de conservation des sites inscrits et des propositions d'inscriptions. La Directrice générale indique également que le Comité a encouragé le dialogue et la communication dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention et a insisté sur la responsabilité commune de tous les acteurs concernés dans ce cadre.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for the debate on this item.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Director-General for taking such initiatives in improving dialogue and transparency in the implementation of the Convention. The Delegation further commented upon the engagement of expertise from different parts of the world to more equitable coverage of types of heritage, dialogue with the Advisory Bodies on different processes of the Convention. It also expressed its concerns on the representation of States Parties on the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** informed that the informal drafting group on Item 4 had finished with its work and that he proposed to suspend examination of Item 11 to give the floor to the Chair of the informal drafting group to present the outcomes of the meeting of this group.

ITEM 4 REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY *(continuation)*

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Mr Dankert Vedeler (Norway) who chaired the informal drafting group.

The **Chair** of the informal drafting group presented a new Draft Resolution indicating that this proposal was the subject of a consensus amongst the members of the informal group, in which all the geographical regions were represented equitably.

The new Draft Resolution **19 GA 4** was adopted by consensus.

The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Dankert Vedeler for this efficient work and closed **Item 4** of the Agenda.

ITEM 11 SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S MEETING ON "THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: THINKING AHEAD" (UNESCO HQS, 2-3 OCTOBER 2012) *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** reopened the examination of Item 11.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** reiterated the need to provide a clearer and precise meaning of the Outstanding Universal Value and the importance of using the List of World Heritage in Danger in a more positive way.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its concern regarding the credibility of the Convention. It recognized the professionalism of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and stated that focus have to be changed from the need to inscribe sites, countries need to have less focus on inscriptions. It also expressed the need for longer time of inscription process, for instance, 2 years.

La Délégation du **Gabon** remercie la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO pour les actions menées et réitère son regret quant aux résultats des élections, au terme desquelles aucun État Partie africain n'a été élu. Elle remarque aussi que ce sont avant tout les États parties qui doivent rechercher les causes de cet échec. Elle demande également une plus grande vulgarisation des règles de procédure pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention et pour l'inscription des sites sur la Liste.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** expressed its gratitude to the Director-General for the work. The Delegation pointed out the need for clearer key performance indicators for the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee; the need to ensure transparency and need to know the names of the experts involved in the drafting of State of Conservation reports notably; and finally pointed out the usefulness of States Parties to fact-check the State of Conservation reports and comment on their accuracy.

The Delegation of **Cuba** also expressed its thanks to the Director-General and mentioned the need of capacity building activities and the dissemination of information by the World Heritage Centre. It further noted the need to improve transparency, which was already reflected in paragraph 6, and suggested three points of improvement: the first was the technical aspects of training; second, the need for better communication and dialogue; and third was a focus on better management and monitoring efforts.

The Delegation of **Brazil** also expressed its thanks to the Director-General of UNESCO for this initiative and further noted the need for more dialogue, transparency, and the exchange of information. It noted the existing gap on free dialogue regarding the conservation process and tentative list existing between State Parties and Advisory Bodies, but it underlined that this gap can be reduced with help of Centre.

The Delegation of **Columbia** thanked the Director-General for her efforts and encouraged the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to continue their efforts to reduce the gap between the Advisory Bodies and the State Parties. It encouraged the Advisory Bodies to bolster good practice among all State Parties, and expressed special gratitude to the management efforts of the Centre.

The Delegation of **Nicaragua** expressed its thanks to the Director-General for her initiative to encourage dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation also considered that this was the best way forward in conservation efforts and shared the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Saint-Lucia.

The Delegation of **Barbados** commended the Director-General for this initiative and encouraged an increased dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the State Parties. It also suggested an extension of the time required for the preparation of nominations and commented on the financial constraints affecting the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat, and the State Parties.

The Delegation of **Albania** thanked the World Heritage Centre for all their hard work and collaboration between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. The Delegation mentioned the extra-budgetary project “Towards strengthened governance of the shared transboundary natural and cultural heritage of the Lake Ohrid Region” and ‘Upstream Processes’ associated with the project as a good example for open dialogue between Advisory Bodies and the State Party.

The Delegation of **Estonia** also mentioned the need to improve dialogue between Advisory Bodies and State Parties. It suggested that Tentative List has to justify Outstanding Universal Value before the preparation of full nomination. It also mentioned the problems regarding the tight schedule in the Operational Guidelines and expressed the need for change in the calendar regarding the evaluation and nomination processes.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Director-General and the World Heritage Centre for the efforts to strengthen the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the State Parties, and believes that better dialogue leads to better cooperation and transparency.

The Delegation of **Sudan** expressed its thanks to the Director-General of UNESCO and commended the spirit of cooperation.

The Delegation of **Nepal** mentioned the need to intensify the efforts to open dialogue and cooperation regarding the Tentative List review process.

The **Chairperson** called upon the Rapporteur to read the draft resolution.

The Rapporteur read the draft resolution with suggested amendments by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom, Barbados, Switzerland, Sweden, Brazil, Saint Lucia, Italy, India, Cuba, Belgium and Columbia.**

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 11** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson gave the floor to the Director-General of UNESCO for closing comments.

The Director-General of UNESCO thanked the General Assembly for their commitment to move towards a Resolution to the issues regarding improved dialogue, transparency, and communication among the State Parties, the Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre in the framework of the implementation processes of the 1972 Convention.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 11** of the Agenda.

ITEM 10 FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*: OUTCOMES AND PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION ON THE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN INCLUDING A REPORT ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS

Document: WHC-13/19.GA/10

Draft Resolution: **19 GA 10**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** who presented an overview of document WHC-13/19.GA/10.

The Delegation of **Japan** recalled the closing event of the celebrations of the 40th anniversary held in Kyoto in November 2012 which led to the outcome document, the “Kyoto Vision”. It also recalled that 2014 will mark the 20th anniversary of the Nara document on authenticity and informed that Japan will host an international meeting on the Nara document to take in account the current challenges that the Convention is facing.

The Draft Resolution **19 GA 10** was adopted.

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

The session closed at 7.15 pm

ANNEX I

Address by Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO on the occasion of 19th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

UNESCO, 19 November 2013

Her Highness Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani,
Excellency Dr SOK An, Vice Prime Minister of Cambodia,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me to extend a warm welcome on a cold day to you all, for this 19th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

We are honoured by the presence of Her Highness Sheika Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Al-Thani, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, elected in June 2013.

I would also like to thank the outgoing Chairperson, His Excellency Dr SOK An, Vice Prime Minister of Cambodia.

As you recall, the last session of the World Heritage Committee raised some fundamental questions, which this General Assembly will have to address.

This is, first, the question of the sustainability of the 1972 Convention.

There is also the question of its credibility.

These questions are linked, of course, and they take in the Convention itself, the States Parties as well as UNESCO as an Organization.

And, let us be clear, these questions are posed, because a number of developments have come together to weaken the basic principles enshrined in the Convention.

If we fail to address them, the credibility of the Convention will be thrown into doubt, and this will have a direct impact on our capacity to act – because, as we know, in times of financial constraints, our capacity to act depends on our credibility.

The questions are not new – I raised them last year, during the Convention's 40th anniversary and we have explored them on various occasions since then, and this is why I am so pleased to see that a specific item on your agenda is dedicated to this matter.

This session is set to explore a number of other critical issues – including:

- The follow-up to the report of the External Auditor on the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative (World Heritage Partnerships for Conservation), for which you established a Working Group;
- The follow-up to the *Future of the World Heritage Convention* and the Action Plan and Vision 2012-2022;

- The critical budgetary situation, and how we can find workable solutions and a long-term vision for the Convention;
- And the recommendations of the recent evaluation of the working methods of the Culture Conventions by UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service, which is relevant to all of these discussions.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Les menaces qui pèsent sur le patrimoine – catastrophes naturelles ou conflits armés – nous rappellent la pertinence de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, et l'urgence de la mettre en œuvre, pour la résilience, la reconstruction, le dialogue.

Devant l'urgence, le Comité du patrimoine mondial a répondu présent, et pris les décisions nécessaires pour établir un fonds spécial pour la protection du patrimoine syrien.

La mobilisation internationale s'est aussi mise en place - soutenue par l'UNESCO - pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine du Mali, et nous avons reçu hier l'Imam de la mosquée Djingareyber qui est venu le dire en personne.

La Convention du patrimoine mondial représente l'autorité morale suprême dans le domaine culturel, qui permet de construire des coalitions, de mobiliser les énergies à l'échelle du monde.

Cette autorité morale dépend de notre expertise, de l'intégrité, de la crédibilité, de la recherche, de l'excellence. Ces valeurs ne se gèrent pas comme une rente : elles doivent être consolidées en permanence.

Notre autorité dépend de notre capacité à transformer les idées contenues dans ce texte en instruments réels pour les Etats pour former des professionnels, mobiliser pleinement les savoirs et les savoirs faire des communautés locales, qui portent souvent la culture vivante liée aux sites inscrits.

C'est la raison pour laquelle nous devons garantir que l'objectif principal de cette Convention soit de protéger et de promouvoir les patrimoines sur le long terme par le renforcement des capacités, par le partage de bonnes pratiques, le tourisme culturel respectueux, la gestion durable.

C'est l'ambition de l'UNESCO, et c'est mon engagement personnel, en dépit de la situation que vous connaissez. C'est aussi le but du dialogue que j'ai lancé il y a un an avec les organes consultatifs et je suis confiante que ce dialogue va continuer dans l'esprit d'équilibre des différentes approches.

Dans cet esprit, je souhaite le plein succès à vos travaux.

ANNEX II

Oral Report of the Rapporteur of the 18th General Assembly to the 19th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention- Ms Hyosang Jo (Republic of Korea)

Good morning! I am pleased to be with you and to deliver my report on the results and outcomes of the 18th session of the General Assembly of the World Heritage Convention.

The 18th session of the General Assembly, was held from 7th to 9th November 2011. It was an active, and intensive session, yet very efficiently conducted. At that time looking forward to the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, the General Assembly took decisions on resolutions regarding the Future of the Convention and audits on past work. These previous discussions are sources for future directions and continuous successful work.

H.E. Mr. Pablo César GROUX from Bolivia was elected as the Chairperson, while Slovenia, Cap Verde and Kuwait was elected as Vice Chairpersons. Altogether 12 resolutions were adopted, including the resolutions related to the financial, administrative and conceptual aspects of implementing the World Heritage Convention as well as elections to the World Heritage Committee. 9 new members were elected to the World Heritage Committee. These were Algeria, Colombia, Germany, India, Japan, Malaysia, Senegal, Serbia and Qatar.

The main issues and highlights of the session were mainly centered on the Strategic Action Plan for the Future of the Convention, together with the evaluations of the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative by the external auditor, who presented the evaluations of both programs and recommendations for better implementation in the future.

The General Assembly welcomed and applauded the work of the Future of the Convention team led by Mr. Greg Terrill of Australia for setting up a sound Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012 -2022. The action plan set out 6 goals with priorities. As the problems with the Global Strategy was mainly identified to be the lack of a specific action plan to implement the objectives, the General Assembly requested that a draft implementation plan be constructed in order to execute the Strategic Action Plan.

Regarding the Global Strategy the External auditor highlighted numerous problems, stating that the Strategy lacks a clear definition of the objectives and appropriate indicators to evaluate its results.

- The strategy has not been able to mitigate the underrepresentation of natural heritage;
- has not addressed difficulties linked to the growth of the List;
- the credibility of the list were being threatened by geopolitical decisions of the Committee;
- and priority was placed on new nominations rather than the conservation of properties.

The recommendation made by the external auditor was to envisage objectives and establish appropriate piloting tools for the Global Strategy. The Committee must strengthen the strictness of procedures and restore conservation as a priority. These points gathered strong agreement with the General Assembly which recognized the need to address these recommendations with the utmost integrity and urgency, as the credibility of the Convention was indeed facing great danger. Many delegations concurred with the overt politicization of the Committee decisions, overthrowing the scientific and technical basis of heritage conservation. There was heated debate regarding the necessity and composition of the open-ended working group since there was already another working group for the Future of the Convention and that financial implications would be a burden to the World Heritage Centre. However with the proposals of several governments wishing to provide extra

budgetary funds, a resolution was adopted to establish an open-ended working group to produce an implementation plan for the recommendations of the external auditor, indicating priorities and financial implications.

The External Auditor's recommendation for the PACT Initiative was also duly noted. Although the program had not yet been successful, the possibilities for better implementation and results were recognized. Therefore it was decided to implement the recommendations provided by the auditor to harmonize PACT with UNESCO's development of partnership strategies.

Category 2 Centres related to the World Heritage Convention reported on their activities. The GA applauded their efforts and stressed the importance of harmonization of the programs and initiatives of these centres so that their expertise are not overlapped and spread out in all regions and fields. A results based management was called for and the successful first meeting of these Centres held with the support of the government of Bahrain was considered an excellent practice which should be taken up regularly in the future.

Issues on financial and managerial aspects were adopted with little debate taking note of the status of the Member state contributions and the means for increasing additional voluntary contributions. The GA requested an analysis to be conducted relating to the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and noted the importance of following up on the results of the management audits.

I will treasure the honour that I have had to be elected as rapporteur of the General Assembly and I have put my utmost consciousness and dedication for the task. I thank all the States Parties and colleagues for putting their trust in me and for the Secretariat for giving me all the help I needed.

I thank you for your attention and I wish you another great session of successful work!

Report of the Chairperson of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee on the activities of the World Heritage Committee

H.E. Dr SOK AN, Deputy Prime Minister of Cambodia

**19th session of the General Assembly of States Parties
(UNESCO, 19 November 2013)**

Excellencies,
Dear colleagues;

I am very pleased to be with you today on the occasion of the 19th General Assembly of States Parties. I would like first of all to present my warmest congratulations to Mrs. Irina Bokova upon her re-election as Director-General of UNESCO. I am convinced that she will pursue all the efforts already undertaken to guide our House in the right direction.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the General Assembly of States Parties is the occasion for all of us to meet every two years not only to actively contribute to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and but also to participate in the reflection on its future, on the strategies that can be developed, as well as on our capacity to take up the existing and forthcoming challenges.

The General Assembly has also the responsibility to elect members of the World Heritage Committee. The members of this important intergovernmental body carry a very heavy responsibility, especially now, when our Convention has just celebrated its 40th anniversary. This year during which major celebrations worldwide have been organized, should be the starting point of a revival, renewal for World Heritage. We should all be mobilized to get the Convention into the 21st century. I have no doubt that, thanks to our united efforts, the role of the Convention in the safeguarding and protection of the common heritage of the world will stay as a decisive one.

I will now turn to the presentation of the Report on the activities of the World Heritage Committee since our last General Assembly. You have all in front of you **Document 37 C/REP/13** which was submitted to the UNESCO General Conference with information regarding the main activities and decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee since the 18th General Assembly of States Parties in the implementation of the Convention.

As you have noticed from the document; the report has been consolidated according to the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee:

- (a) strengthen the **credibility** of the World Heritage List;
- (b) ensure the effective **conservation** of the World Heritage properties;
- (c) promote the development of effective **capacity-building** in States Parties;

- (d) increase public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through **communication**
- (e) enhance the role of **communities** in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Regarding the Convention, as of May 2013, there are 190 States Parties to the Convention. Since the 18th General Assembly in 2011, Brunei-Darussalam, Palestine as well as Singapore have joined the Convention.

You can see on the screen the actual composition of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee that was elected last June in Phnom Penh. As you know all the new elected Chairperson is **Her Excellency Sheika AL MAYASSA BINT HAMAD AL-THANI from Qatar**, the Rapporteur: **Mr. Francisco J. Gutierrez from Colombia** and the Vice-Chairs: **Algeria, Colombia, Germany, Japan, Senegal**

Dear colleagues, **45** properties were inscribed on the World heritage List since the 18Th General Assembly. Therefore, the total number of properties on the World Heritage List as of July 2013 is **981** out of which 759 cultural, 193 natural and 29 mixed. These properties are located in **160** States Parties.

The total number of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger as of July 2013 is **44** out of which 26 cultural and 18 natural.

Since our last meeting, Fiji, Lesotho and Qatar have had their first property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

To date **30 States Parties** have no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Regarding Global strategy, a number of international conferences and symposiums focused on various World Heritage issues have been organized.

As regards the State of Conservation of sites, please note that **298** states of conservation reports were examined and **3** properties removed from the List of World Heritage in danger, while **12** properties were inscribed on the List of World Heritage in danger.

In line with our efforts towards an improved communication and reinforced dialogue between all actors of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Centre, with the support of the Flemish Government, has recently launched a unique Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, which is publicly available online. All relevant information on the monitoring of properties since 1979 can be consulted in a few clicks.

Dear friends,

Since our last meeting, 20 requests for International Assistance were received from 19 States Parties and a Total amount of USD 618,099 was approved..

Dear colleagues, as you know, the Periodic reporting is a very important exercise that is carefully and regularly followed by the World Heritage Committee. In this regard; follow-up as well as final reports on the periodic reporting by region were examined by the 36th session as well as by the 37th session of the Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, the last year was marked by the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of our Convention. On this occasion, a large number of major events were organized worldwide on the theme of the Anniversary "World Heritage and Sustainable Development".

Concerning the Global Training Strategy, an important number of activities were implemented in line with the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 in close cooperation with States Parties, as well as the Advisory bodies.

On World Heritage Education as well major activities have been undertaken, comprising international World Heritage youth forums, youth volunteer projects and international as well as regional workshop and training courses. Material regarding this field of activity has also been developed.

Dear colleagues, as you know, the Rules of Procedures of the Committee as well as the Operational Guidelines have been amended since the last session of the General Assembly and are available on the web site of the World Heritage Centre.

Let me mention also that since 2011, a large amount of publications were produced and disseminated worldwide, this includes World Heritage maps, World Heritage Papers Series, the magazine *World Heritage*, as well the World Heritage Resource Manual Series among others.

Excellences,

Chers collègues,

Je voudrais, pour finir et avant de quitter définitivement mes charges de président du Comité du Patrimoine mondial, vous proposer des réflexions pour l'avenir, à la lumière de mon expérience et de nos travaux en commun, au cours de la 37^{ème} session du Comité.

- En premier lieu, il me semble légitime d'exprimer des inquiétudes au sujet des **ressources financières** consacrées à la mise en œuvre de notre Convention. Oui, nous savons tous que les temps sont difficiles. Mais, puisque la relance de la croissance mondiale s'annonce prochaine, il est important de rappeler que le patrimoine de l'humanité exige de nous tous un effort financier approprié. Il est assuré que le suivi de la gestion des biens déjà inscrits sur la Liste demande cet effort. Il est assuré également que cet effort est rendu nécessaire non seulement par le processus d'évaluation de l'état de ces biens mais aussi par l'examen des nouvelles propositions d'inscription.

Nous connaissons tous, à cet égard, le travail considérable fait par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et par les organes consultatifs : ICCROM, UICN et ICOMOS. Il ne suffit pas de les féliciter, il faut surtout leur donner les moyens de bien assumer leur tâche.

- J'en viens, maintenant, à mon ultime recommandation. Comme l'a mis en exergue, en 2012, la conférence de KYOTO pour la célébration du 40^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention, nous devons tous être fiers du chemin parcouru, des réalisations accomplies et de la Liste établie. Pour continuer cette marche heureuse et équilibrée, nous devons prendre garde à éviter un écueil qui peut mettre en péril l'harmonie de nos sessions.

Je fais allusion au risque de **politisation des débats**. Je dois à la vérité de dire que, parfois, dans le passé, notre Comité a eu à faire face à des cas pénibles qui ont vraiment perturbé les délégués.

Aussi vais-je, avec votre permission, recommander instamment de veiller, de toutes nos forces, à la sérénité des travaux de notre Comité, durant les prochaines sessions.

Excellences,

Chers collègues,

Je vous remercie vivement de votre aimable patience. Je vous avoue que j'ai été heureux et honoré d'assumer la charge de la présidence et que je ne manquerai pas d'être assidu aux prochaines sessions de notre cher Comité.

Au revoir, donc !

**Address by Irina Bokova
Director-General of UNESCO
on the occasion of the opening of the debate on Item 11 “Follow-up of the Director
General’s meeting on “The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead” during the
19th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention
UNESCO, 21 November 2013**

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for this opportunity to address the 19th General Assembly for a second time.

I wish to thank all of you, who responded positively to my proposal last year, in the framework of the 40th anniversary, to organize meetings between the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat and the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

As you know, these meetings were designed for several purposes.

First and foremost, they have provided an opportunity for the Advisory Bodies to understand clearly the expectations of the States Parties and to consolidate the implementation of the Convention, in the preparation also of the draft Medium-Term Strategy.

Second, the meetings have acted as useful platforms for dialogue, to share views – and of course also concerns – about the challenges confronting the Convention as it embarks upon its 5th decade.

I have said it before, and I believe we all agree, the question of credibility stands out as the most pressing challenge today.

We must address this question in collaboration, by working together and by “thinking ahead.” UNESCO’s strength does not lie in its financial nor material resources – it lies in our collective commitment to uphold the highest standards.

Safeguarding heritage is a process that calls on us to adapt continually, to strengthen capacities, to involve local communities, to show political will, in order to resolve difficulties that often extend across borders.

Our capacity to act depends on our credibility.

It depends on our integrity.

Let me be clear -- in recent years, a number of developments within the inscription process have weakened the principles of objectivity and impartiality at the heart of the Convention. It undermines everything the Convention stands for, everything we have sought for over 40 years.

Ensuring – strengthening – through such dialogue the credibility of the Convention can only be a collaborative effort, taken forward by all members of the UNESCO family -- by the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and you, the Member States.

So, I believe we collectively carry on our shoulders the need to respect the highest standards of integrity, and it is call to action to all of us.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Il est également essentiel de recentrer l'attention sur la conservation.

C'est un aspect majeur de la Convention qui suppose de donner la priorité aux sites déjà inscrits par rapport aux nouvelles propositions d'inscriptions.

Comme nous l'avons maintes fois souligné, la liste du patrimoine en péril doit être comprise et utilisée comme un moyen d'intensifier la protection et pas de stigmatiser un Etat.

Tous ces principes, sur lesquels se fonde la Convention elle-même, sont des éléments indispensables au dialogue, à la coopération et à une meilleure mise en œuvre de cet instrument.

Lors de vos débats, vous allez être informés des actions de suivi entreprises à la suite de notre réunion de l'année dernière et des actions qui sont en cours ou à venir.

Ces actions sont nombreuses.

Elles concernent l'amélioration et la transparence des méthodes de travail concernant de l'état de conservation des sites inscrits et celles concernant les propositions d'inscriptions.

Je souhaite particulièrement souligner la nécessité d'un dialogue accru et régulier entre les états parties et les organes consultatifs tout au long des processus d'évaluation et de suivi des biens, qu'ils soient soumis à l'inscription ou qu'ils soient concernés par le mécanisme de suivi réactif.

Le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de sa récente session a reconnu ces actions de suivi déjà entreprises et a demandé la poursuite des efforts -- notamment dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des recommandations de l'auditeur externe de l'UNESCO et du Plan d'Action stratégique 2012-2022.

Le Comité a également encouragé toutes les parties concernées à renforcer le dialogue et la communication dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des mécanismes de la Convention.

Il nous appartient donc, ensemble, de permettre ce dialogue constructif, et d'assurer que notre travail commun soit le garant de la crédibilité et de l'efficacité de notre Convention, qui reste la vitrine de notre action pour la sauvegarde et la préservation du patrimoine, pour les générations futures.

Je vous remercie.