



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**

**1 EXT. GA**

**WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/INF.4**

**Original: English/French**

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

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

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters  
13-24 November 2014**

**SUMMARY RECORDS**

**RESUME DES TRAVAUX**

**FIRST DAY – Thursday, 13 November 2014**

**FIRST MEETING**

**10 a.m. –1 p.m.**

**Chairperson : H. E. Mrs Véra Lacoeyilhe (Saint-Lucia)**

**ITEM 1            OPENING OF THE SESSION**

**1A.                Opening of the First Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly by  
the Assistant Director-General for Culture**

*No document*

In his opening remarks, **the Director of the World Heritage Centre** underlined that the General Assembly of States Parties was meeting for the first time on an extraordinary session. He thanked the Republic of Korea and Norway for their financial support to the process of the revision of the *Rules of Procedure* of the Assembly, the Mandate of the extraordinary session. Finally, he informed the meeting that working documents for this session had been made available to all States Parties within the statutory deadline of 6 weeks before the General Assembly and were accessible on the website of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** opened the session by welcoming all States Parties to the first extraordinary session of the General Assembly. He indicated the specific purpose of this session was mainly the Revision of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly in order to achieve an equitable geographical and cultural representation on the World Heritage Committee. ADG/CLT reiterated the utmost importance of this meeting which would have a crucial impact on the future of the World Heritage Convention. He underlined however, that this was not a new debate and recalled the hard work that had been undertaken in 2008-2009 by the former Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO, H.E. Mr. Seiichi Kondo, who presided over a Working Group with this same and unique mandate. ADG/CLT also recalled the broader context of financial challenges and the need for reform in which the debate was now taking place as well as the “Thinking Ahead” reflection process, launched by the Director-General in 2012, concerning both working methods of the *Convention* and transparency of procedures.

Le Sous-Directeur général pour la culture évoque le mandat spécifique de l'UNESCO dans le domaine de la culture et son élaboration d'un corpus normatif de Conventions culturelles dont la mise en œuvre repose sur la coopération internationale et le dialogue. Il forme le vœu que les Résolutions qui seront éventuellement prises au cours de cette session le soient dans un esprit de respect, d'échange et de dialogue, d'intégrité et de transparence.

Il invite les Etats parties à éviter la politisation des débats en y opposant la crédibilité scientifique et les mécanismes de coopération et rappelle que le principe de crédibilité, qui représente l'avenir de la *Convention*, ne s'applique pas seulement à la Liste du patrimoine mondial mais aussi aux méthodes de travail du Comité.

*[Le discours du Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture dans son intégralité se trouve en **Annexe I** du présent document]*

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

*No document*

*Draft Resolution: 1 EXT. GA 1B*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that, as per Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Assembly shall elect a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Brazil** presented **H.E. Mrs Véra Lacoeuilhe (Saint-Lucia)** as Chairperson of the 1<sup>st</sup> extraordinary session of the General Assembly.

The Delegations of **Turkey, Senegal, Serbia and Gambia** supported this proposal.

This proposal was approved by acclamation.

Upon proposals by the Delegations of **Philippines** and **Oman, Nepal and Palestine** were presented as Vice-Chairpersons. These proposals were approved by acclamation.

The Delegation of **Benin** presented the candidature of **Mr. James Wakibara (United Republic of Tanzania)** as Rapporteur of the 1<sup>st</sup> extraordinary session of the General Assembly. This proposal was approved by acclamation.

The Resolution **1 EXT. GA 1B** was adopted.

**Item 1** of the Agenda was closed.

The newly elected **Chairperson** recalled that several working groups had met over the past few years on the question of having an equitable geographical representation on the Committee. The **Chairperson** underscored the transparency of the process, and that despite holding opposing views, States Parties had expressed their willingness for compromise. The Chairperson informed that her role was to act as an impartial facilitator and arrive at an option that would be supported by all States Parties to bridge gaps. The Chairperson stated that she was counting on the full cooperation of all States Parties for this meeting.

Finally, the **Chairperson** invited the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Switzerland to UNESCO H.E. Mr. Jean-Frédéric Jauslin, Chairperson of the open-ended working group for the revision of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties, to present its report on the outcomes of the working group.

Le **Président** du groupe de travail ouvert rappelle que le groupe a été établi pour une durée limitée à un an et que son mandat, donné par la Résolution **19 GA 4**, visait à faire des propositions d'amendement au Règlement intérieur afin d'atteindre l'objectif de la représentation géographique et culturelle équitable, ainsi que de proposer d'autres mesures.

Le **Président** rappelle que le groupe de travail ouvert a tenu 3 réunions au courant de l'année 2014, en janvier, mars et mai. Il indique qu'à l'issue de ces réunions le Groupe soumet à l'Assemblée Générale extraordinaire 3 propositions concernant un nouveau système électoral : la proposition du GRULAC, la proposition Estonienne et la proposition Norvégienne modifiée. Le groupe propose également cinq « autres mesures » : augmenter

le temps de latence entre les mandats au sein du Comité de quatre à six ans; réintroduire un système de vote à plusieurs tours; introduire un format standard de candidature; bannir les clean slates et réserver un siège à un état qui n'a jamais été membre du Comité.

Le **Président** mentionne également que le Comité s'est saisi de la question de l'étude de la suspension de l'examen de propositions d'inscription émanant d'un Etat membre du Comité.

Le **Président** du groupe de travail constate que, comme le laissaient présager les nombreuses délibérations qui avaient déjà eu lieu dans le groupe dit Kondo, l'objectif d'aboutir à une seule proposition consensuelle était une gageure difficilement surmontable. Il précise que son souhait aurait été de pouvoir proposer une seule variante au système actuel. Il indique être toutefois heureux que le groupe de travail ait pu rendre une copie riche déposée aujourd'hui entre les mains de l'Assemblée générale souveraine et qui va lui permettre d'avancer dans la prise de décision. Il remercie tous les pays pour leur participation active aux débats du groupe de travail qui a mené ses travaux de manière correcte et constructive. Le **Président** souhaite que les travaux de l'Assemblée générale extraordinaire se déroulent de manière efficace et efficiente.

**ITEM 2            ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OF THE TIMETABLE OF THE 1st  
EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**2A.            Adoption of the Agenda of the 1st extraordinary session of the General  
Assembly**

**2B.            Adoption of the Timetable of the 1st extraordinary session of the  
General Assembly**

*Documents:    WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/2A  
                      WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/INF.2A  
                      WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/2B*

*Draft Resolution:    1 EXT.GA 2A  
Draft Resolution:    1 EXT. GA 2B*

The **Chairperson** briefly introduced documents WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/2A, WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/INF.2A and WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/2B, and indicated that the main item on the Agenda was the revision of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly, based on the examination of the proposals by the open-ended working group.

The Draft Resolutions **1 EXT.GA 2A** and **1 EXT.GA 2B** were adopted.

**Item 2** of the Agenda was closed.

**ITEM 3            REVISION OF THE *RULES OF PROCEDURE* OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

*Documents:*    *WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/3*  
                  *WHC-14/1 EXT.GA/INF.3*

*Draft Resolution:*        **1 EXT. GA 3**

The **Chairperson** indicated that she would first give the floor to all States Parties that wished to make general statements.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, remercie le Secrétariat et félicite la Présidente au nom du Groupe Afrique. Elle indique appuyer la proposition modifiée de la Norvège en faveur d'un consensus et suggère en outre la révision des autres mesures recommandées par le groupe de travail.

On behalf of Group II, the Delegation of **Slovenia** underlined the hard work of the working group, discussions that had taken place on the different proposals and the importance of reaching a consensus. The Delegation further underlined that while the Estonian proposal was welcomed, in view of a consensus, Electoral Group II would support the modified Norway proposal. It further indicated that concerning the "other measures", the States Parties of Electoral Group II would state their own views.

The Delegation of **Ecuador** underlined the need to comply with the mandate given to ensure equitable geographical representation on the Committee. It indicated that the GRULAC proposal offered the most objective and fair solution. However, the Delegation acknowledged that it would be impossible not to come to a consensus on one of the three proposals and therefore would be ready to support the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Japan** informed that there was no consensus within the ASPAC group but there however was consensus that an equitable representation of cultures and regions on the Committee as well as having a combination of open seats and a safety net in the nomination process were important. The Delegation underlined that open elections should remain as the core principle for any decision undertaken and any new proposal should also be made on a trial basis.

La Délégation du **Canada**, souhaite assurer une répartition géographique et culturelle équitable au sein du Comité en appuyant la proposition de l'Estonie et les cinq mesures étudiées par le groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Honduras** noted that the status quo was not acceptable and that it was fundamental for the Assembly to arrive at a consensus. The Delegation expressed its view that the GRULAC proposal was most likely to reach a consensus.

The Delegation of **China** stressed that many new States Parties had joined the *Convention* and that more properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation recalled with regret that during the last elections, one electoral group was not represented at all. Therefore, the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly need to be amended to

guarantee equitable representation of all regions and cultures. The Delegation underlined its wish that the extraordinary session of the General Assembly would come to a consensus.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stressed that the proposal for a safety net was given in the hopes of finding a compromise and that the elections should not be too complicated or time consuming. It indicated that the Estonian proposal was based on the idea that the election system should consist of the election of experts. The Delegation underlined the importance of the "other measures". However, the Delegation indicated its readiness to support the modified Norway proposal in order to reach a consensus and avoid voting.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its concern that the electoral process was not underpinned by expertise, competition, and transparency. The Delegation underlined that the World Heritage Convention should build on the existing technical expertise in each State Party and that in the interest of competition and expertise, the system with one allocated seat per region was considered the best way forward. However, the Delegation indicated that it could support the Estonian proposal.

The Delegation of **Argentina** underlined that it was the right time to arrive at a decision on this matter as the World Heritage Committee was currently the only intergovernmental body without equitable representation. It indicated that a consensus on one of the three proposals was needed and that the status quo was unacceptable. The Delegation noted that it would be ready to support any proposal that would correct the current geographical imbalance.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte**, indique soutenir fortement la proposition du Groupe Afrique et appuie la proposition norvégienne modifiée en faveur d'un consensus afin de renforcer la crédibilité et l'efficacité du Comité.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique soutenir la proposition du Groupe Afrique et appuie la proposition norvégienne modifiée en faveur d'un consensus.

The Delegation of **Albania** expressed its view that the modified Norwegian proposal would more likely reach consensus. The Delegation stated that this session of the General Assembly should amend its *Rules of Procedure* to move forward and focus on other important matters.

The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed its commitment to work towards more equitable representation on the Committee and that the fact that the *World Heritage Convention* had almost reached universality required equitable geographical representation. The Delegation regretted that the LAC region had been underrepresented in the past and expressed its hope to solve the issue of regional imbalance. The Delegation supported the GRULAC proposal but would also go along with the modified Norway proposal in the spirit of consensus.

The Delegation of **El Salvador** stressed that the status quo was no longer acceptable. It indicated that a more flexible voting system was needed to represent all regions and that GRULAC proposal was supported, but that the modified Norway proposal was acceptable in a spirit of consensus.

The Delegation of **Colombia** underlined that out of the three proposals, the GRULAC proposal was the fairest to address geographical imbalances and to ensure that there is appropriate expertise on the Committee. However, it also recognized the need for

consensus, and in this spirit, the Delegation would be ready to support the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation d'**Angola**, s'associe au Sénégal au nom du Groupe Afrique pour privilégier le consensus et éviter le *statu quo* en soutenant la proposition modifiée de la Norvège.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that after the elections in 2011 and 2013, the need for a change in the *Rules of Procedure* became evident. It noted that 103 States Parties had never served in the Committee and that the status quo was not an option. It indicated that a genuine compromise would be the modified Norway proposal. The Delegation underlined the importance of the measures to increase the gap from four to six years before a State Party could stand for election as a Committee member again and to introduce a standard candidature format for the presentation of experts.

The Delegation of **Uruguay** supported the GRULAC proposal as the most satisfactory outcome of the open-ended working group to address regional imbalances. However, it underlined the importance of working on the basis of consensus. Therefore, the Delegation was prepared to be flexible and support the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Austria** recalled with regret the years of debates on this issue and noted that there was a need for reform as the credibility of the World Heritage Convention was at stake. It underlined that consensus was possible and that the General Assembly should avoid voting but show its flexibility and avoid the perception of indecision, which could be construed as failure.

The Delegation of **India** stressed that the current distribution of one seat per electoral group was not satisfactory. To this end, the Delegation supported the idea of having an adequate number of both open and reserved seats. For the sake of consensus, the Delegation indicated its willingness to support any of the three options and that the "other measures" should be considered as part of the package to be adopted.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** indique être en faveur du consensus et donc soutenir la position du groupe Africain.

The Delegation of **Finland** underlined that consensus would be the best option and should be reached during this meeting. The Delegation regretted that the "other measures" were considered as a minor part in the debates and underlined the importance of the principle for States Parties to refrain on a voluntary basis from presenting nominations during their mandate even though this initiative did not gain wide support. Furthermore, it indicated that the measure to increase the gap from four to six years before a State Party could stand for election as a Committee member again, and other aspects, would strengthen the credibility of the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Chile** reminded the meeting of its active participation in the debates of the open-ended working group. It indicated that the delegation supported the GRULAC proposal but was ready to accept the modified Norway proposal as a compromise.

The Delegation of **Brazil** reminded the meeting that its initial proposal had been modified to become the GRULAC proposal which it supported; however in order to reach a consensus, it declared its readiness to support the modified Norwegian proposal.

The Delegation of **Iceland** indicated that equitable representation within the World Heritage Committee had not been ensured and reiterated the need to change the *Rules of Procedure* in order not to remain in the current status quo. It declared its support for the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Venezuela** thanked the Chairperson for her role in conducting the session. It recalled the need to ensure that fragile cultural natural heritage is saved and hence, the need to reach a consensus. It declared its support for the GRULAC proposal.

The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** reiterated the importance of arriving at a decision to address this longstanding issue. It indicated that geographical representation could be achieved with the required expertise. It declared that while it believed the GRULAC proposal to be the best, in the spirit of consensus, expressed its readiness to support the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** declared that the time had come for States Parties to make a good decision and reach consensus on this issue. It indicated that the General Assembly has to improve the message sent out over the last decades but without necessarily going for major change. It declared its support for the Estonian proposal but, in the spirit of consensus, would accept the modified Norway proposal, including the measure aimed at increasing the gap between a State Party's mandate on the Committee from four to six years.

The Delegation of **Pakistan** emphasized the need to increase the democratization of the procedures and supported amending the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly to ensure equitable representation on the Committee. It declared support for the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation de la **Grèce** indique appuyer le consensus et soutenir la proposition modifiée de la Norvège.

La Délégation de la **République Tchèque** informe qu'elle soutenait la proposition de l'Estonie, mais qu'elle appuie désormais la proposition modifiée de la Norvège en vue d'atteindre le consensus.

The Delegation of **United Kingdom** pointed out that the current status quo was no longer acceptable. It recalled that no region had the monopoly on good experts or on bad ones. The Delegation stated that it considered the Estonian proposal to be the best one, but it could agree with the modified Norway proposal. It invited the General Assembly to reach consensus on this issue and move forward.

La Délégation du **Mexique** appuie la proposition du GRULAC mais indique pouvoir faire preuve de souplesse en faveur du consensus.

The Delegation of **Guatemala** recalled that the *Convention* was well-known due to the World Heritage List and as current challenges are a matter of legitimacy and credibility, the status quo was not possible and it would very important to deal with these issues. It expressed



support for the GRULAC proposal but also its readiness to support any other option that would ensure consensus.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** soutient le consensus et appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège pour mettre fin au *statu quo*.

The Delegation of **Denmark** declared that it was ready for a constructive way forward that took into consideration the main concerns of States Parties. It reiterated that while there was no perfect model, the constructive spirit had to be preserved. It joined other delegations in saying that the status quo could no longer continue and that a decision had to be taken.

The Delegation of **Grenada** considered that it was time for the General Assembly to take a decision on this matter as the status quo was no longer acceptable. It considered the GRULAC proposal as the fairest option as it was close to the spirit of what was done for the 2003 and 2005 Conventions. Nevertheless, it expressed its readiness to support the revised Norwegian proposal as it guaranteed a minimum of seats for each group.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** stressed the need for consensus. It called for the end of the status quo and joined the African countries in their support for the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Sweden** emphasized the need to move forward and the necessity of reaching a decision. It recalled that the work of the open-ended working group had brought forth three proposals and that among these three proposals, one should be chosen that provides the best compromise and takes into account the various concerns expressed. It stated its support for the modified Norway proposal and recalled the decision by the General Assembly at its previous ordinary session to implement the "other measures". It reiterated the fact that this General Assembly had to reach consensus and noted that there were already 38 interventions in support for the modified Norway proposal thus far.

The Delegation of **Paraguay** expressed its trust in the capacity of the General Assembly to reach a consensus and expressed its support for the GRULAC proposal, which the delegation considered to be as the fairest. However, it expressed its readiness to support consensus, including being in favour of the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** congratulated the Working Group for its work and the development of these three proposals. The delegation explained that since the beginning, it was in favour of the GRULAC proposal, with the exception of one reservation. However, it said that the Assembly was ready to move and that the modified Norway proposal seemed to be the most widely supported. The delegation stressed that along with the package of "other measures", this proposal would be the most adequate.

The Delegation of **Lesotho** underlined that the most important issue was equitable representation. The delegation declared that its position was in line with the other African countries and supported the modified Norway proposal along with the package of "other measures".

The Delegation of **Serbia** said that the equitable distribution of seats is a longstanding issue and that the status quo had to end. It emphasized the need to reach a consensus and joined the Delegations of Slovenia and Estonia in support for the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the GRULAC countries for conceiving the possibility of supporting the modified Norway proposal if it would bring consensus and joined the African Group in support for the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Zambia** thanked the open-ended working group for its efforts. It expressed support for the modified Norwegian proposal which takes into account equitable representation and having a competitive approach. It declared that the status quo was no longer acceptable and that it supported the “other measures” put forward by the working group.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** remercie le groupe de travail et appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège en faveur du consensus pour éviter le *statu quo*.

The Delegation of **Sudan** thanked the Chairperson for the efforts towards reaching a consensus and those who were working towards fair and equitable geographic representation. It recalled the need to move forward and arrive at a consensus. It joined the African position in supporting the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation de la **France** indique que le consensus est toujours préférable mais qu’aujourd’hui, il ne semble possible que par défaut. Toutefois, et afin d’aboutir à une décision, la Délégation propose de passer au vote. Elle rappelle que la France n’est pas gênée par la *statu quo* et que le principal souci commun est celui de la crédibilité et de l’universalité de la *Convention*. Si les options présentées semblent ne pas être une solution, la France, dans un souci de compromis, soutient la proposition de l’Estonie. Concernant les autres mesures, la France rappelle qu’elle ne soutient pas l’allongement du temps de latence entre les mandats au sein du Comité et l’idée d’empêcher la présentation de propositions d’inscriptions durant ce mandat. La Délégation de la **France** indique soutenir la proposition japonaise de revoir les Résolutions adoptées après un certain temps.

The Delegation of **Portugal** shared the view expressed by many on the need to change the current election system. Along with many other States Parties, it regretted that the current composition of the Committee was not representative. It emphasized the need to adopt one of the proposals, in addition to other measures such as increasing the gap between a State Party’s mandates on the Committee from four to six years and having a reserved seat for countries which have never been on the Committee. It declared that there was a need for a comprehensive solution as stated in the Estonian proposal.

La Délégation de l’**Italie** indique appuyer la proposition de l’Estonie.

La Délégation du **Togo** félicite la Présidente et le Groupe de travail pour ses résultats. La Délégation soutient le consensus et la fin du *statu quo*. Dans ce cadre elle appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège et des autres mesures recommandées par le groupe de travail.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège soutenue par le Groupe Afrique et indique souhaiter débattre des autres mesures séparément. La Délégation en appelle au consensus.

The Delegation of **Nepal** joined the previous speakers in congratulating the Ambassador of Switzerland for the work of the open-ended working group and the report produced. It supported the idea of consensus and the need to change the current situation which did not

reflect the principles of the *Convention*. It supported the modified Norway proposal and the measures aimed at increasing the gap between a State Party's mandates on the Committee from four to six years, in order to allow for competitive elections between members, and a reserved seat for a State Party which had never served on the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** recalled that protecting World Heritage was a shared responsibility and that equitable representation had to be reached. It expressed support for the GRULAC proposal as well as the possibility to go along with the modified Norway proposal if it would bring consensus.

The Delegation of **Peru** said that it was important to reach an agreement that would enable equitable representation and expertise on the Committee. It noted that most of the delegations proposed working towards a consensus while the Delegation of France had proposed going for a vote. It declared its support for the GRULAC proposal as the only acceptable option.

La Délégation du **Maroc** déplore les résultats des dernières élections et souhaite trouver des solutions. Elle réitère sa position qui s'aligne sur celle du groupe africain et appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège. Elle indique également souhaiter un consensus concernant les « autres mesures » recommandées par le groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Saint Kitts and Nevis** supported the modified Norway proposal, as the best option for Small Island Developing States (SIDS). It recalled that only slightly over 3% of World Heritage sites are in SIDS and one possible reason for this could be the low representation of SIDS within the Committee. The delegation also declared that it was in favour of the set of “other measures” as well.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that the ultimate goal of the Convention was the conservation of the World Heritage. It also reminded the meeting that the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust was also created for that purpose. The delegation declared its support for the measures which promote a balanced and equitable representation on the Committee. It also expressed regret that issues such as conflicts of interest were not addressed.

La Délégation du **Congo** appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège, permettant un meilleur équilibre géographique en faveur du consensus et pour éviter le statu quo.

The Delegation of **Oman** thanked the open-ended working group and in particular the Chairperson of the working group, for their efforts. It said that the *Convention* was at a turning point and change was absolutely necessary in order to ensure the credibility of the *Convention*. It declared that all States Parties should contribute with their expertise and declared support for the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Iran** noted that things were moving in the direction of a vote but that the General Assembly was divided. It declared that voting was possible but wished to recall that intellectual and moral solidarity was in UNESCO's Constitution. It suggested that the Chairperson organize the workings of the General Assembly differently in order to reach consensus.

The **Chairperson** indicated that there was still a list of speakers but this was almost finished. The Chairperson took note of the proposal from the Delegation of Iran but underlined the

need to remain in plenary mode since the time to make a decision had come. She also said that the lunch break would allow the States Parties to continue with their consultations.

The Delegation of **Gambia** supported Senegal's intervention on behalf of the African Group and expressed its support for the modified Norway proposal. It also wished to thank the open-ended working group for the outcomes of their work.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** declared that it was neither comfortable nor satisfied with being elected in 2013 at the expense of other African countries. It noted from the mathematical calculations provided by the Delegation of Norway that the election system did not favor balance and equity. It added that status quo was no longer acceptable and that the Delegation of Jamaica supported the modified Norway proposal, in the spirit of consensus, while still having a close affiliation to the GRULAC proposal.

The Delegation of **Mozambique** commended the working group for coming up with the three proposals and joined other speakers in saying that the status quo was not an option. The delegation expressed support for the modified Norway proposal which it considered to be balanced and fair.

La Délégation de la **Syrie** appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège.

La Délégation de l'**Afghanistan** exprime sa perplexité sur l'universalité et la crédibilité de la Convention. Elle indique souhaiter un compromis et non un consensus et exprime son intérêt pour le vote.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** noted that the General Assembly had three options and expressed its support for the African position in favour of the modified Norway proposal which it considered to be a win-win proposal. It recommended that the "other measures" be taken as a package along with the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed their hope for consensus and that their position was in line with the African Group.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that there had already been a year of talks on this issue and that the time had come for a geographical representation. It reiterated that the situation faced by the African Group was no longer acceptable.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its hope to avoid a vote and reach a compromise. It emphasized the need to respect the integrity and impartiality of the Committee. It pointed out that tailoring some of the other measures such as having multiple rounds of voting, would correct the failures of the elections at the last session. The Delegation reiterated its support for cultural diversity and called for greater efforts to be focused on more important issues such as the conflict of interest.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its support for the Estonian proposal and declared its readiness to go for compromise with the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** rappelle l'objectif principal de la *Convention*. Elle soutenait la proposition de l'Estonie mais est désormais favorable pour la proposition modifiée de la Norvège dans un esprit de consensus.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie la proposition de l'Estonie et les « autres mesures » recommandées par le groupe de travail et est en faveur du vote comme unique processus démocratique.

The Delegation of **Bangladesh** commended the hard work of the open-ended working group in developing these three proposals. It expressed its support for the modified Norway proposal and called for a decision by consensus in order to move forward.

The Delegation of **Nicaragua** expressed its support for the GRULAC proposal which the delegation considered to be the fairest. It also expressed its support for the modified Norway proposal in favour of consensus.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that the status quo was no longer acceptable and expressed its belief that the Estonian proposal was the best. Nevertheless, it expressed its readiness to support the option that would favour compromise.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the consensus on the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recalled the need to revise the *Rules of Procedure* and stated it recognized that the need to do so had become more pertinent after the last elections. It said that this was a critical moment in the history of the *Convention* and that the General Assembly had an opportunity to show that consensus can be reached. The Delegation of Turkey expressed its support for the modified Norway proposal with the package of measures, except the one that proposed to increase the gap between a State Party's mandates on the Committee from four to six years.

The Delegation of **Namibia** supported the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Uganda** declared that all three proposals were acceptable but that it supported the modified Norway proposal. It also expressed hope to reach a consensus.

**La Délégation du Gabon** soutient la position du groupe africain qui appuie la proposition modifiée de la Norvège en faveur du consensus pour l'égalité des chances.

**The Chairperson** recalled that proposal where Committee members were encouraged to refrain from presenting sites for inscription during their mandate was not on the table at the present juncture and that the Committee would be working to address this issue. She recalled that the measures concerned were in the working document of the General Assembly and that a decision had to be taken on this issue during the present extraordinary session. The Chairperson specified that no new proposals could be taken into account. She noted that 81 States Parties had taken the floor and that there was a strong wish for consensus although some countries preferred to use the word compromise. She further noted that a majority of countries did not want to go for a vote. The Chairperson indicated that should some countries request for a vote, the procedure foreseen in the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly would be applied. She concluded with the observation that the overwhelming majority seemed to go for the modified Norway proposal, but if State Parties preferred to take a vote, this could happen as well. The **Chairperson** invited States Parties to consult with each other during the lunch break and come back with the decision on whether to proceed by consensus or vote.

The morning session was adjourned by the **Chairperson**.

**FIRST DAY – Thursday, 13 November 2014**

**SECOND MEETING**

**3 pm – 6 pm**

**Chairperson : H. E. Mrs Véra Lacoeuilhe (Saint-Lucia)**

**ITEM 3 REVISION OF THE *RULES OF PROCEDURE* OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continuation)**

The **Chairperson** opened the afternoon session and gave the floor to the Delegation of Senegal.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique que le groupe africain suggère que le travail soit fait sur la base de la proposition modifiée de la Norvège et sur la question des « autres mesures » d'accompagnement proposées.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** se joint à la position du Sénégal et indique que le groupe arabe partage la même position que le Groupe Africain.

The Delegation of **Brazil** joined the previous speakers in favor of working on the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Japan** explained that there were different views among the States Parties within Group IV. The Delegation expressed its preference for the Estonian proposal but indicated that it would accept the modified Norway proposal in the spirit of the consensus. However, the Delegation was of the view that clean slates should be avoided, free seats secured as much as possible and that any new proposal should be introduced on a trial basis and be reviewed after a certain period. The Delegation also expressed support for the proposal to have a four year gap before a State Party could stand for election as a Committee member again, but reiterated its wish to go along with the consensus.

La Délégation de la **France** indique penser qu'aucun consensus ne se dégage et réitère sa demande de vote.

The Delegation of **Slovenia** supported the Delegation of Senegal, Palestine and Brazil.

The **Chairperson** suggested that since the Delegation of France had requested for a vote, the Assembly should proceed with the vote.

Les Délégation **d'Afghanistan et d'Allemagne** indiquent soutenir la demande de vote introduite par la France.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** demande, s'il y a vote, que celui-ci se fasse par appel nominal.

La Délégation du **Togo** se dit désolée d'aller au vote. Elle note toutefois que l'Estonie, qui a une proposition parmi les trois, a soutenu la proposition modifiée de la Norvège et se demande si l'Estonie serait prête à retirer sa proposition.

La **Présidente** indique que la proposition de l'Estonie est maintenant la proposition du groupe de travail et que l'Estonie ne peut pas, en tant qu'Etat Partie, retirer sa proposition, la proposition ne lui appartenant plus. Cette indication est confirmée par la **Conseillère Juridique**.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the room made a motion to move to a vote and proceeded to explain the voting procedure. She indicated that the vote would be conducted by roll-call in response to the following question: "Which proposal out of the three should be examined first". She clarified that the discussion would not be on the substance of the proposals but through the vote, determine their order of examination. The Chairperson clarified that the order was not in the sense of the most preferred proposal but rather on the proposal that would be voted first.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that the order of voting be carried out according to the draft decision that had been put forward first.

The **Chairperson** clarified that what are being put forward were proposals, not amendments. She pointed out that according to the *Rules of Procedure*, when a vote is made on different proposals, the vote would start with the one that had been presented first. However, this was an unprecedented case where the three proposals have been presented by the working group at the same time and therefore this required the General Assembly's decision on the order in which the three proposals should be examined. She indicated that the rule mentioned by the Delegation of **Kenya** would apply when the "other measures" were discussed and amendments proposed. The **Chairperson** reiterated that the question that would be put to the vote was: "Which proposal out of the three should be examined first". The proposal that received the highest number of votes would be examined first. She informed that subsequently, the General Assembly would choose, out of the two remaining proposals, which should be examined second and third.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested for clarification on whether the General Assembly's vote on the proposals should take into consideration the "other measures" or not.

The **Chairperson** clarified that at the present moment, the General Assembly was just deciding on the order of examination of the proposals and not the content. She indicated that the "other measures" would be discussed along with each proposal.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that from its understanding of the *Rules of Procedure*, it considered that the GRULAC proposal should be examined first as it was the proposal that was put forward first.

The **Chairperson** clarified that while the GRULAC proposal had been presented at another session of the General Assembly, the working group was currently surfacing the three proposals for examination at the same time.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the three proposals were simultaneously put forward to the General Assembly by the working group, and therefore the General Assembly had to decide on their order of examination. The proposal which received the highest number of votes would be the first proposal to be examined by the General Assembly.

**Roll-call vote on the question "Which proposal do you want to examine first?"**

The Secretariat proceeded with conducting the vote on the proposed question.

### **Results of the vote**

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the roll-call, as follows:

With **133** States Parties voting,

“Estonian proposal” **105**

“GRULAC proposal” **18**

“Modified Norway proposal” **10**

### **Roll-call vote on the question “Which proposal do you want to examine second?”**

The Secretariat proceeded with conducting the vote on the proposed question.

### **Results of the vote**

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the roll-call, as follows:

With **133** States Parties voting,

“Modified Norway proposal” **109**

“GRULAC proposal” **24**

Following the results of the vote, the **Chairperson** indicated that the General Assembly would first consider the Estonian proposal. She elaborated that the discussion would be on the substance of the proposal and underlined that no new proposals should be submitted at this stage; only amendments to the proposals submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly would be accepted.

The Delegation of **Peru** enquired of the Chairperson on the number of votes required, as per the *Rules of Procedure*, for a decision to be taken.

The **Chairperson** indicated that pursuant to Rule 17 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly, for each proposal, every part that constituted an amendment to the *Rules of Procedure* required a two-thirds majority vote from States Parties present and voting. Abstentions would not count. The **Chairperson** indicated that at the end of the vote, the number of votes from States Parties would be made known and therefore, the exact majority could be determined.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** souhaite une clarification quant à la question qui va être soumise au vote.

The **Chairperson** indicated that if there were no further interventions, the question: “Who is supporting the Estonian proposal?” would be put to the vote.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed out that it was very important to indicate clearly that Delegations could vote affirmatively for more than one proposal.

The **Chairperson** concurred that Delegations could vote once for each of the three proposals. She clarified that if the Estonian proposal, which was being voted on first, received a two-thirds majority at this juncture, it would be considered as adopted and the other two proposals would not be put up for consideration. However, if the Estonian proposal did not garner a two-thirds majority, then the General Assembly would have to vote on the



modified Norway proposal, and subsequently the GRULAC proposal, where the same voting procedure would apply.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested for clarification on what the General Assembly would be voting on.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the papers that have been distributed in the room contained the text that would be used to amend the Rules of Procedures. She clarified that the text's content was also available in working document 3, except that it has been drafted in a format for amending the *Rules of Procedure*. The text included the proposals on the distribution of seats and the five "other measures".

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the proposal of the Chairperson to move to the vote on the Estonian proposal with the five "other measures" included.

The **Chairperson** indicated that she would proceed with the vote after giving the floor to the Delegation of India. The Delegation of India wanted to know if the vote concerned the "other measures" as well. The Chairperson also added that the Delegation of India had requested to know if the reserved seat would be reserved for a State Party who had never served on the Committee or if it would stay a seat reserved for a State Party with no site on the List.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the vote for each proposal was inclusive of the "other measures" as a package.

The Delegation of **Peru** requested for clarification on the voting procedure, if it would take place by roll-call, i.e. where the name of each country would be called and they indicate if it was voting in favor of, against or if it abstained.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the procedure.

The Delegation of **Brazil** underlined that it was not clear if the vote also concerned the "other measures" and requested for clarification on the possibility of amending the measures.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne qu'elle voit afficher sur les écrans le texte de la proposition de l'Estonie et non juste le tableau extrait du Document de travail, afin que tout le monde sache exactement sur quoi le vote porte.

La **Présidente** souhaite préciser avant le vote que celui-ci concerne un tout : la proposition proprement dite avec les « autres mesures ». Elle indique que des amendements sont possibles concernant les mesures proposées. Elle clarifie toutefois qu'aucune nouvelle proposition ne sera acceptée, le mandat de l'Assemblée générale étant de se prononcer sur ce qui est proposé par le groupe de travail ouvert. Des amendements peuvent être soumis sur les « autres mesures » à condition qu'ils ne transforment pas les mesures proposées en de nouvelles mesures.

Le Délégation **d'Italie** souligne que si l'Assemblée générale approuve une modification de son *Règlement intérieur*, elle doit adopter un texte définitif, immédiatement applicable. Toutefois, la Délégation ne voit pas une formulation du Règlement intérieur dans ce qui est proposé. Ainsi, précise la Delegation de l'Italie, le principe de garantir que le système d'élection maintienne un choix à chaque étape est partagé par la Délégation, mais elle souhaite savoir comment ceci peut être formulé dans un texte; pour l'instant ce « texte de loi » n'existe pas.

La **Présidente** indique que le texte des propositions, qui ont été distribuées dans les six langues, sont précisément des textes de règles, tels qu'ils devraient figurer dans le

*Règlement intérieur* en cas d'adoption. Elle suggère aux participants de se pencher sur ce texte.

The Delegation of **India** enquired if the room would first examine the “other measures” before proceeding with the different proposals.

The **Chairperson** indicated that she had proposed to take amendments to the “other measures” at the present moment.

The Delegation of **India** underlined the importance of discussing the “other measures” first in order to be able to propose amendments, before deciding on a proposal and the “other measures” as a package.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that if amendments were received, they could be put to a vote.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to keep the gap between a State Party's mandate on the Committee at four years instead of the six as proposed in the “other measures”. It enquired on how the reserved seat for a State Party who has never served on the Committee would be attributed, if it would be deducted from the open seats or come from the minimum regional quotas. The Delegation of **Brazil** also enquired on how the voting system would be implemented.

The **Chairperson** highlighted that there was now an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil. She indicated that the question on how the reserved seat for States Parties who had never served on the Committee would be ensured would have to be decided upon by the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed an amendment to stipulate that the reserved seat should come from the open seats available and not from the seats reserved for the regions.

The Delegation of **Japan** underlined that the text as it was currently presented was just one interpretation and that there were also different ways of implementing it. The Delegation stated that it was ready to present amendments to the “other measures” to avoid clean slates.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Japan to present its proposed amendment, underlining that this should not result in a new proposal.

La Délégation de **Palestine** souligne qu'il y a une demande de vote, qui est secondée, sur les propositions elles-mêmes, qui concernent la répartition des Sièges propositions qui nécessitent une majorité des deux tiers. Les « autres mesures » seront examinées ensuite, car le modèle à besoin d'être déterminé avant que les Etats Parties puissent se prononcer sur les « autres mesures ». Ainsi, la Délégation de Palestine réitère la demande de vote concernant les différents modèles à choisir.

The **Chairperson** shared with the room that she had a request from Palestine to delink the proposals for the allocation of seats from the “other measures” and subsequently a request to vote on both items separately. She asked if the General Assembly seconded this request.

The Delegation of **Peru** indicated that this work had already been done by the open-ended working group and that a vote should be taken on the proposals as a whole, in their entirety.

The **Chairperson** noted that since no consensus could be found, a vote had to be taken immediately on whether to examine the Estonian proposal as a package, or to delink it from the “other measures”.

The Delegation of **Bulgaria** suggested voting on this question by a show of hands.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its support to what was raised by the Delegation of Italy, that it was impossible to vote on the “other measures” as part of the three proposals and recommended to delink the process of examining of the proposals and the “other measures”.

The **Chairperson** explained that the reason for which this question had been put forward to the General Assembly was because there were also requests to examine the proposals with the “other measures” as a whole.

La Délégation du **Liban** demande que les propositions précises issues du groupe de travail soient présentées sur les écrans dans la salle Elle précise que les « autres mesures » sont les mêmes pour les trois propositions et se demande si il est judicieux d’examiner les propositions séparément des mesures.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise la position du groupe africain qui est d’examiner « un package », il faut donc s’entendre sur le principe d’examiner un proposition et les « autres mesures » et ainsi pour les trois propositions, afin d’économiser du temps.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** demande un débat sur les « autres mesures » et, après accord sur celles-ci, un vote sur les propositions avec les mesures.

The Delegation of **Ecuador** indicated that the “other measures” remained the same regardless of the model that would eventually be chosen. The Delegation was of the view that it would be more logical to vote on the proposals first before the “other measures”.

The Delegation of **India** highlighted the need to discuss the “other measures”.

**Les Délégations de l’Argentine, du Sénégal, de l’Equateur, de la Turquie et du Salvador** indiquent qu’il faut d’abord choisir le modèle de répartition géographique, puis se pencher sur les « autres mesures », ce qui est conforme aux discussions du groupe de travail.

La **Présidente** rappelle cependant que c’est à l’Assemblée générale de délibérer comme elle le souhaite de la question à examiner, le groupe de travail n’ayant pas avancé de propositions à cet égard. Elle suggère de procéder à un vote car avoir consensus ne se dégage des débats sur la question relative à l’examen sépare des propositions et des « autre mesures ».

La Délégation du **Sénégal** invite la Présidente à passer au vote.

The Delegation of **Cuba** proposed to examine the three proposals on the allocation of seats.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the “other measures” needed to either be objected to or adopted in principal.

The delegation of **Sweden** suggested moving to a vote on the three proposals, along with the “other measures” as a package.

La Délégation du **Canada, soutenue par les Délégations de Côte d’Ivoire, de République Dominicaine, du Brésil, du Kenya et du Japon** appuient la proposition de la Palestine:

salon laquelle le vote doit d'abord s'effectuer sur les propositions de répartition géopolitique des sièges, puis sur les « autres mesures ».

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the statements made by the Delegations of **Senegal** and **Sweden** that the “other measures” and the proposals (or models) should be seen as a package; otherwise, the “other measures” should be decided on before voting on the three models takes place.

La Délégation d'**Egypte** estime que la question du siège réservé à un pays qui n'a jamais siégé au Comité auparavant est vraiment essentielle. La Délégation estime que les modèles de répartition comptent moins et peuvent être discutés après.

The Delegation of **Iran** underlined that the “other measures” needed to be examined first because they guide the choice of models.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed potential amendments to the “other measures”. It indicated that the General Assembly should make its decision from the options that had already been developed, and not act as the working group which had been responsible for developing the content of the proposals.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the General Assembly should consider conducting the examination process model by model, with the “other measures” as part of each model, and propose amendments to each model.

The **Chairperson** indicated that if amendments for the Estonian model and “other measures” were to be submitted, they would be examined one by one.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** enquired on the possibility of amending the “other measures”, given that that Chairperson had earlier confirmed that the model could not be changed at this stage.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the extraordinary session was sovereign in accepting or rejecting amendments for measures as they were being proposed. She mentioned this with regards to the amendment not to increase the gap between a State Party's mandates on the World Heritage Committee from four to six years, which the Delegation of **Brazil** had proposed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** reiterated that in its view, four years was already a sufficient gap and proposed to delete the measure suggesting a “six-year gap” from the package.

The **Chairperson** indicated that such an amendment needed a two-thirds majority, and invited the General Assembly to vote on this question by a show of hands.

The Delegation of **Mexico** requested for clarification on whether a simple majority would suffice to make a decision on this issue.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated that a two-thirds majority was necessary to amend the *Rules of Procedure*. However, a simple majority would be sufficient to adopt a decision which would not change the *Rules of Procedures*. In this regard, the **Legal Advisor** underlined that maintaining a four-year period as a gap between a State Party's mandates on the Committee

did not entail a change to the *Rules of Procedure*, and therefore could be decided on by a simple majority.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the vote, by show of hands, on the following question: “Who is in favor of the measure to increase the gap from four to six years before a State Party’s election to the Committee again?”

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote as follows:

### **Results of the vote**

Countries present and voting: **126**

Majority required: **84**

In favour of the amendment: **105**

The **Chairperson** therefore declared the measure adopted.

The Chairperson indicated that the room would also decide on the measure concerning the reserved seat. She recalled that several delegations had already sought clarifications on whether this reserved seat shall come from the open seats or from the seats assigned to each regional group.

The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed an amendment to this measure stating that the reserved seat for a State Party that has never served on the Committee should be taken from the open seats.

The Delegation of **New Zealand**, on the contrary, proposed that the reserved seat should be taken from the seats allocated to the regional groups.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** requested for advice regarding a third option where the reserved seat for a State Party that has never served on the Committee would be taken from the open seats only in the event that the States Party concerned has not been elected for a regional seat. This would depend on how the rounds of voting would work.

Referring to the possible third proposal, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated the existing *Rules of Procedure* mentioned that the election for the reserved seat preceded the general election and therefore, an amendment to the existing *Rules of Procedure* would be necessary.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** underlined that all the proposals were aimed at having more seats reserved for each region and requested to know if these proposals should therefore be processed first. It mentioned that this suggestion was a pragmatic one: if a State Party that has never served on the Committee before had already been elected during an earlier round, there would no longer be a need to take this seat from open seats. However, this implied that the general election would have to come first.

The **Chairperson** indicated that there were now three proposals being put forward to the General Assembly from the Delegations of **Hungary**, **New Zealand** and the **United Kingdom** and proposed to put them to a vote.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed an amendment to state that at each election, a seat shall be reserved for a State Party that has never served on the Committee on a rotational basis

by regional group. The Delegation mentioned that this would avoid the situation where the reserved seat became a permanent feature of one particular region.

The Delegation of **Portugal** underlined that the Secretariat rightly pointed out that if the General Assembly stuck with the present *Rules of Procedure*, a decision should be made on whether this seat should come from the regional quota or the open seats. The General Assembly could stick to the election of the reserved seat first as if this format were to be changed, it would require an amendment to the existing *Rules of Procedure*.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its support for the proposal of the Delegation of New Zealand and proposed the addition of the following sentence: “the reserved seat to be fulfilled under this paragraph shall be deemed to be part of the seat reserved pursuant to 14.1(c)” of the *Rules of Procedure*.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** signale que la proposition du Kenya n’est pas recevable car elle modifie les trois modèles proposés par le groupe de travail. Elle indique que la question ici est de savoir dans quelle catégorie le siège réservé sera pris : parmi les sièges ouverts ou dans les quotas attribués par régions.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the proposal from the Delegation of Japan to add a sentence to the amendment proposed by its Delegation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** clarified that the Estonian proposal stated that this reserved seat should be deducted from the minimum number of seats. It clarified that this was the same for the modified Norway proposal as well.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the following question would be put to a vote: “Who is in favor of the reserved seat being deducted from the free seats?”

The vote was conducted by a show of hands. The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote as follows:

#### **Results of the vote:**

In favor: **52**

Against: **36**

The **Chairperson** clarified that the States Parties had expressed their wish to have the reserved seat to be deducted from the free seats. However, she indicated that the States Parties had to now decide on the modification of the existing *Rules of Procedure* to replace the reserved seat for a State Party that has no site on the World Heritage List with a reserved seat for a State Party that has never served on the World Heritage Committee. She recalled that amendments to the *Rules of Procedure* required a two-thirds majority.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested for clarification on whether this measure applied specifically to the Estonian model where there were nine free seats.

The **Chairperson** confirmed this.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested for clarification on the type of majority that would apply for this vote.

The **Chairperson** indicated that for the decision concerning the replacement of a reserved seat for a State Party that has no site on the World Heritage List by a reserved seat for a

State Party that has never served on the Committee, a two-third majority was required as this entailed an amendment to the existing *Rules of Procedure*.

La Délégation de la **France** demande une clarification additionnelle quant à la majorité utilisée pour le vote. De plus, la Délégation demande à la Conseillère juridique la confirmation que les décisions qui viennent d'être prises ne modifient en aucune manière les trois propositions d'origine.

La **Présidente** indique une nouvelle fois que le *Règlement intérieur* en usage actuellement prévoit un siège réservé pour un état n'ayant pas de site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et que pour changer cela par un siège réservé pour un Etat partie n'ayant jamais été membre du Comité, ceci implique un amendement au *Règlement intérieur* est donc requiert une majorité des deux-tiers.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que tout ajout au *Règlement intérieur* est une modification de celui-ci.

The **Legal Adviser** confirmed that a two-third majority was required to amend the *Rules of Procedure*. However, she clarified that the present discussion was intended to determine the amendments that would eventually be presented to the General Assembly. It was this amendment that would need a two-third majority to be adopted.

La Délégation du **Portugal** mentionne que l'origine du siège réservé est également une question de substance et donc qu'elle nécessite d'être décidée à la majorité des deux-tiers.

La **Présidente** clarifie que le changement de substance a été approuvé à la majorité des deux-tiers.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that the present discussion was centered on deciding on an appropriate amendment in relation to the Estonian proposal and that this proposal would be put to the vote. If there was a two-thirds majority for the Estonian proposal along with these amendments, there would be, by definition, a two-thirds majority for those amendments. The Delegation of the United Kingdom clarified that the General Assembly was currently designing the package that goes with the Estonian proposal.

The **Chairperson** moved the discussion to the rest of the "other measures".

La Délégation **d'Italie** indique ne pas voir de formulation juridique pour le reste des « autres mesures » et précise qu'il faut les écrire avant de les approuver.

La Délégation de la **France** demande la confirmation de la Conseillère juridique que les décisions prises ne modifient pas la proposition Estonienne de départ qui répartit 9 sièges ouverts. Elle demande si le fait de préciser que l'un de ces sièges sera la siège réservé ne modifie pas la proposition de départ.

The **Legal Adviser** indicated that the question of where this reserved seat should come from would be considered in relation to all three proposals. She indicated that from a legal point of view, this did not alter the original proposal which decided that the reserved seat should come from the free seats rather than regional quotas.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage l'avis exprimé par la Délégation française et souligne que la proposition de la Nouvelle-Zélande aurait dû également être mise aux voix. Elle indique considérer également que la modification approuvée est *de facto* une modification du *Règlement intérieur* et donc aurait nécessité une majorité des deux-tiers.

La **Présidente** souligne que la proposition de la Nouvelle-Zélande est exactement l'inverse de celle de la Hongrie et qu'ainsi le résultat aurait été le même. Elle rappelle une nouvelle fois que le groupe de travail a spécifiquement demandé à l'Assemblée générale de décider de l'origine du siège réservé.

The Delegation of **Japan** reiterated that it supported the measure to ensure that the voting system maintained a choice during all stages of the process by avoiding clean slates. It reiterated the importance of maintaining competitiveness but acknowledged that this needed to be discussed further. In this regard, the Delegation of Japan indicated that it was preparing a draft that would be circulated to all States Parties.

The Delegation of **Grenada** indicated that the General Assembly was considering proposals for a new system designated to ensure equitable geographical representation on the Committee and that the decision to have a reserved seat for countries that have never served on the Committee was not linked to geographical representation. Therefore, the Delegation of Grenada did not consider this as a change to the Estonian proposal.

The Delegation of **Peru** underlined that similarly, it did not consider the Estonian proposal as modified under the current discussion.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed concern that voting process was not very clear. It underlined that big changes were under discussion and that the procedure to adopt these changes should be made clearer. The Delegation indicated its support for the delegation of France which considered that the proposed amendment by the delegation of Hungary had changed the substance of the original Estonian proposal.

The **Chairperson** underlined that a point of order could be raised to provide more clarity on what is being voted on.

The Delegation of **Sweden** proposed to vote on the Estonian proposal immediately as it would most likely not be approved.

The Delegation of **Chile** proposed that for greater clarity, the General Assembly should move to a vote on the proposal.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed their full support for the remarks by the Delegation of the United States of America. It indicated that the discussion was substantial and if it were to be held in the framework of the GRULAC proposal, the decision to take the reserved seat from open seats would in fact eliminate any open seats in the GRULAC proposal.

The Delegation of **Nicaragua** acknowledged the complexity of the debate and underlined the necessity to determine the origin of the reserved seat, not necessarily only in the framework of the Estonian proposal.

The Delegation of **Pakistan** underlined the necessity of having more clarity in first identifying a proposal, before proceeding with the debate on the "other measures".

The Delegation of **Peru** underlined that the suggestion had already been accepted by the General Assembly to go through the "other measures" first before voting on the package together with the Estonian proposal. The Delegation expressed concern that a decision that had already been taken was now being discussed again.

La Délégation de la **France** indique soutenir l'intervention de la Délégation du **Portugal** concernant la substance du débat et celle des Etats-Unis concernant la nécessité de clarté



sur les questions de procédure concernant les votes notamment. Elle réaffirme que, selon elle, ce qui vient d'être adopté change la proposition originale de l'Estonienne.

La **Présidente** rappelle de nouveau que le groupe de travail ouvert a bien demandé à l'Assemblée générale de déterminer l'origine du siège réservé.

La Présidente ajourne la débat et annonce leur reprise, le lendemain, vendredi 14 Novembre, à 10 heures.

**SECOND DAY – FRIDAY, 14 November 2014**

**THIRD MEETING**

**10 am. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson : H. E. Mrs Véra Lacoeuilhe (Saint-Lucia)**

**ITEM 3 REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continuation)**

The **Chairperson** opened the session with a recap on the work undertaken the day before, that ended with the examination of the different “other measures” under the Estonian proposal and that a proposal had been put forward by the Delegation of **Japan** regarding the multiple rounds of voting and clean slates mechanism. She announced that the examination of the measure regarding multiple rounds of voting would proceed and indicated that the existing *Rules of Procedure* already provided for multiple rounds of voting. She underlined that the discussions of the open-ended working group were intended to ensure that the two rounds of voting by the General Assembly would be able to correct the geographical distribution of the Committee. The open-ended working group had discussed a system which required States Parties to receive qualified majority in the first two rounds to get elected. In this way, after two rounds, it would be clear which States Parties were elected and what the geographical distribution of seats in the Committee would look like. Furthermore, if States Parties desired, they could propose a correction to ensure that no group was excluded in the second round. The Chairperson indicated that this system was intended to prevent all the seats from being filled by the first round of voting, as had happened during the last election. The previous system had been abolished because it was long and required several rounds of voting. States Parties decided to simplify the system and replaced it with the current system. The Chairperson indicated that the wording to describe the previous system was available in older versions of the *Rules of Procedure*. She announced that it would be displayed on the screen for ease of reference.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que ce système est parfait mais qu’il ne fonctionne pas dans le cadre des trois propositions à l’étude qui présentent une distribution par région. Il faudrait donc que les Etats parties ayant obtenu la majorité requise au premier tour dans chaque région suivant le nombre de sièges, soient élus. Il faut un système prenant en compte cette répartition régionale.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** soutient la déclaration du Liban et indique qu’il faudrait ajouter dans le texte une indication se rapportant à chaque groupe électoral.

La Délégation du **Gabon** se réfère à un problème de méthode, notant que les travaux de la veille se sont terminés avec l’examen de la proposition de l’Estonie et reprennent ce matin avec l’examen d’un texte existant précédemment dans le *Règlement intérieur*. Elle souligne qu’hier un vote a eu lieu aboutissant à la décision d’examiner en premier lieu la proposition de l’Estonie suivie par la proposition modifiée de la Norvège. Elle indique donc qu’elle

s'attendait ce matin à reprendre l'examen de la proposition de l'Estonie avec l'examen des « autres mesures ».

La **Présidente** clarifie que l'Assemblée générale examine toujours en ce moment la proposition de l'Estonie car la session d'hier n'avait pas fini l'examen des « autres mesures » qui viennent avec cette proposition et notamment la mesure concernant les tours de scrutins multiples, celle concernant les clean slates et le format concernant la désignation des experts. Une fois ces mesures examinées, la proposition de l'Estonie devrait être mise au vote.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that it deeply regretted what happened in the General Assembly the day before, noting that the same kind of diversion strategy was used to prevent advancing on this very important matter. The Delegation expressed its hope that the present day's discussions would lead to a vote on a proposal that will fulfill the expectations of a large majority of States Parties to the *Convention*. It also highlighted that it was now clear that a small group of States Parties were against the consensus and wanted to keep the status quo.

The Delegation of **Kenya** voiced strong support for the statement by the Delegation of Brazil and shared the opinion that the vision of the minority unfortunately prevailed over the wish of the majority. The Delegation expressed the view that the voting procedure was not over as the debate had resumed even after voting on the reserved seats had taken place.

The Delegation of **Argentina** also voiced support for the statements from the Delegations of Brazil and Kenya. It indicated that the “other measures” currently under examination were only related to the Estonian proposal because some of these measures were not applicable to another models. It underlined the loss of time during the debates.

The Delegation of **Japan** pointed out that it was under the impression that its proposal would be examined this morning. It expressed understanding for the frustration in the room and that it was not really clear on what was being voted on. It also stressed the importance of the “other measures” related to the reserved seats and suggested that a vote be taken on the sentence regarding the *Rules of Procedure*. The Delegation of Japan underlined that its understanding was that the General Assembly was still in the process of examining the Estonian proposal and that as indicated by the Chairperson, a vote would be taken regarding this proposal together with the other measures.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que l'action devrait remplacer les déclarations de principes. La proposition devant l'Assemblée générale est simple, il suffit de valider une élection à plusieurs tours et de laisser au Secrétariat le soin de préparer un mode d'élections à plusieurs tours qui sera présenté à la prochaine session de l'Assemblée générale ordinaire, à l'ouverture des débats, pour une modification des statuts. Elle souligne que le mode d'élection peut varier en fonction du modèle qui sera choisi ici. Donc, l'Assemblée générale extraordinaire décide du principe et confie au Secrétariat le soin de préparer le mode d'élection.

The Delegation of **Costa Rica** supported the statements of Brazil and Argentina and suggested following the procedure that was initiated the day before, to first choose a model and then proceed with the “other measures” that should be applied to it.

La Délégation d'**Afghanistan** soutient la déclaration de la Délégation du **Gabon** suggérant un changement de méthode. Elle indique que le but de l'Assemblée générale est de faire le choix entre les propositions soumises par le groupe de travail ouvert. Ensuite, il faudra un vote. Elle rejoint la proposition faite par le Liban concernant le fait que l'Assemblée générale extraordinaire décide du principe et confie au Secrétariat le soin de préparer le mode d'élection.

La Délégation de **Palestine** soulevé une motion d'ordre et demande la clôture du débat et un vote, par appel nominal, sur l'ensemble de la proposition Estonienne telle qu'elle se présente à l'instant.

The Delegation of **Honduras** seconded this proposal.

The **Chairperson** indicated that a motion order had been made to close the debate and proceed to a vote. The Chairperson clarified that in this regard, she had tried from the beginning of the meeting to let every Delegation express their view and position. She indicated that the *Rules of Procedure* were clear and that if the closure of debate was agreed upon by all States Parties, the Estonian proposal and the “other measures”, as it stands would immediately be put to the vote.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime son étonnement. Elle indique que les réactions observées au sein de l'Assemblée générale ce jour augurent mal de l'avenir de la Convention. La délégation précise également penser que le vote va s'effectuer sur un « paquet tronqué » et une proposition « bancale » car dès lors qu'il a été décidé d'examiner les mesures avant les options et dès lors qu'il est évident que la proposition de départ est, de fait, modifiée, il y a un sens à examiner ces mesures une par une et par options. Elle estime que si la discussion est arrêtée au milieu de l'examen des mesures, le vote sera tronqué.

The **Chairperson** mentioned that she would only take interventions regarding the closure of the debate and no other interventions.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested a clarification on what would be voted upon.

The **Chairperson** indicated that a vote would first be undertaken concerning the closure of the debate and that indications would be given along the way to next vote on the Estonian proposal as it stands.

The Delegation of **India** requested for clarification on the status of the “other measures”; if the General Assembly would presently be proceeding to vote on the proposals.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the vote would concern only the Estonian proposal and the “other measures” that go along with it. She clarified that presently, the General Assembly was requested to vote on the closure of the debate.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** requested to see the Estonian proposal and the “other measures” on the screen, before proceeding with the vote on the closure of the debate, in order to be well aware of what would be put to a vote afterwards.

La Délégation de **l’Italie** appuie ce qui a été souligné par la Délégation française. Elle considère que cette motion n’est pas recevable dans la mesure où une motion de ce genre peut être présentée dès lors qu’il y a un texte, ce qui n’est pas le cas à l’heure actuelle. Ce texte n’est pas complet et la Délégation estime donc que la motion n’est pas recevable.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** indique que la clôture du débat peut-être demandée, selon le *Règlement intérieur*, sur n’importe quel sujet. Elle rappelle également que le sujet en discussion actuellement est la proposition de l’Estonie, c’est-à-dire le modèle ainsi que les autres mesures ensemble. La Délégation suggère également de procéder au vote sur la clôture du débat à main levée pour gagner du temps.

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

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite savoir ce que deviennent les « autres mesures » non examinées dans le cadre de la proposition de l’Estonie. Elle souligne que certaines mesures ont été débattues hier et qu’un vote a eu lieu sur plusieurs d’entre elles mais elle remarque également qu’il y a une partie d’entre elles qui n’a pas été discutée.

La **Présidente** précise que les termes de vote sur la proposition de l’Estonie seront expliqués une fois qu’il aura été décidé de clore ou non le débat. La Présidente fait procéder au vote à main levée sur la clôture du débat.

La Présidente annonce les résultats des votes sur la clôture du débat comme suit :

**Résultats du vote :**

<b>POUR la clôture du débat :</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>CONTRE la clôture du débat</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ABSTENTION :</b>	<b>3</b>

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Estonian proposal together with the “other measures” would be put to a vote. She clarified that two of the measures that go with Estonian proposal had been amended the day before. She further clarified that the remaining three had not been discussed yet; though principles and proposals had been submitted by some States Parties, no wording had been proposed and no formal adoption was done. The Chairperson clarified that if the Estonian proposal was adopted, these three measures would be adopted as well, as principles without clear indication on how they would be implemented.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that the General Assembly would be voting on a particular proposal with two of the “other measures” voted and decided upon, with the remaining three measures adopted in principle. However, the Delegation of India mentioned that the term “in principle” was not clear and requested for clarification.

The **Chairperson** clarified that she did not mention that the three “other measures” would be adopted “in principle”. They would be adopted but their modalities would need to be defined. For example, if the General Assembly was to adopt the principle to have mechanisms that prevents clean slates, the exact mechanisms would be proposed later on. The same applied for the measure on having multiple rounds of voting. The principles would be adopted, with modalities of implementation developed at a later stage.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle qu’elle souhaite voir affichée sur l’écran l’ensemble de la proposition de l’Estonie.

La Délégation de la **France** réitère que le vote est demandé sur un texte bancal qui n’a qu’une moitié d’efficacité juridique. La proposition sur laquelle, il est demandé de voter n’existe pas.

La Délégation de **l’Italie** souhaite savoir qui a l’autorité de préciser par la suite ce que l’Assemblée générale des Etats parties n’a pas approuvé. Elle précise que si cette proposition est approuvée, cela signifierait que les prochaines élections, lors de la prochaine Assemblée, seraient régies par un texte à moitié approuvé par les Etats parties et à moitié rédigé par une entité inconnue.

La **Présidente** précise que c’est à l’Assemblée générale de décider qui sera responsable de proposer des mécanismes, ainsi tel que suggéré par la Délégation du Liban, le Secrétariat pourrait faire des propositions sur les tours de scrutins multiples et les « clean-slates ».

The Delegation of **Nepal** requested to know if the subject currently under discussion at the present moment was the Estonian proposal.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that since the General Assembly had decided by vote to close the debate, the Estonian proposal would now be put to a vote. She indicated that she wanted to ensure that all States Parties were clear on what would be put to the vote.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that it had presented a proposal to the General Assembly for amendments the day before. Furthermore, the Delegation considered that changing the *Rules of Procedure* at the beginning of the next session of the General Assembly was not a solution, and that changes had to be made during the present extraordinary session of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** clarified that it was the responsibility of the open-ended working group to explain the implementation of the measures that were sent to the General Assembly. She underlined that it was difficult to expect the General Assembly to develop all the mechanisms for these *Rules of Procedure* within two days. She also mentioned that it was difficult to expect all this to be implemented immediately. For example, the format for the appointment of experts was not ready although the Secretariat has to present it to the General Assembly for implementation. The **Chairperson** reiterated that though issues and measures were adopted by this General Assembly, they may not be implemented immediately, but at a later stage. She reaffirmed that this should have been discussed in the open-ended working group.

La Délégation de **Côte d'Ivoire** indique que le débat sur cette question ne devrait pas être repris sous une autre forme. Le vote devrait maintenant avoir lieu sur la proposition de l'Estonie avec les mesures et principes tels que présentés maintenant.

La Délégation du **Portugal** insiste sur le fait que la proposition sur laquelle le vote doit avoir lieu doit être claire et donc que toutes les explications doivent être données avant le vote. La Délégation mentionne toutefois que, pour elles, les choses ne sont pas claires, elle souhaite par exemple savoir, si le Secrétariat présente des solutions pratiques pour mettre œuvre ces mesures, si ces mesures doivent être approuvées avant la prochaine réunion. Elle ne souhaite pas donner un mandat ouvert.

La **Présidente** précise que comme indiqué précédemment les demandes au Secrétariat de préparer des options sur les « principes » pourront figurer dans le texte de la Résolution qui sera adoptée. Ces options pourront être adoptées par la prochaine Assemblée générale si c'est ce qui est souhaité.

La Délégation de **l'Italie** demande si le texte que l'Assemblée générale adopte aujourd'hui régira les élections des membres du Comité lors de la prochaine session de l'Assemblée générale, en 2015.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that it was still not clear on what is being requested from the General Assembly, and fully supported the statements of France and Italy in this regard. While the General Assembly had agreed to close the debate and go for a vote, the treatment of the "other measures" was still not clear. While the Assembly had adopted two of these measures, the Delegation of India was unclear on what would happen with the three "other measures" that have yet to be adopted. It reiterated that things have to be clarified before any decision is taken. If no further clarity was given, the Delegation of India mentioned that it would abstain from the vote because it was not clear on what is being voted on.

La Delegation du **Liban** indique que, pour elle, ce qui est proposé pour le vote est très clair. Une proposition est soumise avec deux mesures adoptées, et trois points de principes. C'est un « package ». The Delegation of Lebanon mentioned that it was not the first time the General Assembly, or the Committee, voted on decisions that were "principles" and that generally, the Secretariat would prepare a legal translation of these principles for submission to the Committee or the General Assembly for approval.

The **Legal Adviser** indicated that from her perspective, the vote would comprise the text for the proposal on regional groupings – the Estonian proposal – and the two "other measures" that were discussed the day before. For the remaining three "other measures", since the General Assembly had neither discussed these measures nor had finalized texts which could be adopted as decisions, the General Assembly would need to vote on these measures as principles that would require further elaboration by the Secretariat. In response to the question raised on how the amendments that were being voted on at the present moment would be applied, the Legal Advisor clarified that the Estonian proposal and the two "other measures" that have already been voted on, with the text adopted, could be applied immediately. The remaining three "other measures" would only apply once text had been formulated for the General Assembly to adopt at a future meeting.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that if time permitted, the General Assembly could prepare these texts and propose amendments. This was what the Delegation of **Japan** had prepared.

The Delegation of **Egypt** mentioned that it understood the voting procedure has been initiated and therefore requested for the vote to start.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne son inquiétude face au mélange de mesures juridiques et de mesures seulement approuvées dans leur principe, des mesures d'applicabilité immédiate et d'autres d'applicabilité différée. La Délégation souligne que si la proposition Estonienne est adoptée, il y aura un régime d'élection pour la prochaine élection qui mariera des mesures d'application immédiate et des mesures acceptées dans le principe mais qui ne seront applicables qu'une fois validées par l'Assemblée générale. Le régime d'élection sera donc bancal.

La **Présidente** précise qu'il existe déjà dans le *Règlement intérieur* une disposition concernant les tours de scrutins multiples.

The **Chairperson** indicated that since all States Parties have had a chance to express their views and opportunities were given for clarifications, it was now time to move to a vote. She indicated that the question that would be put to the vote was: Who is in favor of the Estonian proposal as it stands now, with the two measures adopted the day before and the remaining measures to be adopted as a matter of principle first, with modalities to be defined at a later stage. She clarified that this proposal required a two-thirds majority. She repeated that the question put to the vote was: *Who is in favor of the Estonian proposal with the measures as they stand now?*

La **Présidente** annonce les résultats des votes comme suit:

**Résultats du vote :**

Majorité requise : 74

**POUR: 24**

**CONTRE 86**

**ABSTENTION: 28**

The **Chairperson** announced that therefore the Estonian proposal was not carried forward. She announced that the General Assembly would now examine the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation du **Canada** souhaite clarifier son vote en faveur de la clôture du débat sur la proposition de l'Estonie et ensuite son abstention pour ce qui concerne le vote sur cette même proposition. Elle indique que la Délégation soutenait initialement cette proposition et que la délégation a toujours favorisé le consensus. Toutefois, la Délégation a remarqué que la proposition de l'Estonie n'avait aucune chance d'être adoptée d'autant plus qu'elle est devenue incomplète. La Délégation souhaite donc une discussion constructive autour de la proposition norvégienne afin que cette session extraordinaire ait un résultat positif.



La Délégation de l'**Italie** indique avoir voté pour la proposition de l'Estonie l'ayant toujours soutenue considérant qu'un changement du *Règlement intérieur* était nécessaire. La Délégation indique regretter que les clôturer des débats empêché que cette proposition requiert les voix nécessaires, et qu'elle soit ainsi devenue une proposition inapplicable. La Délégation considère qu'un texte ne peut être appliqué en partie seulement. La Délégation regrette cet état de fait dans la maison de l'UNESCO qui a toujours privilégié le dialogue et les débats.

La Délégation de la **France** indique avoir été forcée de s'abstenir sur le vote concernant cette proposition en raison du fait que celle-ci est inapplicable et comporte des incertitudes inacceptables. La Délégation souligne qu'on ne peut plaider le consensus et refuser la discussion.

The Delegation of **India** supported the statements of the Delegations of France and Italy and expressed its deep disappointment in how the process has been conducted. The Delegation of India underlined that things were not made clear, Delegations were not allowed to speak and that the process was hurried through. The Delegation of India requested that its deepest concern and dissatisfaction be included in the records of the session.

The Delegation of **Brazil** clarified that at the beginning of the previous day's session, all States Parties wanted to have a dialogue on the different proposals presently. It underlined that presently, the countries who had expressed regret at the lack of dialogue were the ones who had asked for the vote.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the Delegation of Brazil and congratulated the Chairperson on the conduct of the debates.

The Delegation of **El Salvador** supported the Delegations of Brazil and Argentina. It underlined that now the General Assembly should continue and renewed its trust in the **Chairperson**.

The Delegation of **Honduras** supported the Delegations of Brazil, Argentina and El Salvador in expressing its full confidence in the Chairperson.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that the Chairperson had conducted the debates in an exemplary manner but requested to proceed with the examination of the modified Norway proposal in order to not to waste any more time.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the modified Norway proposal and requested for the text to be put on the screen.

The Delegation of **Nepal** enquired if the Chairperson had put forth a proposal for examination as the Delegation understood that the proposal could not be amended.

The **Chairperson** clarified that she was putting up this proposal for examination by the General Assembly and indicated that a small correction should be made on the Spanish and English versions of this proposal.

The Delegation of **Norway** indicated that for the sake of clarity, it would like to amend the second “other measure” which mentioned that *“one seat shall be reserved for a State Party that has never been elected a member of the World Heritage Committee”* to *“this seat shall be allocated from the fixed regional seats/quotas”*.

The Delegation of **Bulgaria** indicated that while it understood the intention of the Delegation of Norway, but it was not permitted to change a model unless the vote was to retain it, which has not been done yet. The Delegation of Bulgaria indicated that only once a proposal had been retained out of the remaining two, only then could amendments be proposed on the “other measures”. Therefore, the Delegation of Bulgaria proposed to immediately put the modified Norway proposal to a vote.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** sought clarification on what was proposed by the Delegation of Bulgaria as amendments had been proposed to the Estonian proposal and therefore, it should also be possible to propose amendments to the modified Norway proposal.

The **Chairperson** said that if she understood well, the Delegation of Bulgaria had proposed to vote on the modified Norway proposal first before moving on to discuss the other measures.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** noted that this was not what had been done for the Estonian proposal.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the Delegation of **Bulgaria**.

The Delegation of **Bulgaria** clarified that, concerning the Estonian proposal, amendments were taken on the “other measures” and not on the proposal itself. Therefore the Delegation of Bulgaria had proposed to move to a vote on the modified Norway proposal and after its adoption, proceed to the “other measures”.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that for the Estonian proposal, the General Assembly had decided on the measure regarding the reserved seat, before voting on the proposal itself. It mentioned that an indication of where the reserved seat would come from had a direct implication on the model. The Delegation of Egypt emphasized that this procedure should be consistent with what was conducted the day before. It fully supported what was proposed by the Delegation of Norway.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that there was confusion again. It requested for clarification on whether the “other measures” would be discussed along with the modified Norway proposal, contrary with what was done for the Estonian proposal, where only two of the “other measures” were adopted and the remaining three retained as “principles”.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the proposal of the Delegation of Bulgaria was to first vote on the model before examining the “other measures”. She indicated that in her view, all measures should be discussed.

The Delegation of **India** requested once again for clarification on whether all the measures would be discussed under the Norwegian proposal, as this was not the case for the Estonian proposal. The Delegation indicated that this treatment was asymmetrical.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that States Parties had requested for closure of the debate on the Estonian proposal, and that she was following the General Assembly's wish.

The Delegation of **Austria** supported the proposal by the Delegation of **Bulgaria** underlining that this was the only way forward to avoid a status quo.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that it totally disagreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Bulgaria for the following reasons: it had been decided that the General Assembly would finish the work of the open-ended working group by completing the models first before voting on them. This included having a discussion on the "other measures" that were not discussed under the Estonian model. The Delegation of the United Kingdom requested that Delegation of Bulgaria reconsider its proposal.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested keeping the two measures that had already been adopted the day before by a clear majority. It mentioned that the modified Norway proposal made it absolutely clear that the reserved seat should be "absorbed" in the distributed seats and that five seats would remain open. Therefore, if there was clarity on these two measures, the General Assembly could proceed to vote on that and that could serve as a compromise solution.

The Delegation of **Costa Rica** indicated that the General Assembly was in the process of voting and that it supported the Delegation of **Bulgaria's** proposal to vote on the model first.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the General Assembly was presently dealing with the modified Norway proposal and not any other proposal.

The Delegation of **Argentina** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Bulgaria, and explained that a vote should first be organized on the models and following that, work on the "other measures" could be initiated.

The Delegation of **Portugal** pointed out that there was no reason to change what had been applied for the examination of the Estonian proposal. It added that the decision on the "other measures" would also be relevant for the decision that would be taken on the proposal itself.

The Delegation of **Bulgaria** clarified that the only intention of its proposal was to expedite the process and make it more efficient. However, as its proposal had initiated a debate that was not intended, the Delegation of **Bulgaria** has decided to withdraw its proposal and proceed with voting in the same format as what was done for the Estonian proposal.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the content of the "other measures" were linked to the models and therefore the implications should be kept in mind before going to a vote. She urged the General Assembly not to hurry with the adoption of a proposal but to proceed with clear understanding. The Chairperson suggested that the work on the five "other measures" be

completed in order to have a consolidated proposal that could be put to the vote. She asked if the General Assembly were in agreement with what she had proposed.

The Delegation of **Cuba** requested to know if the remaining three “other measures” would be adopted only as principles.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the General Assembly would look at all the measures. She indicated that if texts were ready and agreed upon by the General Assembly, the measures could be adopted. She underlined that the substance of the measures should be examined carefully so that the General Assembly could agree on a package that was complete and ready to be implemented. She called on the General Assembly to give itself a chance to try and accomplish this task.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that if the proposal from the Delegation of Bulgaria had been agreed upon, this would avoid starting the debate again and would give the majority an opportunity to express their preference on a model.

La Delegation du **Canada** suggère de procéder paragraphe par paragraphe.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the proposal from the Delegation of Bulgaria was withdrawn. She asked if this proposal was put forward again.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of the Dominican Republic, confirmed that it was proposing to put forward the proposal from the Delegation of Bulgaria again.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** indicated that it objected to this proposal. It underlined that a clear majority was against delinking the proposals from the “other measures” the day before, and wondered why the General Assembly was now reversing its decision.

The **Chairperson** asked the General Assembly if they wished to put the modified Norway proposal to a vote before examining the “other measures”. She also asked if all States Parties were clear on where the reserved seat would come from for this model.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** proposed an alternative scenario for a vote – to move for the consideration of the modified Norway proposal along with the two measures accepted the day before but to concentrate on unfinished business.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime son mécontentement quant aux débats menés. Elle indique que des décisions sont prises sur des propositions viciées et que ceci est très regrettable. Elle indique qu’il faut en tenir à la décision prise par la majorité la veille comme indiqué par la Délégation des Pays-Bas.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique souhaiter une suspension de séance pour consultations sur la question du siège réservé.

The Chairperson proceeded to the vote and informed the General Assembly that there were **65** votes in favour of suspending the debate, with **12** voting against and **15** abstentions. The debates were hence suspended for 15 minutes.

The **Chairperson** announced that the debate had resumed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** announced that it withdrew the motion for a separate discussion of the proposals and the “other measures”.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that the question of the reserved seat had been clearly defined in the working document for the General Assembly; it was part of the modified Norway proposal which stated that this seat would be deducted from the regional seats.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed support for the positions of the Delegations of Norway and Estonia.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested for the General Assembly to consider the possibility of removing the option of having a reserved seat in the proposal.

The **Chairperson** summarized the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Brazil and asked if the General Assembly was agreeable to remove the option of a reserved seat in the new electoral mechanism that may be adopted.

The Delegations of **Argentina** and **Ecuador** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** strongly disagreed with the proposal by the Delegation of **Brazil**. The Delegation underlined that the reserved seat for a State Party that does not have a site on the World Heritage List was already in the *Rules of Procedure* and the open-ended working group had proposed to change the criteria to reserve a seat for a State Party that had never served on the Committee instead. It underlined that the principle of a reserved seat was extremely important, being the only way for smallest countries to be represented on the Committee. The Delegation of New Zealand stated that it felt the responsibility to represent countries in its region that could not afford to come to this meeting and thus were not able to share their views on this issue or to vote on important decisions.

La Délégation de **Palestine** soutient la proposition du Brésil. Elle indique que le siège réservé est une spécificité du Comité du patrimoine mondial et que ceci n'existe pas dans les Comités relatifs aux autres Conventions culturelles.

La Délégation du **Togo** appuie la proposition **du Brésil et** mentionne que ce siège existe déjà dans le *Règlement intérieur* et qu'il n'y sera donc pas touché, chaque groupe gère ce siège réservé comme il l'entend.

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed strong support for the proposal by the Delegation of Brazil in the spirit of consensus.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle, en tant que Président du groupe de travail ouvert, que le siège réservé est explicitement prévu dans le modèle. Elle souligne qu'il avait été décidé au début des travaux de la session extraordinaire de ne pas modifier les modèles.

La **Présidente** indique que ce qui a été décidé est de ne pas modifier le nombre de sièges fixes et ouverts et que le siège réservé ne modifie ni l'un ni l'autre.

La Délégation de **Suisse** exprime son désaccord.

La Délégation de la **République Tchèque** souhaite savoir si en supprimant une ligne dans proposition modifiée de la Norvège, le modèle lui-même ne serait pas modifié sachant que le conseiller juridique avait indiqué que ceci ne pouvait être fait.

The **Legal Adviser** clarified that she did not say that no modification of proposals was possible. The Legal Adviser stated that the room had to decide on the proposal that it wished to adopt and the terms of the proposal. She indicated that the specific proposal on the table presented 16 allocated seats and five open seats. Regarding the line concerning the seat reserved for a State Party that had never served on the Committee, it was presently not determined if the seat should come from the allocated seats or open seats. The Legal Adviser confirmed that it was for the room to decide on what should be done with this aspect of the proposal.

La **République Démocratique du Congo** mentionne qu'elle soutient la proposition Brésilienne.

The **Dominican Republic** indicated that it supported the proposal by Brazil.

The Delegation of **Nepal** indicated that it supported the proposal by the Delegation of New Zealand.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated what had already been mentioned by the Delegation of Egypt, that the document stated that the reserved seat should be deducted from the minimum number of seats. The Delegation proceeded to read out to the General Assembly the relevant section included in working document three that was submitted to the extraordinary session of the General Assembly presenting the modified Norway proposal. It expressed support for the declaration by the Delegation of New Zealand, indicating that the reserved seat would ensure that smaller States Parties have a chance to become members of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** stated that since no consensus could be obtained on this matter, it should be put to a vote. She mentioned that a two-thirds majority was needed to remove the reserved seat.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite savoir de quel siège réservé il s'agit, de celui pour les pays n'ayant jamais été membre du Comité ou de celui réservé en alternance pour les groupes III et IV tel que mentionné dans la proposition modifiée de la Norvège.

La **Présidente** clarifie qu'il est ici question du siège réservé pour les pays n'ayant jamais été membres du Comité. Elle indique que la salle est divisée sur ce qui figure dans le document et qu'une proposition a été faite pour supprimer complètement un siège réservé. Elle indique que si un vote se fait sur cette question, une majorité des deux-tiers est requise.

La Délégation du **Portugal** indique sa surprise quant au fait que la proposition Brésilienne ait été faite aujourd'hui et non hier lors du débat que l'Assemblée générale a eu sur cette question. Elle souhaite toutefois savoir si le vote va porter sur l'élimination du siège « original », celui qui existe actuellement dans le *Règlement intérieur*.

La **Présidente** indique que le vote porterait sur le fait de ne plus avoir de siège réservé du tout. Elle indique également que comme il a été décidé que les mesures dépendent des modèles, les adaptations de celles-ci font que les positions des pays peuvent changer en fonction du modèle choisi. Elle précise le but du siège réservé.

The **Delegation of Egypt** indicated that the *Rules of Procedure* foresaw the possibility of explaining the vote before the voting procedure took place. It indicated that it considered the coming vote as a very sad and unnecessary one. It recalled that this question was clarified by the Delegations of Norway and the Kingdom of Netherlands and the Chairperson herself.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was no agreement in the room.

The Delegation of **Argentina** mentioned that the vote would require a two-thirds majority as this implies modification of the existing *Rules of Procedure*.

Before closing the morning session, the **Chairperson** confirmed that this vote constituted amendments to the *Rules of Procedure* and therefore would require a two-thirds majority.

The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

**SECOND DAY – FRIDAY, 14 November 2014**

**FOURTH MEETING**

**3 pm. – 7 p.m.**

**Chairperson : H. E. Mrs Véra Lacoeylle (Saint-Lucia)**

**ITEM 3 REVISION OF THE *RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY* (continuation)**

The **Chairperson** recalled that the General Assembly was discussing the issue of a “reserved seat” and that a motion to remove this reserved seat was put forward before the lunch break.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commented on the rule for reserved seats, and emphasized the importance of not losing the essence of the message embodied in the rule. While not rejecting the proposal from the Delegation of Brazil, the Delegation of Egypt proposed to insert a short paragraph or amendment to the current paragraph 14.1(c) of the *Rules of Procedure* (the original rule regarding reserved seats) so that it read as follows: *“Notwithstanding, at each election, due consideration shall be given to the election of at least one State Party, which has never served as a member of the World Heritage Committee.”* The Delegation of Egypt noted that this would still embody the essence of the original rule and encourage States Parties to elect countries who have never served as Committee members.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the proposal to remove reserved seats was to be put to a vote before lunch break. She indicated that the Delegation of Egypt was now proposing to replace the rule on reserved seats with the text that had just been read out and displayed on the screen. Therefore, the vote would be to no longer have reserved seats, with an encouragement to vote for a State Party that has never served on the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the proposal from the Delegation of Egypt, and suggested adding the notion of reintroducing multiple rounds of voting, which would allow States Parties to see the mix of elected states prior to the final vote. It proposed the following wording: *“To further facilitate this goal, the Committee will reintroduce a multiple round voting system.”*

The **Chairperson** informed that the proposal by the Delegation of the United States of America concerned the measure that will be examined next, after the question of reserved seats and therefore asked if it wanted to add their proposal to the current section or wait for the discussion on the next measure.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** clarified that it would suggest adding it in the current section.

The **Chairperson** noted the response and clarified again that this would be also addressed in the next section.



The Delegation of **Lebanon** pointed out that it would not be the Committee that reintroduced the voting system. As this constituted an amendment to the *Rules of Procedure*, it would entail approval by the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** confirmed this indication and proposed to keep a general sentence which would mention multiple rounds of voting, without specific reference to the Committee or to the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** thanked the Delegation of Egypt for their proposal which it supported. It argued that reserving a seat for the 120 States Parties who have never served on the Committee would not help Small Island Developing States such as theirs to be elected. It suggested that increasing the number of allocated seats from eight to 16, as well as having a six year gap between a State Party's mandates on the Committee would ensure rotation and equitable representation.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** agreed that the proposals from the Delegation of Egypt and the amendment from the Delegation of the United States of America were very reasonable, and requested to proceed with a vote.

The **Chairperson** indicated that she would proceed with the vote on those in favor of removing the reserved seat. She clarified that under this model, States Parties were voting to no longer have a reserved seat in the electoral system. She reiterated that the reserved seat would be replaced by the proposal from the Delegation of Egypt and the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America, as displayed on screen.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the vote and informed the General Assembly that the total number of States Parties voting was 111, and reminded them that the two-thirds majority required was 74 votes. She announced that therefore, the results of the vote were as follows:

Required majority:	74
<b>FOR:</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>ABSTENTION:</b>	<b>22</b>

After announcing the adoption of the motion, the **Chairperson** moved to the next of the "other measures" concerning the gap of six years between a State Party's mandates on the Committee. She reminded the General Assembly that a vote had been undertaken on this measure during the examination of the Estonian proposal. She asked the General Assembly if there were any objections to this measure. As no objections were raised, the Chairperson declared that the measure to have a six year gap between a State Party's two mandates on the Committee was adopted under the modified Norway model.

The **Chairperson** moved to the next of the "other measures" regarding multiple rounds of voting. She recalled that an amended text had already been prepared this morning by the Delegations of Lebanon and Palestine and requested for the text to be displayed on the screen again.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed to adopt this “other measure” as a principle and leave it to the Secretariat to propose to the next General Assembly procedures for this measure that corresponded to the modified Norway proposal.

The **Chairperson** reminded the General Assembly that this was the model which had been in place until in 2003. This model had also been discussed in the working group, where States Parties expressed regret that it had been dropped because it made it impossible to have all Committee members elected in the first round of voting. Having multiple rounds of voting would therefore make it possible to correct the geographical distribution between two rounds. The Chairperson emphasized that adopting this measure would be reverting to the old model.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that this model should be adapted as it did not take into consideration the minimum number of seats per region.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the minimum number of seats per region had to be filled through elections with multiple rounds of voting, and only when the quotas of the minimum number of seats per region were filled, would the vote move to the free seats.

The Delegation of **Palestine** reiterated the amendments proposed during the morning session, and enquired if it was possible to adopt the measure as a principle and leave it to the Secretariat to propose implementation options at the next General Assembly. The Delegation recalled that the amendment should read as follows “*Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected unless the number of States obtaining that majority is greater than the number of seats to be filled in each electoral group. In that case the States obtaining the greatest number of vote up to the number of seats to be filled in their electoral group shall be declared elected [...]*”

The Delegation of **Lebanon** stated that the Palestinian proposal did not work because while it took into consideration the minimum number of seats of each electoral group, it did not take into account the other floating seat. It indicated that the text should be rephrased and hence suggested that the Secretariat propose implementation modalities at the next General Assembly. It also recommended that the Secretariat work with the Legal Advisor to develop a coherent proposal that would work well.

The **Legal Advisor** noted that it was difficult to draft with a group of 200, but suggested that the General Assembly would have to work separately on the floating seat. She added that the same amendment made by the Delegation of Palestine to the first sentence should also be made for subsequent ballots.

The Delegation of **Cuba** suggested the General Assembly adopt these as principles or modalities that would be further elaborated on by the Secretariat. It added that the Assembly could adopt the model and then look at the “other measures” as principles to adopt; otherwise the meeting would not finish on time. It added that the most important thing was to ensure that the General Assembly had a clear model to follow.

La Délégation d'**Italie** estime que les participants doivent continuer un travail déjà bien engagé, et que puisque l'Assemblée générale est là pour adopter des règles de procédure, il faudra bien les écrire. L'Italie partage l'avis de la Conseillère juridique et considère que

l'amendement reposé par la **Palestine** est viable. Il faudra donc préciser que le 1<sup>er</sup> tour de scrutin est relatif aux sièges des groupes électoraux, et ensuite préciser ce qu'il en est pour chaque tour des élections.

The Delegation of **Honduras** noted that they could go along with the Delegation of Palestine's amendment and the Legal Advisor's suggestion, but found the Delegation of Cuba's suggestion prudent – to first vote for the model before proceeding with a discussion on the other measures.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed to go along with the Legal Advisor's suggestion, incorporating the Delegation of Palestine's proposal with an additional reference to floating seat.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed support for the proposals by the Delegations of Cuba and Palestine.

The Delegation of **Serbia** agreed that they could accept the proposal by the Delegation of Cuba. It pointed out that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Palestine only addressed regional groups but not open seats. It added that if the General Assembly added the phrase "in all ballots", this would solve the problem as it would apply to both regional and open seats.

The **Legal Advisor** agreed that a new text could be drafted. The Legal Advisor pointed out that the issue of having a system of multiple rounds of voting first for the reserved seats, which included the floating seat, is what the first General Assembly would have to decide on, and especially on what would be voted on first. The Legal Advisor stated that the voting procedure of multiple rounds of voting should be adopted also in relation to the open seats. She observed that after this section, the text was cumbersome, and recommended that it would be better to divide the text into 14.8(a) for reserved seats and 14.8(b) for open seats. Lastly, she requested for time to develop the draft text.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the next measure while the Legal Advisor worked on a proposal for the text in order to not waste time and have a ready system in place for the next General Assembly.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** indique être d'accord avec ce que suggère la Conseillère juridique et propose le titre « ballot for allocated seats » pour le paragraphe 14.8(a) et le titre « ballot for open seats » pour le paragraphe 14.8(b), pour lequel on prendrait l'ancien texte sans les amendements qui concernent les groupes électoraux. Ces titres clarifieraient donc tout.

The Delegation of **Serbia** reminded the General Assembly that it had also proposed an amendment that was not reflected on the screen. It suggested adding the phrase "in all ballots" to clarify that this procedure applied to all ballots.

Le **Liban** considère que le système proposé ici est très clair : il y a deux votes, un pour les sièges alloués, un pour les sièges non-alloués, et dans chaque cas plusieurs votes. Toutefois, cette formule possible présente le désavantage que les groupes régionaux pourraient être tentés de s'entendre sur un certain nombre de sièges alloués, ce qui

conduirait à réduire la compétition ouverte. Un autre système est aussi possible: un système d'élections ouvert à plusieurs tours, qui peut aboutir au même résultat. La Délégation réitère sa proposition que le Secrétariat se penche sur cette rédaction et propose les différentes possibilités à la prochaine Assemblée Générale.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that, according to the current proposal, there was no rule to prevent the clean slate. It proposed adding a paragraph to rule 14.8 as follows, new rule 14.1(c)bis : *"Notwithstanding, in case the number of the candidatures for any electoral group, to be finalized 48 hours before the opening of the General Assembly pursuant to Rule 30.4, is equal to or fewer than the number of seats allocated for that electoral group as provided in Rule 14.1(c) above, the number of seats to be allocated for that electoral group shall be decreased to such a number as is one seat fewer than the number of the candidatures for that electoral group. The seat(s) that is no longer allocated pursuant to this paragraph shall be open to any State Party that has expressed its candidature pursuant to Rule 13.1."* The Delegation of Japan acknowledged that this amendment may seem strange or illegal, but rationalized that this provided a mechanism to trigger a discussion for the General Assembly to avoid clean slates. It added that with regards to the legal dimension, the Assembly would decrease the number of allocated seats. However, it further noted that there were no legal issues if the General Assembly agreed on this matter.

La Délégation du **Portugal** indique qu'il est satisfait de la proposition palestinienne, et que, même si la possibilité d'arrangements au sein des régions existera toujours, indépendamment de tout modèle, on peut néanmoins arriver facilement à un accord pour avoir une proposition consistante et conséquente.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient ce qui vient d'être dit par la Délégation du Portugal et exprime son opinion que les participants sont bien engagés, grâce à la Conseillère juridique.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that the proposal from the Delegation of Japan specifically concerned clean slates, which was another measure to be taken up at a later juncture. It underlined that while this measure had links with the multiple rounds of voting, it was not directly related. The Delegation highlighted its concerns and support for the position taken by the Delegations of Cuba and Lebanon to adopt the model first before further discussing the modalities. The Delegation expressed concern to hear that there was the possibility of having separate votes for allocated seats and only one vote for open seats as it had understood from the modified Norway model that there would be one vote for both the allocated and floating seat. The Delegation of Egypt called for the General Assembly to be precise and accurate on the subject. It suggested having a simulation to try out the scenario. The Delegation also announced that it was in favor of prudence and doing the General Assembly's work so that no problems would arise at the next election. Lastly, it recalled that the working document had made it clear that the two measures would be subject to the voting model adopted by the extraordinary session. The Delegation of Egypt expressed its wish to adopt the model first before proceeding with a discussion on the modalities.

The Delegation of **Albania** indicated that it considered the proposal from Delegation of Japan complicated. The proposal would punish an electoral group whose number of candidates was equal to or less than the number of seats. The Delegation considered that the modified Norway proposal could take care of the clean slate problem and questioned the need to have an extra measure to prevent clean slates.

The Delegation of **Canada** drew members' attention to the following point: if a regional group had a clean slate, it would mean that no candidate from that group could stand for elections for the other five open positions. Therefore, in presenting a clean slate, the electoral group would lose its advantage, since the State Party will have no candidates for those five seats. The Delegation therefore concluded that the General Assembly did not need the amendment from the Delegation of **Japan**.

La Délégation de l'**Argentine** indique qu'elle est tout à fait d'accord avec le Canada et l'Albanie, et que la proposition du Japon contient une sorte de « pénalité », ce qui n'est pas le but de cette session. L'Argentine souligne également qu'il est important de voter pour un modèle, lequel pourra toujours être ajusté par la suite.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** observed that during the debates over the models, a majority of States Parties were not in favor of not having clean slates. It noted that there was incentive in the modified Norway proposal to not to have a clean slate. While the Delegation expressed understanding for the intention behind the amendment from the Delegation of Japan, it requested for the Legal Advisor to inform the General Assembly on the legalities of this proposal. In the event that the proposal did not find favor, the Delegation of the United Kingdom would propose the alternative formulation, in the language of a decision: [*The General Assembly*]: *“Reiterates its strong request to Member States and Electoral Groups to provide a sufficient number of candidates for each seat and each election to ensure a genuine choice at each election.”*

La Délégation de la **Palestine** indique que la proposition du Royaume-Uni est tout à fait acceptable. Cependant, elle indique que le débat tourne en rond autour des questions des scrutins à plusieurs tours et du clean slate. La Palestine indique que vraisemblablement, aucun des participants ne s'oppose aux scrutins à plusieurs tours ou à la suppression du clean slate. Elle indique également qu'il y a eu plusieurs propositions par les membres, et qu'on semble s'être mis d'accord sur le principe. Pour le clean slate, la proposition du Royaume-Uni est satisfaisante, mais qu'il n'y a pas encore de solution satisfaisante pour les autres questions. Elle note qu'une proposition avancée était d'adopter le principe de la mesure et de demander au Secrétariat de proposer des « mécanismes » pour adoption à l'ouverture de la prochaine l'Assemblée Générale et mise en œuvre immédiate pour les prochaines élections. Ceci éviterait de discuter des détails.

The **Legal Advisor** added one last proposal and noted that the General Assembly may need three elements to respond to the discussions:

- 1) Reference to a provision already in the language of the working document, on page two of the modified Norway proposal concerning 14.1(a). She underlined that it was clear that ballots for allocated seats shall precede ballots for the remaining seats to be filled. That was how the procedure has been carried out to date, and how it would continue to be for the future. Unsuccessful candidates in a ballot for allocated seats shall be eligible to stand for election in subsequent ballots.
- 2) For 14.8 to revert to the language of 2003, as indicated by the Delegation of Serbia – this would apply to the ballots for multiple voting rounds of voting.

3) As in the 2005 Convention, to include in the *Rules of Procedure* provisions that require the Secretariat to prepare for each Delegation, envelopes with ballots papers for each of the electoral groups, bearing the names of States Parties that are candidates for those groups. A subsequent provision indicating that the count for each electoral group would take place separately would also be included.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated that this would meet the requirements of what the room had sought to achieve. If this proposal was not satisfactory, she recommended that it could be agreed upon as a principle first.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed concern that the terms “reserved” and “allocated” seats were not used in the correct way in the Legal Advisor’s presentation. A reference had been made to reserved seats but reserved seats had earlier been abolished by the General Assembly. Furthermore, the “allocated seats” were now included in a model where there would simultaneously be elections for every seat that was to be filled.

The **Chairperson** noted the comments from the Delegation of **Egypt** that acknowledged that the Legal Advisor had reflected the corrections regarding “reserved” and “allocated” seats.

The Delegation of **Egypt** reiterated that the concept of “allocated” did not fit in with the modified Norway proposal.

The Delegation of **Peru** suggested that the General Assembly return to the original spirit of the proposals made. It agreed that the Delegation of Palestine’s proposal concerning regional allocated seats was good. The Delegation pointed out that the Delegation of Palestine’s proposal, coupled with the Delegation of the United Kingdom’s proposal, would cover all the points that the Delegation of Japan was trying to make. Lastly, the Delegation called for one clear succinct paragraph that would sum up all the ideas discussed.

La Délégation du **Liban** indique qu’il y a un réel problème de fond, comme l’a indiqué l’Égypte. Elle souhaite ainsi savoir s’il y a deux scrutins séparés, un pour les sièges régionaux et un pour les sièges ouverts, ou seulement un seul scrutin pour tous les sièges? Cette question n’est pas réglée, et la Délégation du Liban propose que deux modèles soient présentés par le Secrétariat.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que l’Assemblée générale devrait arriver à une solution effective et opérationnelle. La Délégation de la France réitère son assurance que l’Assemblée générale est sur la bonne voie qu’il faut achever le travail entamé.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** propose, pour éviter de tourner en round, d’adopter les principes et indique qu’elle soumet un amendement demandant au Secrétariat de préparer les mécanismes de mise en œuvre pour la prochaine Assemblée générale en vue de leur application aux prochaines élections, le texte pourrait être le suivant « ask the Secretariat to provide, at the next 20th General Assembly of States Parties, at least two mechanisms to implement the multiple voting rounds. »

La Délégation du **Chypre** indique qu’elle n’est pas tout à fait d’accord avec la Délégation de la Palestine en vue d’achever le travail lors de la prochaine assemblée. Chypre suggère une

pause de 10 minutes pendant laquelle le Secrétariat et la Conseillère juridique peuvent préparer un texte pour adoption au cours de la présente séance.

La Délégation du **Liban** indique qu'une même question de fond reste à résoudre et qu'il faut soit en discuter aujourd'hui, soit adopter la proposition faite précédemment, appuyée par la Délégation de la Palestine. La Délégation du Liban suggère d'arrêter les déclarations de principe.

La **Présidente** indique qu'elle voit les choses plus simplement : un vote où l'on remplit d'abord les quotas, puis la continuation avec tous les sièges libres. Si tout le monde est d'accord avec ce système qui semble le plus simple, il pourrait être utile de demander à la Conseillère juridique de faire un texte en ce sens qui satisferait tout le monde.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique qu'elle est d'accord avec le Liban, et qu'il y a une question de fond à régler avant tout. La Délégation indique qu'il est important de se prononcer sur les amendements lors de cette séance, et qu'on ne peut tout laisser à la prochaine session.

La **Présidente** indique que l'examen de la question des votes à scrutins multiples peut être réglé lors de cette session et qu'ensuite sera abordée la question des clean slates.

La Délégation du **Maroc** soutient la proposition de Chypre de prendre 10 minutes pour se mettre d'accord sur une proposition.

La **Présidente** indique que la **Conseillère juridique** va se consacrer à la rédaction d'un texte dans le sens de ce qui vient d'être dit, mais que pour gagner du temps, l'Assemblée générale continuera son travail sur d'autres questions.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that if there was a decision to be made on a rule regarding the rounds of the next election, the General Assembly should decide on it and draft the text of the rule at this present session. The Delegation indicated that it would be uncomfortable to go to the next meeting of the General Assembly where the elections are taking place, to decide on the rule there and then implement it immediately. It expressed its agreement with the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon to discuss if the General Assembly indeed wanted to have multiple rounds of voting. For the General Assembly to discuss the merits of this measure, the Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that the Secretariat explain the difference between having multiple rounds of voting and not having multiple rounds of voting, with respect to the modified Norway proposal, noting that there were no longer "reserved seats" only "allocated seats".

The **Chairperson** agreed with the suggestion from the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**, but suggested that the General Assembly listen to all questions from States Parties first.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** soutient l'intervention du Royaume-Uni, et mentionne qu'il faut approuver des règles et se pencher sur ces propositions afin de conclure rapidement, comme l'a suggéré le Maroc.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime, à l'instar du Maroc et de l'Italie, son souhait de finaliser le travail lors de la présente session et estime que l'amendement de la Palestine risque de rouvrir inutilement des débats lors de la prochaine session, alors que les discussions achillées avancent vers un accord.

The Delegation of **Peru** underlined that the General Assembly was nearly getting to a solution. It suggested following the suggestion from the Delegation of **Cyprus**.

The Delegation of **Palestine** supported the position of the Delegation of Cuba, indicating that the measures presently being discussed did not affect the modified Norway proposal. It enquired if the General Assembly could first examine and adopt the model, before concentrating on discussing the “other measures” in detail.

The **Chairperson** underlined that regarding the question of clean slates and designation of experts, the General Assembly should try and ensure that either the texts are ready or would be prepared by the Secretariat.

The **Legal Adviser** indicated that she did not attend the open-ended Working group. After consultation with the room, it was decided that the term “reserved” would be replaced with “allocated” in paragraph 14.1 (c). The same change would be applied to the second sentence regarding the rotation between Group III and IV. She stated that if paragraph 14.1, (e) was no longer wanted, it should be removed. She indicated that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Palestine was feasible and that paragraph 14.8 could work as it currently stood.

The Delegation of **Portugal** confirmed that the **Legal Advisor** was correct.

The **Chairperson** indicated that if the General Assembly had reached an agreement to vote on all the seats collectively, the Assembly could now move to discuss the rest of the measures and let the Legal Advisor come up with a clean text. She reminded the room that some States Parties were not comfortable with the proposal regarding clean slates made by the Delegation of Japan, and that the Delegation of the United Kingdom had suggested to replace the proposal by the Delegation of Japan with a recommendation to States Parties and not a rule. She enquired if the Delegation of Japan could accept the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of **Japan** mentioned that previously, only six seats were allocated but now 16 among 21 seats would be allocated and therefore avoiding clean slates would be very important. The Delegation of Japan proposed that this be reviewed after a certain period of time and that the review should also include the state of the clean slate. In this case, the Delegation of Japan could accept the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. It emphasised that the General Assembly should review the results of the amendments to the electoral system after a certain period of time because it was a big change. In this review the General Assembly, should also consider the issue of clean slates amongst others.

The **Chairperson** responded to the Delegation of **Japan** by indicating that if after this model is adopted and implemented, there would be a review it to see if it was working well and preventing clean slates.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that not only clean slates, but other situations arising from this amendment, should be reviewed after a certain period of time as well.

The **Chairperson** requested that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** be given in writing and displayed on the screen for the General Assembly.



The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the proposal from the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** had the merit of clarity. Nevertheless it appeared slightly contradictory and therefore should remain only as a political encouragement.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the General Assembly should do away with the proposal by the Delegation of Japan, because from a practical perspective, there would be no time if the 16 reserved seats were up for grabs, except if the law was directed only to the Africa Group, which would have no seat at the next election. It mentioned that there were countries which already occupied seats and would be moving out gradually as the other countries entered as newly elected Committee members.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la nécessité d'avoir un caractère provisoire des décisions aux fins d'évaluation tel que le propose le Japon. Elle souligne qu'un alinéa (d) existe dans la proposition norvégienne, qui n'a pas été examiné dans le détail et que la Délégation ne comprend pas.

La **Présidente** clarifie que le Comité a actuellement des membres élus dont une partie quitte le Comité en 2015 et sera remplacée. Si ce modèle proposition modifiée de la Norvège est adopté, il sera appliqué dès la prochaine élection Il faudra donc adapter ce modèle à la réalité qui est : combien de pays restent membres dans chaque groupe pour voir si ils ont plus que ce que ce modèle leur donne ou moins. Elle indique que cela est une mesure transitoire mais qu'après simulation celle-ci sera appliquée dans le cas de la proposition modifiée de la Norvège.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite ajouter le terme « transitoire ».

La **Présidente** réitère que pour cette proposition spécifique ce ne sera pas nécessaire, car cela fonctionnera dès le début. Pour une autre proposition, celle du GRULAC par exemple, il y aurait eu besoin de cette période transitoire, mais ce n'est pas le cas de la proposition norvégienne.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the proposal put forth by the Delegation of the United Kingdom was clear and expressed support for it, only on the basis of that there would only be one global round of voting for all seats available.

The Delegation of **Japan** suggested including a separate sentence as it concerns the entire situation, which could read "The General Assembly decides to review the situation created by the amendment 6 years after the first election to be held under the amended *Rules of Procedure*."

The **Chairperson** indicated that this would be reviewed as part of the Decision after the examination of the measures was finished. She asked if any States Parties were in disagreement with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the **United Kingdom**.

No objections were made, thus the amendment from the Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** moved to the measure regarding the format of the presentation of experts. She stated that the Secretariat would provide a format with the information required for the

presentation of experts. She indicated that it was clear that this measure would not apply for the next session of the General Assembly, as this format would only be examined and adopted by the next General Assembly. She asked if all States Parties were in agreement with this measure.

No objections were made, thus the measure was adopted.

The **Chairperson** indicated that there was still the question regarding the multiple rounds of voting to be decided upon before putting up the whole package to the vote.

La Délégation de **la Syrie** exprime sa satisfaction concernant l'adoption de l'amendement proposé par le Royaume-Uni.

La Délégation du **Gabon** demande des précisions quant à l'établissement du format des candidatures d'experts et attire l'attention de la Présidente sur les différences qu'il peut y avoir dans les domaines d'expertise entre les Etats Parties.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne qu'il ne devrait pas y avoir de distinction entre le degré d'expertise des Etats Parties. Elle précise en outre que ce sont les Etats Parties qui prennent la responsabilité du choix d'experts appropriés car l'expertise de haut niveau existent dans tous les pays.

La **Présidente** précise que la Délégation du **Gabon** ne faisait pas allusions niveau d'excellence des experts mais relevant que les spécialisations peuvent être différentes entre les régions.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** constate qu'il appartient aux Etats Parties, membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, de choisir des experts qualifiés dans les domaines du patrimoine pour les représenter.

The **Legal Adviser** underlined the difficulty of drafting and removing the vote on the allocated seat first. The Legal Adviser stated that the allocated seats referred to in paragraph 14.1(c) and in paragraph 14.1(d) could be of a special arrangement as in the case of the 2005 Convention. She noted that the General Assembly removed the first ballot for allocated seats and the second ballot for the open seats. She indicated that Paragraph 14.8 from the 2003 version of the *Rules of Procedure* stated that a ballot would be organized in order that voting for all members could take place at the same time, with the provision that all States Parties who were supposed to get allocated seats receive them as a result of the ordinary voting procedure. The Legal Adviser read out paragraph 14.8 as it was in the Rules of Procedure from 2003: "*Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of States obtaining that majority is greater than the number of seats to be filled.*" She mentioned however that the present situation was different as 16 seats were allocated, and therefore the text should be "*Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of States within an electoral group obtaining that majority is fewer than the number of seats allocated to that electoral group.*"

The Delegation of **Granada** stated the reality that at the next election, there would not be 16 seats to be allocated.

The **Chairperson** indicated that when rules were drafted, they were drafted for a general situation, not for a specific one. The General Assembly would have to agree on a general way for this ballot should be carried out, and the specificities for each context would be defined by the actual committee at the new election.

The Delegation of **Granada** underlined the need to know the number of distributed seats before each election takes place.

The **Legal Adviser** underlined that taking into account that there would already be some States Parties on the Committee in addition to the newly elected ones, the text should be adapted as follows: *Those States obtaining in the first ballot the required majority shall be elected, unless the number of States within an electoral group after the election is fewer than the number of seats allocated to that electoral group.*

La Délégation du **Liban** propose de poursuivre la discussion sur le déroulement du scrutin et sur ce qui se passerait ensuite.

The Delegation of **Granada** stated the possibility of having more States Parties elected than the number of free seats available in the model of the modified Norway proposal.

La Délégation de la **France** préfère employer l'expression «...*sauf si* le nombre des Etats Parties au groupe électoral est inférieur.. » au lieu de « *à moins que..* » dans le texte français.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that as the General Assembly decided to have allocated seats, it should be ensured that the seats are filled in the first round, and a second round would be organized for the remainder of the seats.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** agreed with the Delegation of the United Kingdom that the General Assembly should not get bogged down by minor details and miss the essence of the work that it was supposed to be doing.

The **Legal Adviser** suggested modifying the old text of paragraph 14.8 on the basis of the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with what the Legal Adviser suggested and proposed deleting paragraph 14.8 as the text proposed by the Legal Adviser was clear.

The Delegation of **Peru** indicated that the text was ambiguous and supported the proposal of the Delegation of the United Kingdom to have a simple drafting to first have the vote for allocated seats, where those with the greatest number of votes would be elected. If the number of countries obtaining majority of votes have not filled all the vacant seats of an electoral group, another round of voting would be organized until all vacant seats are filled.

The Delegation of **Norway** indicated that the proposal from the Delegation of the United Kingdom was in line with the modified Norway proposal but that the term “required majority” in paragraph 14.8 created problems. The Delegation enquired if being elected for the allocated seats entailed a required majority or if it would be based on the highest number of votes.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** demande plus de précision sur chaque tour d'élection et recommande de procéder à un deuxième tour dans le cas où tous les sièges ne seront pas attribués.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** constate que la complication ne réside pas dans le fait d'avoir plusieurs tours de scrutin mais dans l'éventualité d'avoir plusieurs Etats Parties qui ont la même majorité requise pour un nombre limité de sièges attribués.

La Délégation du **Liban** recommande de définir un système de vote puisque les sièges alloués seront soumis au vote pour chaque groupe avec le risque d'avoir plusieurs Etats Parties ayant la majorité requise pour un nombre limité de sièges.

**La Présidente** indique que c'est aux Délégations de choisir le type de scrutin pour les sièges attribués et pour les sièges ouverts. Soit il est considéré que l'Etat partie ayant obtenu la majorité qualifiée dès le premier tour, même si les Sièges de son groupe sont déjà pourvus, peut prendre un siège parmi les cinq étant ouverts, soit un nouveau tour de scrutin est organisé sans tenir coqueté du résultat précédent.

The **Delegation of Egypt** indicated the idea of a global vote and the possibility for a third country.

The **Chairperson** expressed her happiness that these discussions were taking place during the present Committee session rather than at the next General Assembly right before the vote takes place.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** clarified its proposal: in the first electoral round, all successful candidates should gain the seats and all unsuccessful candidates would automatically be eligible to qualify for the other rounds of voting. The vote count should start from zero after the first round.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the proposal advanced by the **Delegation of Egypt of** having one global vote as it would help to avoid the clean slates.

The Delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the Delegation of Estonia that the proposal of the Delegation of Egypt (which implied not voting solely for the allocated seats in the first electoral round) would be helpful to avoid the clean slates, but also reiterated the need to reflect on how to adopt a system with multiple rounds of voting.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** exprime sa réticence envers le système de plusieurs tours de scrutin et recommande de se tourner vers le Secrétariat pour une éventuelle nouvelle proposition.

La Délégation de l'**Argentine** appuie la proposition du **Royaume-Uni** concernant un premier tour pour les sièges attribués et un deuxième tour pour les sièges libres.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated its proposal, where the first electoral round would be for the allocated seats and the other rounds would be executed until all vacant seats were filled.

The **Chairperson** enquired if States Parties agreed with the proposal to adopt a process where States Parties with the highest number of votes would be elected for the allocated seats, before proceeding to execute a second round of voting for the other seats.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** recommande que les Etats Parties ayant la majorité requise et restant sans sièges lors du scrutin pour les sièges attribués aient la possibilité d'avoir un siège ouvert.

The **Chairperson** explained that a simple majority was intended for the highest number of votes and that the term "required majority" should not be adopted for the allocated seats.

La Délégation du **Portugal** n'adhère pas à la proposition égyptienne concernant l'attribution de sièges ouverts aux Etats Parties ayant la majorité requise lors du scrutin pour les sièges attribués.

The **Chairperson** explained that two options were being discussed: a unique and global vote, or separate votes. The seats allocated for the regional groups should be filled first and the vote count for the election of the open seats should start from zero. She reiterated that according to this proposal, there would not be a need to achieve a required majority in the first electoral round as candidates are elected on the basis of the highest number of votes. She requested if the States Parties wanted separate ballots.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that according to its proposal there should be a second round of voting for the open seats and that during this round, the vote count should start from zero.

The **Chairperson** asked the States Parties if they agreed with the proposal from the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

#### **The proposal was approved by acclamation.**

The **Chairperson** reiterated that following the proposal from the Delegation of **United Kingdom**, the first electoral round should be for allocated seats and the other rounds for the remaining seats.

The **Legal Advisor**, considering the agreement on executing the ballot for the allocated seats first, asked the States Parties if they preferred to adopt the voting procedure as proposed in sub-paragraphs 14.8 and 14.10 of the *Rules of Procedure* or to maintain the procedure as indicated in the model of 2003.

The Delegation of **Granada** recommended paying particular attention to countries which have never served in the Committee.

The **Chairperson** noted that the current voting system would work for the allocated seats.

La Délégation du **Liban** constate que le système de vote actuel exige d'avoir la majorité qualifiée pour être élu au premier scrutin et soulève la question du type de majorité simple ou qualifiée pour les sièges libres.

The **Legal Adviser** answered that an absolute majority of votes from States Parties present and casting votes was required for a State Party to be elected to the allocated seats,

La Délégation du **Maroc** se joint à la Délégation Libanaise au sujet du choix de type de majorité qui sera exigée pour les sièges ouverts et recommande d'adopter un texte dans l'amendement qui traduira ce choix.

La Délégation du **Togo** recommande d'avoir un scrutin ouvert à tous les Etats Parties pour remplir les sièges ouverts y compris par ceux qui n'ont pas eu de majorité lors du scrutin pour les sièges attribués.

La Délégation du **Liban** préfère un scrutin simple pour les tours de votes y compris pour les sièges ouverts.

La Délégation du **Portugal** recommande de garder les règles de procédures actuelles à savoir un premier scrutin à majorité qualifiée.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that in the case where no States Party achieved the required majority of votes in the first electoral round, the required majority could be applied from the second round onwards, but not from the first round.

The **Chairperson** noted that the problem raised by the Delegation of Germany has already been addressed by the solution of having several rounds of voting.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that according to its proposal, the winners of the election for the allocated seats are those who receive the highest number of votes.

La Délégation du **Liban** constate que dans le cas de figure d'un vote à majorité qualifiée des Etats Parties peuvent être élus avec un nombre de voix relativement insignifiant par rapport au nombre des Etats Parties.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that the real problem concerned the majority vote required to be elected for the open seats and supported the proposal from the Delegation of the United Kingdom. In its opinion, according to this proposal, a simple majority should be adopted in the first round of voting and a qualified majority in the second round.

The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed the same concern as the Delegation of Lebanon and stated that having a simple majority goes against the system of having multiple rounds of voting.

La Délégation de **l'Italie** accepte la majorité simple au premier scrutin concernant les sièges attribués et exige une majorité qualifiée au deuxième tour pour les sièges ouverts.

La Délégation de **l'Egypte** accepte le choix de la salle concernant un scrutin à majorité simple pour les sièges attribués et un scrutin à majorité qualifiée pour les sièges ouverts par ailleurs, l'Egypte exprime sa préférence pour un vote à majorité qualifiée pour les deux tours.

La Délégation du **Togo** recommande le choix d'un vote à majorité simple pour le premier tour.

La Délégation de **l'Argentine** approuve le sentiment général pour un scrutin à majorité simple au premier tour et un scrutin à majorité qualifiée pour le second tour.

Le Délégation du **Kenya** propose de voter sur la proposition modifiée de la Norvège afin de pouvoir discuter de la proposition du « GRULAC ».

The **Chairperson** rejected the request of the Delegation of **Kenya**.

La Délégation de la **France** s'exprime en faveur d'un scrutin à majorité absolu le plus en amont dans les tours de vote.

The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** supported the proposal advanced by the Delegation of Argentina of to adopt a simple majority in the first electoral round for the allocated seats and a qualified majority in the second round for the open seats and urged to move the proposal to a vote.

The Delegations of **Venezuela, Ecuador, Honduras** and **Armenia** supported the proposal advanced by the Delegation of Argentina.

La Délégation du **Maroc** approuve la proposition **de l'Argentine** pour un scrutin simple au premier tour concernant les sièges attribués et un scrutin absolu pour le deuxième tour concernant les sièges libres.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, following the other Delegations, supported the proposal advanced by the **Delegation of Argentina**.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that in her understanding, States Parties intended for “simple majority” to mean having the highest number of votes. She expressed the need to have better clarity on the definition of terms “simple” and “qualified” majority.

The **Legal Adviser** clarified the difference between absolute/simple/required/qualified majorities. In her understanding, States Parties wanted absolute and simple majority in the first electoral round for both allocated and open seats. She defined absolute majority as having more than 50% of votes from those present and voting and indicated that it was technically advisable to replace “absolute” with “simple” majority. She stated that the term “greatest number” is also generally adopted (e.g. in paragraph 14.9) and advised avoiding the term “required majority”.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated that there was also confusion between the concept of “round” and “ballot”, stating that there could be a second round for the first ballot.

La délégation de l'**Argentine** réitère sa proposition, selon laquelle une majorité simple devrait être adoptée pour le premier tour et à la majorité qualifiée pour le second tour.

La délégation de l'**Egypte** demande si la majorité simple représente le plus grand nombre de votes et exprime la nécessité de définir ce que signifie la majorité qualifiée afin d'éviter toute confusion.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** approuve la proposition de l'**Argentine** pour un scrutin simple au premier tour concernant les sièges attribués et un scrutin qualifié pour le deuxième tour concernant les sièges libres.

The **Chairperson** explained that the proposal of the Delegation of **Argentina**, supported by the majority of the other Delegations, was to elect candidates with the highest number of votes in the first round for the allocated seats and with 50% plus 1 of the votes in the further rounds for the open seats.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** recommande de clarifier les concepts de majorité simple et qualifiée afin d'éviter toute confusion.

The **Chairperson** explained that the result of the votes was based on the number of States Parties present and voting.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reiterated that according to its proposal, the first electoral round was for the allocated seats. It explained that simple majority does not mean the highest number of votes.

The Delegation of **Cyprus** suggested removing the sentence on “allocated seats”.

La Délégation du **Liban** accepte le choix de la salle pour un scrutin à majorité simple au premier tour et un scrutin à majorité qualifié au deuxième tour, mais exprime son insatisfaction envers ce choix sans s’opposer au consensus auquel sont arrivés les autres Délégations.

La Délégation de la **France** recommande d’éviter d’employer l’expression « majorité simple » dans le texte de l’amendement afin d’éviter toute confusion.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the opinion of the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** recommended maintaining the text in the case of a tie in terms of the number of votes received by two States Parties.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the Delegation of Czech Republic that the text should be maintained in the case of a tie.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la position du Liban.

The Delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the Delegation of Switzerland, maintaining that adopting the proposal from the Delegation of the United Kingdom would imply having two categories – one elected with a simple majority, and the other with 50% plus 1 of the votes.

The **Legal Adviser** proposed using the language of paragraph 14.10 for paragraph 14.8(a).

The Delegation of **Nepal** sought clarification on the difference between the highest and the greatest number of votes.

The **Chairperson** suggested analysing the case in which the penultimate groups competing to be elected for the allocated seats have a tie in terms of number of votes.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested to maintain the older version of the text as it was more comprehensible.

The **Chairperson** negated this request as the modification proposed by the Delegation of Australia was in contrast with the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom that had already been adopted. She reiterated the need to have the sentence on the tie.

La Délégation du **Togo** propose d’ajouter au texte de l’amendement la phrase suivante dans le cas de figure d’une égalité des voix entre les Etats Parties : « en cas d’égalité des voix un second tour est organisé pour les candidats ayant obtenu le même nombre de voix, à concurrence des sièges restant à pourvoir »



The Delegation of **Pakistan** stated that the sentence on the tie should consider not only those who have obtained the same number of votes, but also those with the least number of votes.

The **Legal Adviser** indicated that the last issue to be considered was for the Secretariat to prepare separate ballot papers for each electoral group, and that the text would have to be modified consequently.

La Délégation de la **France** recommande d'ajouter un amendement au texte proposé par le **Togo**.

La Délégation du **Togo** approuve la proposition de la **France**.

The **Chairperson** declared that the session was close to its conclusion and that all the proposals should now have been reflected in the text.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed with the Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** asked the States Parties if they agreed to adopt the proposals unanimously.

**These proposals were approved by acclamation.**

The **Chairperson** consulted with Delegations that had wanted to add something after the adoption of the proposals. The Delegations concerned agreed with the final proposals.

The Delegation of **Granada** congratulated all the participants and expressed its happiness at the results.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its satisfaction that the General Assembly had managed to come to an agreement. The Delegation stated that all participants had put in tremendous effort for the session and the delegation stated that it could therefore be confident at the future of the Convention. The Delegation thanked all participants, and especially the Chairperson for doing a fantastic job.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie la Présidente et les autres délégations pour avoir participé à ce débat. Elle rappelle qu'il y a un an, l'Afrique avait quitté l'Assemblée générale avec un sentiment de malaise, mais que cette année, elle achève cette session avec un large sourire. La Délégation reconnaît que certains aspects des débats furent difficiles mais souligne que l'Assemblée générale a obtenu un résultat qui satisfait tout le monde. La Délégation exprime sa gratitude à tous les participants et réitère que les résultats de cette session aideront la Convention dans le futur.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated all participants and the Chairperson for their commitment to success.

La Délégation du **Gabon** souligne que les résultats obtenus à la présente session démontrent la confiance et le soutien que l'Assemblée générale a placé en sa Présidente. La Délégation exprime sa gratitude à la Présidente, ainsi qu'à la Délégation de la Norvège et à tous les participants qui ont contribué aux résultats obtenus à cette session. La Délégation ajoute qu'elle pourra quitter la salle avec le sourire, comparé aux larmes de l'année passée et cela, grâce au succès de la Présidente.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** exprime sa satisfaction pour trois raisons. Premièrement car elle est heureuse de voir que le groupe africain sourit de nouveau ; d'autant plus parce que leurs droits légitimes ont été entendus. Deuxièmement, elle exprime sa satisfaction à l'adoption par l'Assemblée de la proposition norvégienne. Troisièmement, la Délégation rappelle qu'il s'agit d'un moment historique car l'Assemblée générale faisait face à cette question depuis des décennies. A cet égard, la Délégation souligne que la conduite des débats par la Présidente restera dans les annales de l'histoire. La Délégation remercie tous les participants pour leur ouverture d'esprit, leur flexibilité et leur contribution au compromis obtenu durant la présente session. Elle remercie le Secrétariat pour son travail de préparation ainsi que tous les donateurs grâce auxquels cette Assemblée générale extraordinaire a pu avoir lieu. Elle salue enfin à nouveau la Présidente pour son excellent travail.

La Délégation de l'**Argentine** s'associe à ce qui a été dit par les autres délégations pour saluer le travail de la Présidente. Elle souligne que c'est un moment historique et remercie la Norvège pour sa proposition. La Délégation remercie également le Secrétariat pour son travail de préparation ainsi que tous les Etats parties pour leur engagement dans la réussite de cette session.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** said that it had been a good day, not just for Africa, but also for friends of Africa. The Delegation thanked the Chairperson and all participants for contributing to the results achieved and working tirelessly for this success. The Delegation reiterated its happiness and expressed its gratitude to the General Assembly for its support.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne qu'il n'y a jamais eu de doute sur les compétences de la Présidente à remplir les objectifs de cette mission. La Délégation félicite la Présidente pour le succès de la réunion, en dépit des débats difficiles et des conflits. Elle rappelle que l'Assemblée a pu atteindre un compromis grâce à la diplomatie et la ténacité de la Présidente.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite la Présidente pour les efforts considérables qu'elle a déployés pour arriver à ce résultat. Elle félicite particulièrement le groupe africain pour l'accord qui a été adopté et ajoute que celui-ci était largement mérité.

The **Chairperson** thanked all participants, the Secretariat and interpreters for their efforts. She affirmed that the proposals adopted would be sent to the Ordinary General Assembly and will be applied for the next elections. She also recalled that the General Assembly would also decide on the floating seat in 2015. She declared that this was the most difficult meeting she had ever chaired. In her opinion, the process was a positive one and relevant for the future of the Convention. She assured the meeting that she would assume the responsibility for any aspect discussed throughout the 1st Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly. She indicated that she was relieved to have achieved the sensitive issue of amending the *Rules of Procedure* for equitable geographical and cultural representation. However, she affirmed that the results of the 1st Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly would not resolve the issue of the Committee's politicization; neither would it help to deal with other problems such as of communication and relations with the Advisory Bodies, problems of conservation, financial problems and conflicts of interest. She stated that the most important result achieved was that the issue discussed would no longer require energy, time and money of the States Parties. Ultimately, she urged States Parties to work together for what

really mattered in order to ensure a better future for the *Convention*, stating that if they were able to accomplish that issue, they would be capable of accomplishing everything.

The **Chairperson** then closed the 1st Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly.

**Allocution of the Assistant Director-General for Culture on the occasion of the  
Opening of the 1<sup>st</sup> Extraordinary session of the General Assembly of States Parties to  
the World Heritage Convention**

**UNESCO HQs, 13-14 November 2014 –Room II**

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

- I am delighted to welcome you to the First Extraordinary session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.
- You are meeting for the next two days for a specific purpose, which is the Revision of the Rules of procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in order to achieve an equitable geographical and cultural representation on the World Heritage Committee.
- I can only reiterate once gain the upmost importance of this meeting. Indeed the orientations your debates will take and the Resolutions you will eventually adopt will have a crucial impact on the future of the implementation of the Convention and more generally on the future of the World Heritage Convention itself.
- However, this is not a new debate. The need for a better equitable geographical and cultural representation on the World Heritage Committee has been emphasized for a very long time and long and extensive debates have been held on this particular subject.
- Indeed, it is not the first time this particular matter is the subject of deliberations within both the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly. It has been a preoccupation since the first meeting of the General Assembly. At that time – in 1976 in Nairobi – the question of an equitable geographical representation on the Committee was already raised.
- Since then, this item has been examined on several occasions, and some major amendments to the Rules of Procedures of the General Assembly have been made. The last time it was debated was not so long ago: you will all remember the hard work that has

been undertaken in 2008-2009 by Ambassador Kondo from Japan, who presided over a Working Group with this unique same mandate.

- However, Ladies and Gentlemen, although being the continuation of a longstanding endeavour, the debate on the equitable geographical and cultural representation on the World Heritage Committee is taking place in a particular context.
- During this period of financial constraints, we must respond to increasing challenges. The necessity for more focused programmes goes along with the need to reform our working methods. This is the reason why the Director-General has initiated in 2012 a reflection process in the context of the 40th anniversary of the Convention. The reflection process concerns both working methods and the transparency of procedures. Both have a direct impact on the overall credibility of the Convention.
- The Director-General, by launching this reflection, responded to a call for an assessment of the future of the Convention. On this occasion, she underlined repeatedly her concerns about the gradual erosion over the years of the basic principles enshrined in the Convention: among them dialogue, cooperation and shared responsibility.

Excellences, Chers collègues,

- L'UNESCO est la seule Organisation des Nations-Unies avec un mandat spécifique dans le domaine de la culture. L'UNESCO jouit d'une reconnaissance internationale indiscutée dans ce domaine, laquelle repose sur le corpus normatif de Conventions culturelles que l'Organisation a élaboré. Chacune de ces conventions a pour objectif ultime le respect de valeurs communes et l'égalité de toutes les cultures. A cet égard, la mise en œuvre des Conventions culturelles repose sur la coopération internationale et le dialogue.
- Par conséquent, les débats qui se dérouleront au cours de ces deux journées, les Résolutions qui seront éventuellement prises, se doivent de refléter cet esprit de respect, d'échange et de dialogue, d'intégrité et de transparence qui préside au sens même de la Convention du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel.
- Il ressort de la majorité de vos interventions, lors du Comité du patrimoine mondial, de l'Assemblée générale, ainsi que lors du Conseil exécutif - comme ce fut le cas très récemment – que tous les Etats Parties déplorent la politisation des débats qui semble prévaloir aujourd'hui.

- Vous avez raison, et nous nous devons par conséquent d'être en mesure d'y opposer la crédibilité scientifique et les mécanismes de coopération à la politisation afin de protéger les fondements de l'un des instruments normatifs les plus reconnus dans le monde. Nous devons tous être pleinement conscients que l'efficacité de la Convention du patrimoine mondial repose en dernière instance sur la crédibilité que le monde lui reconnaît.
- Le principe de crédibilité ne s'applique d'ailleurs pas seulement à la Liste du patrimoine mondial; il s'applique d'abord et avant tout aux méthodes de travail du Comité, et par conséquent à vos décisions et à vos actions en faveur de la préservation du patrimoine de l'humanité.
- Le respect du principe de crédibilité est l'avenir de la Convention. De nombreux défis demeurent pour y parvenir. Ces défis sont notamment les questions critiques de représentation géographique et culturelle équitable dont vous allez débattre. Les réponses que vous y apporterez auront un impact important sur notre action dans l'avenir.

Excellences, Chers collègues,

- La crédibilité du Comité - incarnée notamment par sa composition - est entre vos mains. Tel est le défi qui se dresse devant vous aujourd'hui.
- Je souhaite un plein succès à vos travaux et vous remercie.