World Heritage 14 GA

Distribution limited

WHC-03/14.GA/INF.1
Paris, 22 July 2003
Original : English/French

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

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

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room XII
14-15 October 2003**

Item 1 of the Provisional Agenda: Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative

Summary Record of the 13th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (Paris, 30-31 October 2001)

1. The Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was held in Paris, at UNESCO Headquarters on 30 and 31 October 2001 during the thirty-first session of the UNESCO General Conference.

2. Representatives of one hundred and forty-two States Parties to the Convention attended the General Assembly.

3. The representatives of the three Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN) also participated.

4. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre provided the Secretariat for the General Assembly.

Item 1: Opening of the General Assembly by the Director-General or his representative

5. In his opening address, the representative of the Director-General, Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Assistant Director-General for Culture, spoke of the incontestable success of the World Heritage Convention. He welcomed the Kingdom of Bhutan, Samoa and Eritrea as new signatories to the Convention. The Convention would have 167 States Parties by the end of 2001. He stated that this achievement of near universality proved that the world attached special importance to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage.

6. Mr Bouchenaki advised the General Assembly that Mr Peter King (Australia) had submitted a letter of resignation as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and apologised for not being present. Mr Bouchenaki congratulated Mr King for his work and thanked Dr Christina Cameron (Canada) who had accepted the position of Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee until the election of a new Chairperson on 1 November 2001.

7. Mr Bouchenaki stressed that the 13th General Assembly had a heavy agenda. In addition to its traditional task of electing the 7 new members of the Committee, an additional member would need to be elected because Italy had voluntarily yielded its seat after 2 years in office to give other States Parties a chance to join the Committee.

8. He noted that the General Assembly would also be examining the Statement of Accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of contributions. He stated that arrears on dues to the World Heritage Fund were still outstanding from some 60 States Parties for the total sum of just over US$ 500,000. He thanked the Russian Federation and the Republic of Iran for their recent contributions that would assist in settlement of their arrears.

9. Mr Bouchenaki advised the General Assembly that determination of the amount of contributions to the World Heritage Fund, the Representivity of the World Heritage List, and follow-up actions to the Resolution on the Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee adopted by the 12th General Assembly were also on the agenda. He noted that the General Assembly also had before it the Draft Resolution on the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Afghanistan, submitted by the 25th session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

10. He referred to the discussions at Commission IV of the UNESCO General Conference on matters of importance to the States Parties of the World Heritage Convention:

a) A Draft Resolution on "Crimes against the Common Heritage of Humanity";

b) A Draft Convention on Underwater Cultural Heritage;

c) The protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage;

d) A Draft Declaration on Cultural Diversity.

11. He noted that many States Parties had demonstrated their support of the World Heritage Convention by concluding special cooperation agreements with UNESCO. He thanked the Government of France for its continued support, the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands for their co-operation, as well as those States Parties cooperating through the Nordic World Heritage Office. He thanked the Governments of China and the Republic of Korea for their extrabudgetary contributions over and above their dues and paid a special tribute to the United Nations Foundation (UNF) for its important contribution of over US$8 million for the protection of natural heritage sites, particularly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

12. Mr Bouchenaki thanked the States Parties who had supported the World Heritage Centre by providing human resources over the past two years, including Austria, China, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom as well as Delft University of the Netherlands. He also thanked the recent commitment by Belgium to make available an expert for natural heritage.

13. He thanked Mr Abdelaziz Touri (Morocco), the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, and commended Mr Peter King (Australia) and the outgoing members of the World Heritage Committee for their services. Mr Bouchenaki then declared the thirteenth General Assembly open.

Item 2: Election of the Chairperson of the General Assembly

14. The General Assembly elected by acclamation H.E Ambassador Samuel Fernandéz Illanes (Chile) as Chairperson of the General Assembly.

15. The Chairperson thanked the General Assembly for his election and commented on the tremendous importance of the World Heritage Convention.

16. The Delegate of Algeria congratulated the Chairperson on his election and welcomed the three new States Parties to the Convention. He then asked that the representative of Palestine be accepted as an observer to the 13th General Assembly. The Delegates of Cuba, the Republic of Dominica, Egypt, the Republic of South Africa, Malaysia, Oman, India, Pakistan, Yemen, Benin, France, Finland, Laos, Costa Rica, Morocco, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, China, Zimbabwe and Angola supported Algeria's proposal. The Delegate of Israel spoke against the proposal commenting that the Palestinian authority was not a full-fledged state. The Delegate of France commented that Palestine enjoyed observer status at

UNESCO and that Palestine had always enjoyed observer status at the General Assembly. He then asked if there were any legal reason to counter Algeria's proposal.

17. The Legal Advisor of UNESCO referred to Rules 2 and 16 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly. He concluded that according to Rule 2.2, Palestine could not be accepted as an observer at the General Assembly unless Rule 2.2 was amended in accordance with Rule 16. He noted however, that Palestine had been accepted as an observer in the past. The Delegate of Spain noted that the general view of the General Assembly was clear and it was not necessary to resort to amending Rule 2.2.

18. The Delegate of Algeria proposed an amendment to Rule 2.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly to state "The representatives of member States *and observers* of UNESCO…". The Chairperson then suggested that Algeria's proposal to allow Palestine as an observer be accepted. There were no objections. The representative from Palestine thanked the General Assembly for the decision and commented that it opened the way to dialogue amongst peoples that was the only way to achieve peace.

Item 3: Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

19. The Delegate of France questioned the procedures used to elect the Chairperson of the General Assembly whereby there was no consultation prior to the session. He proposed that this issue and Rule 3 of the *Rules of Procedure* be discussed under Item 11: Other business. He also suggested that candidates for Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Rapporteur could be called for in advance and that all States Parties be informed.

20. The Delegate of the United States of America agreed with the proposal made by the Delegate of France and also commented that in future the General Assembly needed to be given prior notice of issues such as the discussion on the changes to the Rules of Procedure that had been discussed under the previous agenda item.

21. The Chairperson informed the General Assembly that the Director-General of UNESCO might be available to attend the closure of the session. He therefore suggested that an item be added to the end of the Agenda - "Closure of the session".

22. The Provisional Agenda was adopted with the proposed amendments.

23. The Director of the World Heritage Centre noted that in relation to Item 10: Elections to the World Heritage Committee, all candidates for election must have paid their contributions to the World Heritage Fund. If States Parties had not yet paid their contributions and wished to stand as a candidate for the Committee, the Comptroller of UNESCO would accept contributions up until the beginning of the election. Candidates were requested to inform the Secretariat if they intended to pay their outstanding contribution to the World Heritage Fund.

Item 4: Election of the Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur

24. The Chairperson invited the General Assembly to choose three Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur. Mr Boubaker Ben Fraj, Director General of the National Institute for

Heritage of Tunisia and Ms Sandra Kalniete, Ambassador of Latvia to UNESCO were appointed as Vice-Chairpersons by acclamation. A third Vice-Chairperson was not appointed. Mrs Deanna Ongpin-Recto (Philippines) was appointed as Rapporteur by acclamation.

Item 5: Report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

25. The Chairperson of the General Assembly referred to document 31C/REP.15 Report by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on its Activities (2000-2001). He explained that the World Heritage Committee, at its sixteenth session held in December 1992 in Santa Fe, United States of America, recommended that the report which the Committee addressed to the General Conference also be presented to the General Assembly of States Parties.

26. Dr Christina Cameron (Canada), Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee presented the report of the Committee (a copy of Dr Cameron's speech is included as Annex I of this report) and introduced two Draft Resolutions to be examined by the General Assembly:

- Draft Resolution presented by the Bureau of the Committee on the protection of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2B); and
- Draft Resolution presented by Mr Peter King (former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee) - proposal for a new additional voluntary contribution by States Parties to the World Heritage Fund (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2C).

27. With reference to the first Draft Resolution, she remarked that the destruction of the ancient statues of Bamiyan in Afghanistan on 12 March 2001 had brought a new focus on the need to strengthen the safeguarding of the common heritage of humankind. In June 2001 the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee discussed ways to strengthen the protection of heritage.

28. Dr Cameron stated that this Draft Resolution should be examined in the context of the debate and Draft Resolution of the UNESCO General Conference on “Acts constituting a Crime against the Common Heritage of Humanity”. She thanked the representative of the Director-General, Mr Bouchenaki, for having referred, in his opening speech, to the important discussions that took place on this subject in Commission IV of the General Conference the previous Saturday.

29. With reference to the second Draft Resolution, Dr Cameron noted that in the last two years many States Parties had benefited from International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund. Hundreds of requests for assistance to prepare nominations, tentative lists, management conservation plans and to organise training workshops had been supported. The sustainability of this support however, had been questioned. In his letter of 2 July 2001, Mr Peter King (then Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee) commented that "in the long term I believe that the compulsory contribution by States Parties of 1% of the contribution to the Regular Budget indicated in the Convention is outdated". In noting that there were also many other fiscal initiatives that must be examined to enhance the protection of World Heritage, Mr King called for the support of all States Parties to a voluntary additional contribution to the World Heritage Fund.

30. Dr Cameron advised that after considering the financial statements as at 31 December 2000, the Comptroller of UNESCO highlighted the World Heritage Fund's position in relation to cash reserves. He indicated that during 2001 the financial resources of the Fund would be fully stretched. The only other resources were locked in the US$2,000,000 outstanding debts from States Parties, a significant asset which was not available.

31. The Chairperson of the General Assembly congratulated Dr Cameron and expressed satisfaction with the work accomplished by the Committee to date. The General Assembly took note of the report.

32. The Chairperson referred to the Draft Resolution on the protection of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan submitted by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fifth session (Paris, 25-30 June 2001) (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2B). He noted that the international community voiced deep concern when the statues of Bamiyan were destroyed. He stated that the General Assembly might wish to amend the wording of the Draft Resolution to reflect the current situation.

33. The Delegate of Greece questioned the procedure whereby the Bureau prepared the Draft Resolution without seeking the views of the Committee. She stated that the Bureau had no legal authority to do so. The Director of the World Heritage Centre stated that this situation had occurred due to the calendar of meetings whereby the Committee was not scheduled to meet until December. The Delegate of Thailand stated that if the Draft Resolution had been put to the Committee, it would have definitely been adopted.

34. The Resolution concerning "Acts constituting a crime against the common heritage of humanity" adopted by Commission IV on 27 October 2001 for adoption by the UNESCO General Conference, was distributed to the General Assembly. This Resolution was read to the General Assembly by the Director of the World Heritage Centre (see Annex II).

35. Recalling that the situation in Afghanistan had changed since the Bureau prepared the Draft Resolution, the Chairperson of the General Assembly requested that a small working group comprising the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, interested delegations and the Secretariat meet to make amendments, in light of the Resolution concerning "Acts constituting a crime against the common heritage of humanity". The revised Draft Resolution was proposed and adopted by the General Assembly by consensus (see Annex III).

36. The Chairperson of the General Assembly then referred to the second Draft Resolution presented by Mr Peter King which was a proposal for a new additional voluntary contribution by States Parties to the World Heritage Fund (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2C).

37. The Delegate of Spain advised the General Assembly that it was a complex issue that required considerable thought and further study, commenting that the proposed voluntary contribution was actually compulsory. Following this, he stated that without further study and explanation of the rationale, Spain could not accept the Draft Resolution. The Delegate of Greece agreed and stated that voluntary contributions were not a predictable way to secure funds. Furthermore, she stated that the World Heritage Committee, the statutory organ to define strategy, had not been consulted about this Draft Resolution. She suggested that every

State Party to the Convention should encourage the establishment of public and private means to provide further funding for World Heritage.

38. The Delegate of Belgium gave credit to the former Chairperson for the ideas presented in the Draft Resolution but stated that an increase of 1% in voluntary contributions was minor. She commented that additional funding should be sought through, for instance, co-operative arrangements. She mentioned that several proposals suggested by States Parties in response to Mr King's proposals had not been made available to the General Assembly and that this issue needed to be more thoroughly prepared and investigated. She suggested that the decision be referred to the World Heritage Committee.

39. The Director of the World Heritage Centre announced that he would make a summary of the responses of States Parties to Mr King's proposals available to the General Assembly (see Annex IV)

40. The Delegate of Thailand stated that before proposing the Draft Resolution, Mr King had approached States Parties at the Bureau and Committee session in Cairns. The idea of the Draft Resolution was not to change the provisions of the Convention (Article 16). He noted that table 1 in the Draft Resolution may lead to some misunderstanding as the figures under "proposed additional voluntary contribution of 1% US$" were too specific. He advised that the word "additional" should be changed to "supplementary".

41. The Delegates of Lithuania, Uruguay, Finland, Hungary, Panama and Japan supported the Delegate of Spain and requested that more time be given to consider the Draft Resolution in greater depth. The Delegate of Argentina suggested that resources be strengthened by active, imaginative and efficient identification of extra budgetary resources and a reallocation of resources within UNESCO's regular budget. The Delegate of Benin commented that a 1% voluntary contribution set a ceiling which was undesirable as States Parties may want to give more. The Delegate of Finland stressed that States Parties who had not paid their contributions to the World Heritage Fund should pay their dues. The Delegate of Israel suggested that the Secretariat take note of the States Parties' responses to the Draft Resolution and provide the General Assembly with an analysis of voluntary and compulsory contributions related to the number of World Heritage sites within each State Party.

42. The Director of the World Heritage Centre agreed that a ceiling could not be put on voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund and that there was no upper limit. 1% was chosen for its simplicity. He also informed the General Assembly that the Draft Resolution also proposed a US$300 minimum contribution to the World Heritage Fund for all States Parties.

43. Following these remarks, the Chairperson of the General Assembly suggested that the matter be deferred and that the World Heritage Committee examine the Draft Resolution in greater depth. This decision was adopted by the General Assembly.

Item 6: Examination of the Statement of Accounts of the World Heritage Fund, including the status of the States Parties' contributions

44. In conformity with the Financial Rules of the World Heritage Fund, the representative of the Comptroller presented for examination by the General Assembly, document WHC-2001/CONF.206/3a which contained:

- the accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period 1998-1999, certified by the auditors within the framework of the UNESCO General Audit; and
- the Fund accounts for the year 2000 approved by the Comptroller and which will be part of the external audit for the financial period 2000-2001.

45. He explained each one of the financial statements and tables contained in this document, noting that it reflected the actual financial situation as at the end of the 1998-1999 biennium and the end of 2000.

46. The Delegate of Canada requested clarification as to the difference between the contingency reserve and the operating reserve (Statement II: Balance Statement of Assets, Liabilities, Reserves and Fund Balance as at 31 December 1999). The representative of the Comptroller recalled that the Reserve for unforeseen expenses amounting to 2 million US dollars, had been established following the decision of the Committee at its 17th session, and that it concerned long-term economies destined to ensure a cash reserve for the budget of the Fund.

47. The Chairperson proposed that the General Assembly approve the accounts for the period 1998-1999 and to take note of the accounts for 2000. The Assembly took note of the document and approved the accounts.

Situation of the state of contributions of States Parties

48. The representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller presented the documents WHC-2001/CONF.206/3b and WHC-2001/CONF.206/3b.Add, containing the compulsory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund as at 30 September and revised as at 22 October 2001. He indicated that the state of compulsory and voluntary contributions would be updated for the next session of the Committee in Helsinki in December 2001.

49. The Delegate of Thailand referred to the last page of document WHC-2001/CONF.206/3b, State of contributions as at 31 August 2001, and requested clarification regarding the minimum level of voluntary and compulsory contributions for 2001. The representative of the Comptroller confirmed that the calculations were based, in both cases, on 1% of the contribution of each State to the UNESCO budget, and that the minimum contribution was US$27 for 2001, and that the figure indicated was correct.

50. The representative of the Comptroller then informed the General Assembly of other contributions received as at 30 October 2001 amounting to US$ 61,826. The Delegate of Bangladesh intervened to announce that his country had paid its contribution for 2001. The representative of the Comptroller confirmed that Bangladesh had indeed paid on 13 September 2001. He indicated that some payments were being processed and would be accepted up until the announcement of the first round of voting so that candidate States to the Committee could regularize their contribution.

51. The General Assembly took note of documents WHC-2001/CONF.206/3b and WHC-2001/CONF.206/3b.Add.

Item 7: Agreement upon the level of contribution to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention

52. The Chairperson presented the document WHC-2001/CONF.206/4 to the General Assembly for a decision as to whether the level of compulsory contributions to the World Heritage Fund should be maintained at 1% of the amount of contributions of States Parties to the Regular Budget of UNESCO, in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention, inline with the decision of previous General Assemblies. The General Assembly took note of the document and unanimously approved this proposal.

Item 8: Representivity of the World Heritage List (follow-up to the Resolution adopted by the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties)

53. The Chairperson referred to document WHC-2001/CONF.206/5 and requested the General Assembly to take note of the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns 2000.

54. The Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that a Resolution had been adopted by the 12th General Assembly concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. Furthermore, he acknowledged the work of the Working Group that was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Yai (Benin) in 2000 whose mandate was to make recommendations, based on the Resolution, towards improving the representivity of the World Heritage List.

55. The Director of the World Heritage Centre summarised the main points of the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns 2000, which were based on the recommendations of the Working Group.

56. The Delegate of Argentina supported the decision of the World Heritage Committee and stressed the importance of the preparation of tentative lists as a first step to protecting heritage. He advised that a committee was recently established in Argentina for this purpose and there were already 10 sites on the tentative list that would be valid until 2010. Under-represented heritage such as cultural landscapes and intangible heritage had been considered as well as sites bordering neighbouring countries.

57. The Delegate of France welcomed the Committee decision but questioned the priority system to be used to select the 30 nominations to be considered by the Committee in 2003. He asked when information from the analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists (requested by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session) would be available to States Parties to assist them in prioritising their nominations. The Director of the World Heritage Centre responded that an initial analysis would be completed in early 2002.

58. The Delegate of Finland commented that the World Heritage List should be analysed according to a whole range of typologies and categories so that States Parties can

identify when they had too much or not enough of a type of heritage represented on the List. He suggested that this would be an important discussion topic at the next World Heritage Committee meeting in Helsinki.

59. The Delegate of Israel referred to document WHC-2001/CONF.206/INF.5 "Distribution of World Heritage properties in States Parties" in which it was stated that 33 States Parties had no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. He stated that by proposing a limit of 30 nominations to be examined, a "gate keeper" was created whereby underrepresented States Parties may be able to present only 1 or 2 properties, thus limiting their potential for representation on the List. He stated that a limitation of 30 nominations was too strict and suggested that the scale of contributions to the World Heritage Fund for each State Party be based on the number of properties it had inscribed on the World Heritage List.

60. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reminded the General Assembly that it was only asked to note the document on Representivity of the List (WHC-2001/CONF.206/5). He also recalled that the Committee had decided to limit the number of new nominations to be examined in 2003. The World Heritage Committee would decide on the number of nominations to be examined in future years.

61. The Delegate of Greece reiterated the comments made by the Delegate of France emphasising that the results of the analysis of the World Heritage List and tentative lists were required by States Parties to prepare nominations of categories of heritage not well represented on the List. She stressed that the analysis should be a priority of the World Heritage Centre.

62. The Director of the World Heritage Centre provided a brief explanation of the analysis of the World Heritage List and tentative lists which had been requested by the World Heritage Committee in Cairns. The deadline for the report of the analysis was 30 September 2001, but the World Heritage Committee had not provided funding for the study and the World Heritage Centre was unable to find resources to initiate the study. He advised that the study would be funded in 2002.

63. The Delegate of New Zealand supported the work done to date to balance the World Heritage List and acknowledged that the Pacific region was underrepresented on the World Heritage List. He mentioned that the Pacific was under-resourced and welcomed assistance to prepare nominations. He noted that the General Assembly must not forget the objective of quality in the words "outstanding universal value". He stated that New Zealand did not believe that properties of "outstanding universal value" should be restricted from being inscribed just because they were located within a State Party that was well represented on the List. He stressed that New Zealand did not want a distorted List or suppression of high-quality nominations.

64. The Delegate of Chile shared the misgivings of the Delegate of France regarding the priority system to be used to select the 30 nominations to be examined by the Committee in 2003. He asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to explain how joint nominations between two or more State Parties would be considered. The Director responded by noting that while this type of nomination had not been considered by the Cairns

Committee, a solution would be proposed in Helsinki that might encourage more of these nominations in the future.

65. The Delegate of Lithuania supported the work conducted to date to balance the World Heritage List and stated that they eagerly awaited the results of the analysis of the World Heritage List and tentative lists. The Delegate of Denmark supported the decision of the Cairns Committee as indicated in the document (WHC-2001/CONF.206/5) and commented that Denmark had selected three natural/cultural areas in Greenland that they would like to nominate for inclusion in the World Heritage List. Furthermore, he informed the General Assembly that the government of Denmark would provide the expertise to assist in the preparation and co-ordination of these nominations.

66. The Delegate of Slovenia mentioned the importance of scientific research for World Heritage properties and suggested that Karstic phenomena be used as one of the criteria for inclusion in the World Heritage List. She also offered to host a seminar in Slovenia in 2002 on Karstic phenomena.

67. The Delegate of India agreed with the comments made by the Delegates of France, New Zealand and Chile. She stated that nominations of properties of quality should not be excluded from the List in the search for new categories, typologies and themes of heritage. She stated that the process for selecting which nominations were to be examined by the World Heritage Committee must be inclusive and consultative rather than exclusive.

68. The Delegate of Iceland welcomed the work to date to ensure a representative World Heritage List and mentioned that Iceland hoped to nominate a property in the near future.

69. The Delegate of Sudan supported the criteria for selecting nominations to be examined by the Committee in 2003. He stated that Sudan had no sites on the World Heritage List even though it covered a large land mass and contained a considerable number of cultural and natural sites. He commented that as part of the priority system for selecting nominations to be examined, the date when a State Party became a signatory to the World Heritage Convention should be considered as Sudan ratified the Convention 25 years ago.

70. The Delegates of Armenia, Iraq and Indonesia all supported the work achieved to date in trying to achieve a more representative and balanced World Heritage List and mentioned that they had cultural and natural sites that could potentially be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

71. The Delegate from the Democratic Republic of the Congo stated that his country had a number of sites on the World Heritage List but due to war, one of the sites had been put on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He appealed to the General Assembly for appropriate funds to be allocated to enable restoration of the site. Furthermore, he stated that the Congo was full of cultural riches that were not on the World Heritage List and asked that a balance be made between cultural and natural sites.

72. Following these interventions, and at the request of the Chairperson, the General Assembly took note of the decision adopted at the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee as presented in document WHC-2001/CONF.206/5.

73. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reiterated that the priority system for limiting the number of nominations to be examined by the Committee each year would be evaluated by the Committee in one to two years' time. He thanked the General Assembly for their words of appreciation and stated that there was a need to establish ongoing activities for States Parties with no sites on the World Heritage List such as Sudan. He advised that the World Heritage Centre had begun a process to identify desertic sites in this region that may have the potential to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. He also stated that with the assistance of a major grant from the United Nations Foundation work was now being conducted in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He noted that the Director-General of UNESCO would visit the Congo in 2002.

Item 9: Equitable representation in the World Heritage Committee (follow-up to the Resolution adopted by the Twelfth General Assembly of States Parties, including amendments to *Rules of Procedure* 13.1 and 13.8)

74. The Chairperson referred to document WHC-2001/CONF.206/6 and requested the General Assembly to examine and approve the Draft Resolution including amendments to the *Rules of Procedure* 13.1 and 13.8 adopted by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns in December 2000.

75. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reminded the General Assembly that the document under consideration had resulted from the Resolution adopted by the twelfth General Assembly and the work of the Working Group on Equitable representation within the World Heritage Committee, established under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador J. Musitelli (France).

76. The Director noted that there were two proposals. The first included a voluntary reduction of term of office on the Committee from six to four years and a request for States Parties not to seek consecutive terms of office. The second proposal called for a change in the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly whereby a seat would be reserved for a State Party with no sites on the World Heritage List, and the electoral process would change slightly as indicated in the table below.

	1st Ballot	2nd Ballot	3rd Ballot	4th Ballot
Existing Election System	All eligible Candidates	Those obtaining greatest no. of votes in the 1st ballot, no. of candidates not more than twice no. of seats remaining	Those obtaining greatest no. of votes in the 2nd ballot, no. of candidates not more than twice no. of seats remaining	Those obtaining greatest no. of votes in the 3rd ballot, no. of candidates not more than twice no. of seats remaining
Proposed Election System	All eligible Candidates	All remaining eligible Candidates	Those obtaining greatest no. of votes in the 2nd ballot, no. of candidates not more than twice no. of seats remaining	Those obtaining greatest no. of votes in the 3rd ballot, no. of candidates not more than twice no. of seats remaining

77. The Delegate of Cuba praised the work conducted to date and withdrew his country's candidature for election to the World Heritage Committee in accordance with the principle of rotation to give more opportunity to Santa Lucia and Argentina to secure a seat on the World Heritage Committee.

78. The Delegate of Tanzania supported the proposals to increase representivity on the World Heritage List and the World Heritage Committee. He stated that participation of States Parties in the World Heritage Committee needed to be considered in terms of geographical distribution and lack of sites on the World Heritage List. The Delegate of India commended Ambassador Musitelli's work and said that it should guide the General Assembly in looking at systematic and institutional changes that were valid for the long term. The Delegates of Spain, Uruguay, Ukraine, Indonesia, Jordan, and Vietnam supported the proposal. The Delegates of Panama, Armenia and Vietnam suggested that the number of members of the World Heritage Committee be increased from 21 to 28.

79. The Delegate of France advised the General Assembly that reducing the term of office from six to four years was voluntary. He stated that during the preparation of the report of the Working Group, UNESCO's legal advisors were consulted regarding this issue. They advised that an obligatory reduction would require an amendment to the World Heritage Convention. He then drew the attention of the General Assembly to the idea of fair play and to the voluntary action of Italy to reduce its current term of office from six to two years.

80. The Delegates of Nigeria, Argentina, Armenia, Lebanon, St Lucia, Saudi Arabia, the Russian Federation, Turkey, the Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Togo, and Oman supported the recommendations of the Working Group and stated that if elected, they would reduce their term of office on the World Heritage Committee from six to four years.

81. The Delegate of New Zealand thanked Italy, Cuba and the States Parties that had volunteered to reduce their terms of office if elected. He noted however that the quality of the State Party's contribution on the World Heritage Committee might justify its continuing in office. He disagreed with the proposal for a reserved seat for States Parties with no sites on the World Heritage List as it risked undermining the quality of membership of the World Heritage Committee. He questioned the wording of the proposed new Rule to be inserted after Rule 13.1 whereby the word "may" is the sixth word. He asked whether this word was meant to be "shall". Furthermore, he suggested that the General Assembly and not the World Heritage Committee make the decision to reserve a seat.

82. In response, the Director of the World Heritage Centre stated that changing the word from "may" to "shall" did not change the essence of the text. He referred to paragraph II.4 of the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 24th session whereby

> "in order to implement the new rule to be inserted following Rule 13.1, the Committee decided that <u>one</u> seat be reserved for a State Party not having a site inscribed on the World Heritage List at the date of the 13th session of the General Assembly."

83. Furthermore, he clarified that the World Heritage Committee proposed that one seat be reserved for the next election to the World Heritage Committee in case the 13th General Assembly adopted the Draft Resolution.

84. The Delegate of Ghana announced that his country was withdrawing its candidature in support of Nigeria. The Delegates of the Ukraine and Georgia also announced withdrawal of their candidatures.

85. Following a question from the Delegate of Thailand, the Director of the World Heritage Centre once again informed the General Assembly that one seat on the Committee would be reserved at this election for a State Party with no sites on the World Heritage List. Furthermore he noted that increasing the number of members of the World Heritage Committee from 21 to 28 or changing the official length of term from 6 to 4 years would require an amendment to the World Heritage Convention;

86. Finally, the Chairperson congratulated the Working Group on behalf of the General Assembly and announced that the Draft Resolution presented below had been adopted. The amended version of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly was then circulated.

The General Assembly,

Recalling Article 8, paragraph 2, of the Convention which stipulates that "Election of members of the Committee shall ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world";

Recalling Article 9 of the Convention which stipulates that "The term of office of States members of the World Heritage Committee shall extend from the end of the ordinary session of the General Conference during which they are elected until the end of its third subsequent ordinary session";

Recalling the Resolution of the 7th General Assembly of States Parties (1989);

Considering the representivity of the World Heritage List could be enhanced through the increased participation in the work of the Committee of States Parties whose heritage is currently unrepresented in the List;

Considering that the strong interest of States Parties in participating in the work of the World Heritage Committee could be addressed by a more frequent rotation of Committee members;

Invites the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, to voluntarily reduce their term of office from six to four years;

Encourages States Parties that are not members of the Committee to make use of their right to participate in meetings of the World Heritage Committee as observers;

Discourages States Parties from seeking consecutive terms of office in the World Heritage Committee;

Decides that before each election of Committee members, the President of the General Assembly of States Parties will inform States Parties of the situation of the representation of regions and cultures in the World Heritage Committee and World Heritage List;

Decides to amend its Rules of Procedure as follows:

New Rule to be inserted after Rule 13.1

A certain number of seats may be reserved for States Parties who do not have sites on the World Heritage List, upon decision of the World Heritage Committee at the session that precedes the General Assembly. Such a ballot for reserved seats would precede the open ballot for the remaining seats to be filled. Unsuccessful candidates in the reserved ballot would be eligible to stand in the open ballot.

Amendment to existing Rule 13.8 (new text in bold)

13.8 *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 that case, the States obtaining the greatest number of votes, up to the number of seats to be filled, shall be declared elected.* ~~*If the number of States obtaining the majority required is less than the number of seats to be filled, there shall be a second ballot, followed by a third and, if necessary a fourth, to fill the remaining seats.*~~ ***If the number of States obtaining the majority required is less than the number of seats to be filled, there shall be a second ballot. If the number of States obtaining the majority required is still less than the number of seats to be filled there shall be a third and, if necessary a fourth ballot, to fill the remaining seats. For the third and fourth ballots,*** *the voting shall be restricted to the States obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot, up to a number twice that of the seats remaining to be filled.*

Decides that this resolution should be implemented immediately.

Item 10: Elections to the World Heritage Committee

87. The Delegate of the United Kingdom announced that if elected, the United Kingdom would reduce its term of office from 6 to 4 years. The Delegate of Turkey appealed to the current members of the World Heritage Committee to reduce their terms of office for the purposes of equality and equity.

88. The Chairperson called on the Director of the World Heritage Centre to summarise the new electoral process according to the amendments adopted under Item 9 of the Agenda.

89. The General Assembly agreed to a secret ballot and the Chairperson appointed two tellers, Ms Margaret Austin (New Zealand) and Ms Iris Leiva de Billault (Costa Rica).

90. The General Assembly was requested to elect eight members of the World Heritage Committee. Before the voting process took place, the Chairperson informed the General Assembly of the States Parties concluding their term after the thirteenth General Assembly which were: Australia, Benin, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Italy, Malta and Morocco. He referred to document WHC-2001/CONF206/7 that contained the names of the 13 States Parties who remained members of the World Heritage Committee and document WHC-

2001/CONF206/INF 3 that referred to the periods during which each State Party had been a member of the Committee.

91. In accordance with Article 16(5) of the World Heritage Convention, the Chairperson stated that Uzbekistan was not eligible for membership to the World Heritage Committee as it had not paid its dues to the World Heritage Fund. The representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller confirmed that all of the other candidates had complied with the conditions of payment of contributions. The Delegate of Uzbekistan informed the General Assembly that there had been a delay in the transfer of funds and gave his assurance that the contributions would be paid.

92. The Delegate of Canada requested confirmation from the UNESCO Legal Advisor as to whether an absolute majority was required for the reserved seat. In accordance with Rules 12.1, 12.3 and 6.2 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly the Legal Advisor stated that a simple majority was required i.e. 51%.

93. Before the voting started, the Delegates of Turkey and Israel declared that if they were elected they would voluntarily reduce their term of office in the Committee from six to four years.

94. The Delegate of Slovenia indicated that the official name of the successor State of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia was the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and not Yugoslavia as had been mentioned in the documents for the General Assembly. The Legal Advisor took note of this and agreed with the need to amend the documents.

95. The Director of the World Heritage Centre announced that there were 17 candidates for 8 seats on the World Heritage Committee. The candidates were as follows: Argentina, Armenia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Israel, Lebanon, Nigeria, Oman, the Russian Federation, Santa Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United Republic of Tanzania. Of these the following States Parties had no sites on the World Heritage List and would be candidates for the reserved seat according to Rule 13.1 of the new *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly: Israel, Santa Lucia, Saudi Arabia and Togo.

96. The results of the first ballot for the reserved seat of the World Heritage Committee were as follows:

Number of State Parties eligible to vote:	164
Number of voters:	142
Majority required:	72
Number of invalid/void votes:	4
No. of Abstentions:	22

Israel (14 votes); Santa Lucia (86 votes); Saudi Arabia (20 votes); Togo (18 votes).

The Chairperson declared Santa Lucia elected.

97. In accordance with the new *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly the first ballot for the remaining seven seats proceeded. The list of candidates was read out to the General Assembly: Argentina, Armenia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Israel, Lebanon, Nigeria, Oman, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United Republic of Tanzania.

The results of the first ballot were as follows:

Number of voters:	141
Majority required:	71
Number of invalid/void votes:	2
Number of Abstentions:	23

Argentina (98 votes); Armenia (25 votes); Czech Republic (59 votes); Ethiopia (42 votes); Guinea (18 votes); India (85 votes); Israel (33 votes); Lebanon (91 votes); Nigeria (80 votes); Oman (57 votes); the Russian Federation (69 votes); Saudi Arabia (46 votes); Togo (37 votes); Turkey (52 votes); United Kingdom (81 votes); the United Republic of Tanzania (28 votes).

The President declared Argentina, India, Lebanon, Nigeria and the United Kingdom elected.

98. Two seats remained to be filled and a second ballot was organised with all the remaining candidates in accordance with Article 13.8 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly. The Delegate of Togo withdrew his county's candidature. The list of candidates was read out to the General Assembly: Armenia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, Israel, Oman, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United Republic of Tanzania.
The results of the second ballot were as follows:

Number of voters:	135
Majority required:	68
Number of invalid/void votes:	2
Number of Abstentions:	29

Armenia (4 votes); Czech Republic (43 votes); Ethiopia (18 votes); Guinea (8 votes); Israel (11 votes); Oman (42 votes); the Russian Federation (53 votes); Saudi Arabia (25 votes); Turkey (40 votes); the United Republic of Tanzania (14 votes);

The Chairperson declared that none of the States Parties had obtained the majority of the votes and that in the third ballot only four States would be candidates in accordance with Article 13.11 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly.

99. The candidates to the remaining two seats of the World Heritage Committee were: the Czech Republic, Oman, the Russian Federation and Turkey.

The results of the third ballot were as follows:

Number of voters:	124

Majority required:	Simple
Number of invalid/void votes:	0
Number of Abstentions:	40

Czech Republic (43 votes); Oman (72 votes); The Russian Federation (53 votes); Turkey (53 votes).

The President declared Oman elected and proceeded to the fourth ballot between the Russian Federation and Turkey who had reached an equal number of votes.

100. The results of the fourth ballot were as follows:

Number of voters:	111
Majority required:	Simple
Number of invalid/void votes:	1
Number of Abstentions:	53

The Russian Federation (68 votes); Turkey (42 votes).

The Chairperson declared the Russian Federation elected and concluded the election.

Item 11: Other Business

101. A number of Delegates expressed their concern at the length of time required to elect members of the Committee. As a result, the following Resolution was adopted by the General Assembly.

> *The 13th General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage requests the Secretariat to review the mechanics of the system of voting for new members of the Committee. Proposals for a more time efficient and simplified voting system should be submitted for review by the twenty-seventh session of the World Heritage Committee in 2003 and decision by the 14th General Assembly in 2003.*

102. The Delegate of France proposed that in order to fulfil the obligations mentioned in Rule 3 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly (election of the Chairman, one or more Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur) in a more transparent manner, States Parties should be informed of the possible candidates at least one month in advance. He emphasised that this would require no change to the *Rules of Procedure*. Following support expressed by a number of Delegates, the Director of the World Heritage Centre read the following Draft Resolution to the General Assembly which was later adopted:

> ***Implementation of the election procedures of the Bureau of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage***
>
> *Noting Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage,*

Wishing to improve the transparency of the election procedures of the Members to its Bureau,

The General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage decides on the following procedure that will take effect from its 14th session:

- *Three months prior to the commencement of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the Secretariat informs all States Parties of the seats to be filled and inquires whether they wish to submit candidatures.*

- *One month prior to the commencement of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the Secretariat informs the States Parties with a specific document on the status of candidatures. This document will be revised, as necessary, based on the evolution of the candidatures.*

103. The Chairperson informed the General Assembly that the 25th session of the World Heritage Committee would be held in Helsinki from 11-16 December 2001. He requested that States Parties register for the meeting as soon as possible. The Delegate of Finland gave a brief presentation on the preparations for the Committee session.

104. The Delegate of Hungary noted that the General Assembly session could not be dissociated from two important events witnessed during the year - the first being the brutal destruction of the Bamiyan statues in Afghanistan and the second the terrorist attack on 11 September against the United States of America. He commented that the first act resulted in the destruction of a cultural monument whilst the second showed that civilization and humankind were threatened. He referred to the World Heritage Convention as one of the best instruments of international cooperation and commented that the 30th anniversary of the Convention in 2002 was a turning point, a time to evaluate successes and encourage all States Parties to contribute to efforts to improve activities in the field of World Heritage protection. He urged the General Assembly to envisage, in this spirit, a new type of dynamism and cooperation for the sake of the protection of universal values.

Item 12: Closure of the Session

105. The Director-General of UNESCO was unable to close the General Assembly as he was required to be at the closing session of the UNESCO Executive Board. The speech of the Director-General was read by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Barbosa (see Annex V).

106. On behalf of the General Assembly, the Chairperson warmly thanked the Director-General of UNESCO for the commitments made in his speech. He stated that important achievements had been attained at the 13th General Assembly, however there was still a lot of work to be done, particularly in terms of the Representivity of the World Heritage List and the need to improve the election process. He thanked the Assistant Director-General

for Culture, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Secretariat, the tellers and the interpreters for their efficient and dedicated work. He declared the 13th General Assembly a success and closed the session.

List of Annexes

Annex I

SPEECH OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, DR CHRISTINA CAMERON (CANADA)

Mr President
Mr Bouchenaki, Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO
Your Excellencies
Ladies and Gentlemen

I have the responsibility of reporting to you on the work of the Committee in 2000 and 2001. Let me begin by paying tribute to my two predecessors - Mr Abdelaziz Touri from Morocco who was our Chair in 1999 and 2000 and Mr Peter King from Australia who has been our Chair during this last year.

Mr Touri and Mr King guided the work of the Committee at a time of great change and importance. Since the last session of the General Assembly, in October 1999, the Committee has focussed on four major issues. It has embarked on an intensive programme of reform, has considered measures for equitable representation on the World Heritage Committee, has continued its debate on the representivity of the World Heritage List and acted to secure the conservation of World Heritage sites. This morning I shall present to you the report of the Committee according to these four themes. I shall then briefly introduce you to two Draft Resolutions to be examined by this General Assembly. The first Draft Resolution is presented by the Bureau of the Committee on the protection of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2B). The second Draft Resolution presented by Mr King is a proposal for a new additional voluntary contribution by States Parties to the World Heritage Fund (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2C).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONVENTION

Let me begin by informing you that the number of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* has continued to increase over the last 2 years. Since October 1999 we have seen an increase in the number of States Parties from 157 to 164 - the new States Parties are Israel, Namibia, Kiribati, Comoros, Rwanda, Niue, and the United Arab Emirates.

I am delighted to inform you that in the last few weeks three more countries, Samoa, Bhutan and Eritrea have deposited their instruments of acceptance with UNESCO. The total membership of the Convention will therefore become 167. I hope that we will soon see all 188 Member States of UNESCO having joined the Convention. The greatest work to be done in this regard is in the Pacific where eight Members States are yet to join the World Heritage family.

REFORM

The increasing number of signatories to the Convention has been matched by a tremendously active period of discussion and reflection by the World Heritage Committee. The Committee's work has been supplemented by a Task Force and several working groups established by the Committee.

Under the chairmanship of Mr Touri, the Committee created a Task Force on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. I was pleased to chair this Task Force with the active participation of Australia, Belgium, Hungary, Morocco, Mexico, South Africa, Thailand, and representatives of the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Our mandate was to identify practical measures for more effective operation of the *Convention*. The Task Force focused on ways to improve (i) the organization and running of the statutory meetings, (ii) the procedures for decision-making, and (iii) the information and documentation management.

Based on recommendations of the Task Force, the Committee has decided on a number of reform measures including (i) revision of the calendar and cycle of World Heritage meetings from June and November to April and June as of 2002, (ii) revision of the deadline for receipt of new nominations from 1 July to 1 February, (iii) introduction of a biennial budget for the World Heritage Fund to harmonize with the UNESCO budget cycle; and, (iv) reforms to statutory documentation.

Revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

The Committee is also actively engaged in a process to revise the *Operational Guidelines*. As you are aware the *Guidelines* are one of the main working tools for World Heritage.

The Committee has embarked on a complete restructuring of the *Guidelines* to prepare a new, user-friendly document. The work is based on recommendations from an *International Expert Meeting* held in United Kingdom in April 2000.

This work to revise the *Guidelines* will be on-going in 2002.

Equitable representation in the World Heritage Committee

In 2000, in another important initiative, a Working Group chaired by H.E. Mr Jean Musitelli, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of France to UNESCO worked to provide options on Equitable Representation within the World Heritage Committee. You will recall that this had been requested by the last session of the General Assembly. I would like to thank Ambassador Musitelli and the other members of his Working Group (Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, the Czech Republic, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Philippines and Zimbabwe) for their careful attention to their complex task.

The recommendations of the Working Group were discussed by a Special Session of the Bureau in October 2000 kindly hosted by Hungary and the twenty-fourth session of the Committee held in Cairns, Australia. As a result, a draft resolution is now presented to the thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties (see WHC-2001/CONF.206/5).

The Draft Resolution includes proposals for a number of voluntary actions that should be acceptable to the majority of States Parties and should help to increase the rotation and regional representation of the Committee membership.

STATUS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Mr President
Ladies and Gentlemen

Let me now turn to the third theme, the status of the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Committee has inscribed 109 new properties on the World Heritage List in the last two years.

The total number of properties on the World Heritage List is now 690 - 529 cultural properties, 138 natural properties and 23 mixed cultural and natural properties.

Ways and means to ensure a Representative World Heritage List

Although the World Heritage List is growing, there is continuing concern that the List is not representative of the diversity of the world's outstanding cultural and natural heritage. Nor does it represent regional diversity. I draw your attention to the statistics in the table presented in paragraph 11 of document 31 C/REP/15.

Of the 109 new sites inscribed in the last two years, only one is from the Arab States, seven are from Africa, twenty-one from the Asia-Pacific region and twenty-four from Latin America and the Caribbean. In a continuing trend, a full fifty per cent of the inscribed sites are from Europe and North America.

At our last General Assembly we adopted a resolution concerning *Ways and means to ensure a Representative World Heritage List.* To ensure appropriate follow-up to the resolution, a Working Group on the Representivity of the World Heritage List was created under the chairmanship of H.E. Mr Olabiyi B.J. Yai, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Benin to UNESCO.

I am sure you would all like to thank Ambassador Yai and his Working Group for their work as the issue of representivity of the World Heritage List is of concern to all States Parties to the Convention. The Working Group members were Australia, Cuba, Egypt, Greece, India, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, Romania, South Africa and Tunisia.

The Working Group's recommendations focussed on the need to make more effective uses of tentative lists and to regulate the examination of the ever-increasing number of nominations to the World Heritage List. Ambassador Yai's group also highlighted the importance of other measures, such as assistance for capacity-building as being vital to ensuring the representation of sites from all regions on the World Heritage List.

Managing the number of nominations to be examined by the Committee each year

Within a broader framework of reform measures, the Committee in Cairns made an historic decision to manage the number of nominations to be examined by the Committee each year. In the first instance and on an interim basis, it was decided that at the twenty-seventh session

of the Committee in 2003, the number of nominations examined by the Committee will be limited to a maximum of 30 new properties.
The Committee will give priority to examining nominations of properties submitted by a State Party with no sites inscribed on the List. Priority will also be given to nominations of properties that illustrate un-represented or less represented categories of natural and cultural properties.

The Committee has made this decision as part of the *Global Strategy for a Balanced and Representative World Heritage List.* The Global Strategy is being implemented according to regional plans of action. Thematic meetings and technical studies on geological heritage, fossil sites, cultural landscapes and alpine sites for example are leading to the preparation of new tentative lists and will encourage nominations of new types of properties to the World Heritage List.

In December 2000 the first Indigenous Peoples forum on World Heritage was organised in Cairns, Australia. The recognition and involvement of indigenous peoples in the identification and conservation of World Heritage sites was strongly supported by the former Chairperson Mr King. Further discussion on the establishment of WHIPCOE, a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts, will take place later this year.

CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

You will recall that in 1997 the General Assembly adopted a Resolution on the Periodic reporting of the state of conservation of World Heritage.

At its twenty-fourth session in Cairns in December 2000, the Committee examined the first regional periodic report for the Arab States. The regional report revealed the need for improved documentation, increased professional and technical skills and improvements in policy and planning.

On 25 April 2001 the World Heritage Centre met with the Permanent Delegates of UNESCO for the Arab region to develop a strategic Action Plan to address the issues highlighted in the regional periodic report.

In the last two years, the Bureau and Committee examined more than 120 state of conservation reports of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List as well as reports on the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee decided to inscribe seven sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger during the reporting period. The sites in all corners of the world were included on the in-Danger List as a result of a diversity of threats ranging from *ad hoc* public works to threats from invasive species.

Brazil	Iguaçu National Park
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Salonga National Park
India	Group of Monuments at Hampi
Pakistan	Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore
Senegal	Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary
Uganda	Rwenzori Mountains National Park
Yemen	Historic Town of Zabid

The destruction of the ancient statues of Bamyan in Afghanistan on 12 March 2001 has brought a new focus on the need to strengthen the safeguarding of the common heritage of humankind. In June of this year the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee discussed ways to strengthen the protection of heritage. A Draft Resolution prepared by the Bureau is presented to this session of the General Assembly (WHC-2001/CONF.206/2B).

This Draft Resolution should be examined in the context of the debate and Draft Resolution of the UNESCO General Conference on "Acts constituting "A Crime against the Common Heritage of Humanity". I would like to thank the representative of the Director-General, Mr Bouchenaki, for having referred to the important discussions that took place on this subject in Commission IV of the General Conference last Saturday in his opening speech.

THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

In the last two years many of the States Parties assembled in this room have benefited from International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund. Hundreds of requests for assistance to prepare nominations, tentative lists, management conservation plans and organise training workshops etc. have been supported.

However, the sustainability of this support has been questioned. In his letter of 2 July 2001, Mr King commented that "in the long term I believe that the compulsory contribution by States Parties of 1% of the contribution to the Regular Budget indicated in the Convention is outdated". In noting that there are also many other fiscal initiatives that must be examined to enhance the protection of World Heritage, Mr King called for the support of all States Parties by a voluntary additional contribution to the World Heritage Fund.

After considering the financial statements as at 31 December 2000, the Comptroller of UNESCO has highlighted the World Heritage Fund's position in relation to cash reserves. He has indicated that during 2001 the financial resources of the Fund will be fully stretched. The only other resources are locked in the US$2,000,000 outstanding debts from States Parties, a significant asset which is not available.

A Draft Resolution on this subject is to be discussed by this session of the General Assembly (see WHC-2001/CONF.206/2C).

Mr President
Ladies and Gentlemen

Before closing it would be remiss of me not to publicly recognize those States Parties who have made significant extra-budgetary contributions towards the implementation of our Convention. I refer you to 31C/REP/15 for the specifics of each contribution but I know you would join me in thanking - Austria, Australia, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom as well as the United Nations Foundation.

Finally, on behalf of the two recent Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Touri and Mr King, I thank all the members of the World Heritage Committee for their commitment and work in the last two years. Special recognition should be given to our three Rapporteurs over the last two years - Ms Anne Lamilla (Finland), Mr Kevin Keeffe (Australia) and Mr Dawson Munjeri (Zimbabwe). I also wish to thank the Secretariat, especially the new Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Francesco Bandarin and the staff of the Centre.

Thank you.

Annex II

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY COMMISSION IV ON SATURDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2001 FOR ADOPTION BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS 31ST SESSION.

Item 5.5 - Acts constituting a crime against the common heritage of humanity (31 C/46)

Having examined document 31 C/46, the Commission recommends that the General Conference adopt the following resolution contained in paragraph 7 as amended during the debate.

The General Conference,

Thanking the Director-General for his report on his continued activity to protect threatened cultural heritage,

Noting the recommendations of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee to the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention at its thirteenth session for follow-up action in this respect,

1. Calls on all Member States and all other States of the world which are not yet party to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict to join that Convention and its two Protocols of 1954 and 1999, as well as the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illicitly Exported Cultural Objects, and the 1972 UNESCO Convention on the World Cultural and Natural Heritage in order to maximize the protection of the cultural heritage of humanity, and in particular, against destructive acts;

2. Notes the fundamental principles included in these instruments to prevent the destruction of the cultural heritage including looting and illicit excavations;

3. Wishes to reiterate the principles set out in these conventions in relation to the protection of the cultural heritage to which all Member States of UNESCO are committed and to serve as principles for the guidance of governments, authorities, institutions, organizations, associations and individual citizens; and

4. Invites the Director-General to formulate, for the 32nd session of the General Conference, a Draft Declaration against the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage based on those existing principles and on the debates on this item discussed at this 31st session of the General Conference.

Annex III

RESOLUTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF AFGHANISTAN ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AT ITS 13TH SESSION (30-31 OCTOBER 2001)

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

Recalling the invitation of the Executive Board of UNESCO at its 161st session to the World Heritage Committee to identify the means of ensuring better protection of the common heritage of humanity;

Noting the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954) and its Protocols, the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970), the World Heritage Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), the UNIDROIT Convention and other relevant international legal instruments;

Appreciating the attempts made by the Director-General of UNESCO, UNESCO Member States and various organizations and individuals to convince the Taliban forces to protect the cultural heritage of Afghanistan;

Condemns the wilful destruction of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan by the Taliban forces, particularly the statues of Bamiyan, as a crime against the common heritage of humanity;

Appeals to all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to become signatories to the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, its Protocols, the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the UNIDROIT Convention and other international legal instruments protecting cultural heritage, if they have not yet done so;

Invites the Director-General of UNESCO to inform the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-fifth session, on the chronology of events related to the nomination for inclusion on the World Heritage List of the statues of Bamiyan and other Afghan cultural heritage properties by the Government of the Islamic State of Afghanistan currently in exile;

Invites the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-fifth session, to consider:

a) ways and means by which the implementation of the World Heritage Convention can be reinforced, especially in relation to the other relevant UNESCO Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage;

b) measures for enhancing the promotion of education, awareness raising activities and communication concerning the irreplaceable values of the cultural heritage of humanity;

c) improved mechanisms for promoting the scientific documentation of potential and existing world cultural heritage properties;

Invites States Parties to inform the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-fifth session, on any steps they have taken to protect the cultural heritage of Afghanistan.

Invites the Director-General of UNESCO to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations when the common heritage of humanity is threatened with wilfil destruction so that he/she may propose necessary actions to protect this heritage.

Annex IV

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM STATES PARTIES TO CIRCULAR LETTER NO. 6 - PROPOSALS FOR A NEW ADDITIONAL VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTION BY STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

State Party	Supports the Draft Resolution	Comments / Suggestions
Belgium	No	• Need to increase human and financial resources in the World Heritage Centre if the number of States Parties and the number of sites on the World Heritage List continually increase. More resources are needed especially since the Committee meeting in Cairns that adopted a series of measures to guarantee the credibility of the Convention. • The increase in the contribution of States Parties is subject to the satisfaction of the first point because it will require supplementary human resources. • It is not realistic to double the contribution by voluntary measures. The financial contributions are subject to precise rules and procedures. It cannot be effected without a solid legal base or if the finances are to be used for a precise project corresponding to distinct priorities. Consequently, our administration cannot facilitate voluntary contributions. • Suggest an alternative method to increase World Heritage funds. Administrations have the possibility to examine the co-financing of projects in the work programme adopted by the Committee, corresponding to their priorities. The budget to cover a biennial cycle decided at the Committee Session in Cairns will facilitate identification of projects by administrations and thus implementation of this proposition. This is a major advantage to the voluntary contributions in terms of human resource allocation.
Finland	No	• Does not think the method proposed is feasible. It is an unpredictable way of securing funds. • Every State Party should pay its contribution to the Fund promptly and without delay.
Greece	No	Greece does not support the Draft Resolution for the following reasons: • Increasing the voluntary contributions is not a predictable way to secure funds. • The "institutionalisation" of this measure seems contradictory to the current policy of the Executive Board of UNESCO concerning the contribution of the Member States to the Organisation since the elaboration of the next programme and budget (31C/5).

		• The eventual increase of the World Heritage Fund presupposes the adoption of a concrete policy by the World Heritage Committee for planning its operations effectively based on articles 21 and 15(4) of the Convention in relation to the capacity building of under-represented regions and to the implementation of article 29. • The increase of the fund presupposes the enforcement of the World Heritage Centre staff for management and evaluation of the results of granting activities. • The proposed resolution has not been examined by the Committee; consequently no decision was taken for submission of its draft to the General Assembly. • Greece stresses the importance that every State Party shall encourage the establishment of national public and private foundations to invite donations for World Heritage and assist in fund raising campaigns for the Fund under the auspices of UNESCO in conformity with articles 17 and 18 of the Convention.
Guatemala	Yes	• Accepts the new fee which will be effective from the year 2002.
Israel	Amendments suggested	• Preference should be given to voluntary contributions that are earmarked for specific projects - to bring about a greater sense of involvement in the activities of the WHC and give that extra budget so needed for the fund. • The voluntary contribution should relate to the number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List but also as a factor of the economic status of the State Party. The mean number of sites for all countries will represent the value of the compulsory contribution. If the mean value is 10 - a possible formula would be as follows: - a State Party with up to 5 sites will pay no voluntary contribution - a State Party with 5-10 sites will pay a voluntary contribution equal to 50% of compulsory contribution - A State party with 11-15 sites will pay a voluntary contribution equal to 100% of the compulsory contribution - A State Party with 16-20 sites will pay a voluntary contribution equal to 150% compulsory contribution - A State Party with over 20 sites will pay a voluntary contribution equal to 200% of the compulsory contribution

		• We hope these changes will benefit the World Heritage Fund and create equitable involvement • Proposed amendments to text of Draft Resolution in italics Encourages all States Parties to make additional voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund *including active and financial participation in the projects and programmes of the World Heritage Centre*. Invites all States Parties to make additional voluntary contributions *of a progressive amount to be based on the number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. This contribution will be determined by the mean number of sites for all States Parties to be equal to their compulsory contribution* or of a sufficient amount to bring their total contribution up to $300, whichever is the greater.
Italy	Yes	• Italy is committed in trying to re-launch the Convention on a voluntary basis. Agrees with voluntary contributions to the Fund and favours inviting major contributors with special interest in heritage to take additional steps beyond that. • Italy was not listed amongst the countries that provided voluntary contributions in 2001, however significant voluntary contributions have been donated. • Some States Parties who may wish to take up special responsibility should be invited to pledge further resources beyond the 2% ceiling proposed. Such contributions should support/complement general activities by the Centre (i.e. emergency assistance, capacity building for under-represented countries and civilisations etc) within a framework of criteria agreed upon by the WHC. The 30th Anniversary next year will be the ideal opportunity upon the basis of the resolution proposed, to reach this second goal.
Zimbabwe	Yes	• Support this initiative considering the benefits to be accrued by States Parties. • Recommend that certain measures should be taken to recover the US$2 million outstanding debts from States Parties in order to bolster the cash reserves of the World Heritage Fund.
Advisory Body		
IUCN	Yes	• Fully supports the proposed resolution and would be happy to speak in support if required.

Annex V

DG/2001/112
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Address by
Mr Koïchiro Matsuura

Director-General
of the United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization
(UNESCO)

at the Closing Session of the 13th General Assembly of
States Parties to the World Heritage Convention

(Read by Mr. M. Barbosa, DDG)

UNESCO, 31 October 2001

Mr Chairperson,
Your Excellencies,
Honourable Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, allow me to congratulate the eight governments newly elected to the World Heritage Committee. The honour to be among the small group of 21 State Party-members of the Committee carries with it the heavy responsibility of guiding the World Heritage Convention into the future. This Convention, our Convention, is today undoubtedly the leading international legal instrument, serving as the global conscience for the protection of cultural and natural heritage sites.

In the course of preparing, debating and finalizing the World Heritage Convention, its framers aimed not only at saving for perpetuity the selected sites of outstanding universal value. In addition, the objective of the World Heritage Convention is, at the same time, to improve national frameworks of law and management and to enlist public support to ensure the protection, preservation and presentation of all cultural and natural properties within the territories of the States Parties to the Convention.

The Convention specifically refers to the importance of research, technical training and general education to preserve these properties, and to integrate their conservation within national development actions. Moreover, it calls upon all States Parties, in full respect of the national sovereignty of each, to cooperate in the protection and conservation of properties deemed to be of value for humanity as a whole. This international treaty also calls upon its signatories to take every care not to damage, deliberately or inadvertently, the cultural and natural properties of other States Parties.

I wish to recall the attention of all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention that UNESCO's General Conference also adopted during the same session, in 1972, the Recommendations concerning the Protection, at the National Level, of Cultural and Natural Heritage. The links between the two are today more evident than ever before, in view of the tragic destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan. The deliberate destruction of the world's only giant Buddha of the great Gandharan art, which vividly illustrated the cross-fertilization between Greco-Roman civilization and the civilizations of ancient Persia, the Indian sub-continent and China, is now lost forever. This is an intolerable loss.

Many treasures of humanity - the physical forms taken by the world's diversity and the story of the evolution of our planet and its inhabitants - are yet to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. These properties, some already on the national tentative list and others still to be identified, must be protected through global action based on the principles of international solidarity and cooperation so nobly articulated in the World Heritage Convention. In this regard, I am pleased that the debate on the 'representivity' of the World Heritage List has placed due focus on international cooperation for capacity-building. I pay tribute to the donor governments which have extended cooperation to States Parties of developing countries through agreements brokered by the Centre.

With renewed urgency, I ask you to take all necessary measures to implement the Convention and to respect the Recommendations referred to above. The World Heritage Committee has the responsibility to steer the course for all States Parties to follow. It is

encouraging that the reform process to improve the working methods of the Committee has resulted in many positive developments.

I hope that the on-going process of revising the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention will reflect the new strategic orientations. These are aimed at promoting adherence to the Convention in user-friendly, accessible language understandable to all States Parties. But as the world evolves and societies change, the Committee must anticipate that it will meet new challenges and will have to deter new threats. The Operational Guidelines, therefore, will need to be revised periodically so that they can inspire action which ensures the protection of our cultural and natural diversity.

I must tell you that I am very encouraged by the display of goodwill and solidarity shown through the voluntary measures to secure a more equitable representation in the World Heritage Committee. These measures - more frequent rotation of Committee members, the reduction of terms of office from six to four years, the foregoing of consecutive terms of office, and the participation of more and more observers – are to be highly commended.

I would like to impress upon the new members of the Committee that your task is global, one that must have a meaning beyond the inner circle of the 21-member Committee. The guiding principles, the standards you are setting, must give impetus to all 167 States Parties in their efforts to protect their cultural and natural properties.

These principles have direct relevance to the people of these States. International treaties are no longer the reserve of Governments. Jurisprudence defining the new role of international treaties is being established in all fields of competence - from human rights to commercial and industrial activities and, following the tragic events of 11 September, to a major international campaign against terrorism, including measures to control the laundering of illicit funds. These seemingly unconnected international actions are rooted in our growing awareness of the need to think globally to ensure the security and quality of our lives, wherever we may be.

When I stood before you two years ago, at the end of my term as Chair of the World Heritage Committee and in the first days of my new role as Director-General of UNESCO, I stressed the importance of addressing the problem of heritage protection and conservation at its roots. This means taking proactive measures for preventive action; it requires moving from theory into practice. Allow me to stress the importance of these considerations with even more vigour. If the ultimate goal of heritage conservation is to improve the quality of our collective existence, and to transmit to future generations the diversity of our world, we must ensure that our work is development-oriented and constructive.

For heritage to have a role in contemporary society, all of you here today, as representatives of the States Parties to the Convention, have a key role to play in linking the government bodies responsible for heritage conservation and socio-economic development activities. I would like to take this opportunity to appeal to the States Parties which are also Members of the OECD. Official Development Assistance (ODA) funds amounting to well over US$ 40 billion a year are being provided to developing countries for economic and social infrastructure; please do your utmost to ensure that such ODA funds also serve to enhance the world’s cultural and natural diversity.

In this regard, I am encouraged that a number of governments have already established special cooperation agreements with the World Heritage Centre to provide technical and financial support to develop activities linking conservation and development. I would like to express my special thanks to Italy and Netherlands for their practical support in this regard. My thanks also go to France, which in 1997 initiated this innovative mode of cooperation with the Centre to promote joint planning and implementation of activities between UNESCO and the bilateral ODA institutions of France. We have also initiated discussions for similar cooperation agreements with other major donor governments, their bilateral aid agencies and regional bodies.

Decentralized local and regional authorities of West European countries are also making available their technical and financial resources to support their counterparts - in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and soon also in Central and Eastern Europe - to better manage their cultural and natural resources. Meanwhile, the adoption by the European Parliament of a resolution to support the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is also an encouraging message to other regional bodies.

Mobilization of support within the private sector is also vital to our cause. The important support extended to UNESCO by the United Nations Foundation, created by Ted Turner, for the protection of natural heritage, is a milestone in this process. We hope that other leaders of the business sector will also espouse the cause of protecting cultural and natural diversity.

Indeed, the development of partnerships will be the focus of the events planned for the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2002.

What is the best way we can encourage, yet also channel, the positive energy of governments, local authorities, universities, the private sector and the citizens of the world at large? This, I believe, is our collective task. The raison d'être of the World Heritage Committee is to lead this process.

On my part, I have proposed to UNESCO's General Conference a leading role for the World Heritage Centre as the flagship of UNESCO in the Medium-Term Strategy. Despite the Organization's financial constraints and staff reduction policy, I have made every effort to provide the Centre with more staff and to create conditions conducive to obtaining more extrabudgetary resources. As part of the UNESCO Headquarters renovation plan, a separate project is being developed for the Saxe Building to house the international multi-media and documentation centre for World Heritage; we will seek voluntary contributions to achieve this.

Let me conclude by saying that I will spare no effort in safeguarding the diversity of the world's cultural and natural heritage through the educational, scientific and communication activities of the Organization. I count on you all to support me in collectively meeting this challenge.

Thank you.